

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Tuesday, March 20, 1973 — Friday, April 27, 1973

c.4

No. 1



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY OF ONTARIO
TORONTO
FEB 7 1994
RECEIVED

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, March 20, 1973, being the first day of the third session of the 29th Parliament of the Province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant Governor of the province.

TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 1973

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the House and being seated upon the throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker, and members of the legislative assembly: I extend my warmest greetings to you on this occasion of the opening of the third session of the 29th Parliament of Ontario. On behalf of our sovereign I convey best wishes to the Premier and to my ministers and to all hon. members.

Je tiens à vous souhaiter à tous une chaleureuse bienvenue en ce jour d'ouverture de la troisième session de la 29ème Législature de l'Ontario. Je veux présenter, au nom de notre souveraine, tous les meilleurs voeux au Premier Ministre, à mes ministres et aux hon. membres.

The people of Ontario and hon. members of this assembly share the honour and pleasure afforded them by the gracious presence of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, on the occasion of their visit to Canada this summer. This royal visit will provide Her Majesty's loyal subjects the opportunity to accord a warm welcome to their Queen and to His Royal Highness.

Hon. members, the province's economy has been strengthened considerably in the past year and has enjoyed the fastest growth rate in the level of employment in over a decade. My government expects this trend to continue in 1973 with an increase in real growth of goods and services of six per cent this year, compared with an estimated 5.5 per cent gain in 1972.

Despite the continued rapid growth of the labour force, the average unemployment rate has declined from 5.2 per cent in 1971 to 4.8 per cent in 1972, and a record 140,000 new jobs were created. This achievement compared favourably with Canada as a whole, where the unemployment rate last year remained virtually unchanged at 6.3 per cent. A moderation in the labour force growth in 1973 combined with the continuing expansion in job opportunities should further improve the Ontario employment picture. Indeed, on a seasonal basis, unemployment in Ontario was 4.1 per cent in February this year compared with 4.6 per cent in February, 1972.

Ontario's fiscal policy in the past two years has played an important part in alleviating unemployment, including such measures as personal income tax reductions and selective expenditure increases made by the province which have had a favourable influence on subsequent federal policy.

In its continuing activities in the development of medium and long-term provincial economic objectives, it is my government's intention to use the resources of the Joint Committee on Economic Policy to study and recommend policies for provincial implementation and to develop positions concerning economic and industrial policy co-ordination between the province and the government of Canada.

My government proposes to strengthen the Ontario Economic Council to support its independent studies of the Ontario economy.

All are aware of the rapidly increasing rate of change around us. The steadily increasing and more concentrated population and the resulting pressure on land create a wide range of new policy imperatives.

It is clear that the preservation of our physical resources is one of the most urgent requirements facing all governments today. The most important of these resources is land. My government will place before you proposals for major new programmes designed to ensure sound planning and to preserve this resource for the use and advantage of future generations.

Two major studies undertaken by the government have now been received and action will be taken with respect to their implementation.

My government will introduce legislation which will ensure the preservation of the Niagara Escarpment. Such proposals will be balanced to permit mixed uses compatible with the preservation of the ecological and historic features of this physical land form which is a unique feature of our province.

In this connection, my government will establish a Niagara Escarpment Commission to be responsible for the overall planning of physical resources and to ensure that government policy to preserve the escarpment is carried out. The total area subject to planning and control in the public interest will be in excess of one million acres.

My government is prepared to proceed with plans for a parkway belt system from Dundas in the west to Oshawa in the east. This parkway belt will provide for the orderly channelling of services and utilities that are the essential support systems of urban southern Ontario, while affording opportunities for the preservation of open space and providing for the separation of individual urban communities.

One of the primary purposes of the reorganization of local government structures is to encourage more effective planning at the local level, particularly in regard to the control and use of land. My government believes it essential that the public be increasingly involved in this process. In this regard, my government intends to initiate a major review of the Planning Act and other legislation related to land development.

My ministry has received proposals regarding regional government both east and west of Metropolitan Toronto and will introduce legislation in this regard. My government believes that a strong and reformed local government is in the best position to determine its own priorities and proposes to transfer to strengthened local governments more authority and responsibility for many of the decisions that relate to local matters.

My government will take steps to ensure proper policy co-ordination of initiatives involving land use controls where agricultural lands are concerned so that good farm land may be retained for agricultural purposes.

My government will introduce legislation to implement recommendations contained in the interim report of the select committee on land drainage.

As a result of its review of the report of the select committee on the Ontario Municipal Board, my government will place before you proposals to make the board a more effective vehicle for discharging its responsibilities.

My government will continue to work for the fullest co-operation with the federal government and other provincial governments and looks forward to a number of joint meetings in the coming months. Amongst them will be the conference of welfare ministers next month which, it is hoped, will provide for the development of an integrated approach to income security programmes. The province is well aware of the implications for our municipalities of many of these policy negotiations and will continue to encourage active municipal representation and participation in provincial negotiations with the federal government.

New policy initiatives in the energy field are a matter of active and intensive consideration.

In its concern about changes taking place in the field of energy, Ontario fully recognizes that actions taken now and in the near future by governments both in Canada and abroad will have a profound impact on the supply and cost of energy and, in turn, on the very foundation of our economic progress. The province is equally aware of the need to place questions on energy in a balanced social perspective to protect the environment as well as the economic interests of the citizens of this province. New policy initiatives establishing agencies for energy may be expected, as well as changes in the role and place of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario. These proposals will be based on the reports of the advisory committee on energy and Task Force Hydro.

My government has already acted in relation to specific matters involving potential and significant environmental considerations, such as the Solandt commission on the proposed Nanticoke-Pickering hydro line and the task force to study the potential of the lignite fuel deposits in northern Ontario.

In the knowledge that similar matters will arise in future which will require intensive and expert study and analysis, my government will place before you legislation to establish a permanent agency for environmental protection, having the responsibility for a comprehensive system of assessment and evaluation of the environmental significance of activities of ministries of the government, utilities, projects funded in part by the gov-

ernment and related activities in the private sector which have comparable environmental implications.

On receiving the recommendations of the task force of the Ministry of the Environment, my government will introduce legislation on the disposal of solid waste.

With respect to the programme initiated last year to remove abandoned automobiles from the landscape, new regulations will be introduced providing simplified and more rapid procedures for divesting the title in derelict vehicles to hasten their removal. Other controls will be introduced with regard to locations where these vehicles are collected.

Measures to control the sale of pesticides and also their use by farmers and foresters are being effectively enforced with the co-operation of vendors and users. Further steps will be taken to strengthen these controls.

It is also the intention of my government to institute a noise abatement programme in co-operation with the municipalities.

The objectives of my government with respect to environmental matters can only be effectively achieved with the co-operation of the people of Ontario, neighbouring provinces and states, and other nations. Therefore, my ministers attach particular significance to the fact that the province of Ontario is to be host to a conference sponsored by the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers this November.

You will be asked to approve a programme designed to increase my government's activity in forest management. This expanded programme includes the regeneration of cut-over lands, establishing new forests on private land, improving growth conditions in existing forests and preparing idle land for planting or seeding. These measures are designed to help meet Ontario's long-term requirements from its forest resources.

Hon. members, various development policy initiatives and programmes will be reviewed by you, including new guidelines for financial assistance to the tourist industry, further support for exports, and industrial development with special emphasis on assistance to small business. An expanded programme has been prepared to promote all-season facilities in northern Ontario and throughout the province.

In view of the accelerated economic growth expected to take place in the United Kingdom because of that country's recent entry into the European Economic Community, the Premier, the Hon. William Davis, has arranged to lead a special mission of manufacturers and businessmen to visit Britain in May to fully explore the range of new opportunities for increasing exports and investments from Ontario to the British market.

To serve the special needs of communities in northern Ontario, amendments will be introduced to the Airports Act, designed to improve existing aviation facilities in that part of our province. My government will propose to contribute up to 80 per cent of total construction costs for these new airport facilities.

In addition, my government will continue to assume full responsibility for the construction and operation of airport facilities servicing unincorporated northern settlements, including plans for three new airstrips at Indian settlements at Round Lake, Fort Hope and Pikangikum, and a new runway for the airport at Moosonee.

My government is also proceeding with plans for the development of a new intermediate-capacity transit system to help meet the transportation needs of our larger cities, and is evaluating proposals from two manufacturers of intermediate-capacity systems. One of these systems is to be installed as a demonstration project at Exhibition Park in Toronto for operational testing purposes.

As hon. members are aware, the Camp Commission on the Legislature is presently studying the procedures and processes of our legislative activities and is giving consideration to certain reforms with respect to party finances and election expenditures. The reports from your commission will be presented for your consideration and resolution during this present session.

My government will ask you to approve the appointment of an independent commission to redistribute the electoral districts of the province, and redefine their boundaries.

My government will propose measures relating to conflict of interest with respect to its civil servants.

My government will provide increased assistance and encouragement to our amateur athletics through special community-wide athletic and recreational programmes, and will be giving full support to the first Ontario Summer Games which will be held in Oshawa this summer.

Following my government's study of the recommendations of the Symons Commission on French-Language Secondary Education, a bill will be put before you to create a Languages of Instruction Commission for Ontario's education system.

Plans for immediate implementation involve expanded services to the Franco-Ontarian

community by the addition of more French-speaking staff in the central and regional offices of the Ministry of Education.

My government will provide increased assistance to the native people of our province through support for cultural development projects, communications services and the local management of resources. More teachers will be provided who are fluent in the languages of native peoples, and better teaching materials will be made available in those languages.

To help promote greater understanding of the rich cultural heritage of Ontario's native people, new courses will be designed for the Ontario curriculum, especially for elementary students.

To conserve and maintain Ontario's heritage and history, my government will propose legislation and make funds available for the restoration and maintenance of selected buildings and structures of historical significance. Local public libraries and existing museums will be given increased financial support.

The report of the Rohmer Commission on Book Publishing has been made available to the hon. members of this House. A number of recommendations have already been implemented by my government and proposals will be submitted to you in relation to the further implementation of the commission's final report.

My government will present legislation in respect to negotiations between the teaching profession and school boards.

My government has published a position paper inviting public reaction with regard to future policies and programmes for the mentally retarded, with particular reference to community as opposed to institutional living. My ministers are confident that the response of interested organizations and the general public will be helpful in determining future programmes. In the interim, present care systems for our retarded and handicapped will continue to receive direct government support, including additional capital funding for daycare nurseries for retarded children and experimental projects in new selected centres for the seriously retarded.

A third regional centre for the hearing handicapped will be opened in London this fall and will provide residential and daycare programmes for 250 deaf and hard-of-hearing students. This new facility will serve as a resource centre for southwestern Ontario so that more children may receive improved educational programmes in their own communities.

My government is appreciative of the co-operation of the Ontario Council of Health advisory group on medical care insurance for undertaking a comprehensive review of the health insurance plan. My ministers are determined to maintain the highest standards of medical and hospital care for all our people throughout Ontario and to deliver these services at a reasonable cost.

Advice has been sought from the Ontario Council of Health on the question of community health centres which when considered with the current activities of the special committee on the future delivery of health services will provide a strong blueprint for future policy in these important areas.

My government will proceed with proposals for a Health Disciplines Act which were tabled in the previous session and will introduce legislation during this session to establish a health disciplines board.

Further legislation will be presented to you to strengthen the position and clarify the role of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario.

My government proposes to increase assistance to family service agencies, and, in addition, to establish a special counselling and welcoming centre for newcomers to our province, which will serve as a means to familiarize them with government services and benefits available to them.

My government will propose adjustments in the benefits provided under the Workmen's Compensation Act in order to maintain an appropriate level of support reflecting increases in the cost of living and recent adjustments to provincial wage rates.

My government will continue its substantial commitment in the field of housing and land development for low and moderate income wage earners. Housing programmes will be restructured during the year in light of new amendments to the National Housing Act and recommendations of the Ontario Task Force on Housing Policy. My government has recently initiated an integrated community housing programme for which Ontario provides development funds at preferred interest rates for the construction of private housing. In return, builders set aside up to 26 percent of this housing for families requiring assistance.

In the area of consumer and commercial relations, my government regards as essential a co-ordinated approach to the development of provincial and federal policies. The government of Canada has been informed of Ontario's concerns regarding the development

of a national competition policy, with the hope that through such consultation more effective legislation may be achieved.

A Livestock Medicines Act will be introduced to control and regulate the use of drugs available for agricultural livestock purposes.

My government plans to introduce the Consumer Reporting Act and the Co-operative Corporations Act, both of which have important implications with regard to credit and loan practices throughout Ontario.

Ontario will press for a greater degree of co-operation and co-ordination with the federal government with respect to the administration of justice.

In one area of special concern, the introduction of intermittent sentencing, while essentially a commendable principle, has resulted in a conflict with the well-developed temporary absence programme of the provincial Ministry of Correctional Services. This has also placed certain difficulties before our judges, and it is most important that clarification of the application of these principles be achieved.

To increase the availability of trained personnel in the corrections field, arrangements have been made with selected community colleges for experimental correctional worker courses, using corrections staff to give advice on the curriculum and offering field training in correctional settings.

My government will also implement certain recommendations of the Botterell report to improve health care services for wards and inmates of correctional institutions. The group home programme for juveniles will be expanded.

My government proposes to improve the efficiency of the courts of law. Following studies by the Law Reform Commission and other agencies, plans will be introduced designed to provide a systems concept based on modern management methods. These measures will require a review of our tiered system of justice, the rules of procedure governing the operation of the courts, and new ways of dealing with certain infractions which are handled as criminal offences but which, as is widely agreed, should not be so treated.

Furthermore, my government will introduce proposals for a system of Crown legal clerks to prosecute minor offences under the direction of the Crown attorney and relieve the police constable of this task.

Amendments will be proposed to the Jurors Act to remove disqualification of people in many occupations and trades and allow greater citizen participation in the jury process. The grand jury, as an element in the criminal trial process, will be abolished, and its present function relating to the inspection of public institutions will be retained and performed by a public review committee.

My government will establish a training programme for justices of the peace who preside in provincial courts, and the Justices of the Peace Act will be amended to clarify their role in relation to that of provincial court judges.

My government will continue to seek the co-operation of the federal government to permit the province to introduce an off-track betting service.

My ministry holds the view that support for our law enforcement services must be strengthened. To this end, improved police training facilities, an upgraded communications and information network, and the comprehensive review of policing in Ontario, currently being conducted by a task force, are all essential elements of an overall response to growing concerns and expectations with regard to public protection.

To help combat drug-related crimes and the illegal use of drugs, the Ontario Provincial Police will establish a special drug law enforcement programme to be undertaken jointly with municipal forces and the RCMP. The programme will place emphasis on controlling the trafficking of hard drugs.

As a result of extensive investigations by our law enforcement agencies, and upon the advice of the appropriate ministry, my government will establish a royal commission to inquire into the possibility of criminal activities within the plastering, lathing and drywalling sectors of the building industry in Metropolitan Toronto.

These and other matters will be placed before you for your consideration.

May Divine Providence guide you in your several tasks and in the discharge of your serious responsibilities.

God bless the Queen and Canada.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was then pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech which I will now read.

(Reading dispensed with.)

POWERS OF ATTORNEY ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, the Powers of Attorney Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to this House be taken into consideration on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, just before you put the motion to adjourn, I would like to ask the Premier if the omission of any reference to the elevator strike in His Honour's remarks is an indication of the Premier's change in policy on compulsory arbitration?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, to reply very briefly, a bill will be introduced tomorrow afternoon providing for compulsory arbitration by way of settlement of that particular strike.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, recognizing the unusual conditions which may well prevail, if the Premier intends to proceed or hopes to proceed tomorrow through all three readings, would it be possible for draft legislation to be made available to the opposition members in order that we can study it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'll see if we can have a draft bill available for both the Leader of the Opposition and the acting leader of the New Democratic Party so they will have an opportunity to assess it. It is our intention to introduce it tomorrow afternoon and move it through as rapidly as possible.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:45 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

(117 members)

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Allan Edward Reuter **Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC**

Member	Party	Constituency
Allan, James N.	PC	Haldimand-Norfolk
Apps, Hon. C. J. S.	PC	Kingston and the Islands
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	PC	Leeds
Bales, Hon. Dalton A.	PC	York Mills
Beckett, Dick	PC	Brantford
Belanger, J. Albert	PC	Prescott and Russell
Bennett, Hon. Claude	PC	Ottawa South
Bernier, Hon. Leo	PC	Kenora
Birch, Hon. Margaret	PC	Scarborough East
Bounsall, Ted	NDP	Windsor West
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L	Etobicoke
Breithaupt, James R.	L	Kitchener
Brunelle, Hon. Rene	PC	Cochrane North
Bullbrook, James E.	L	Sarnia
Burr, Fred A.	NDP	Sandwich-Riverside
Campbell, Margaret	L	St. George
Carruthers, Alex	PC	Durham
Carton, Hon. Gordon R.	PC	Armourdale
Cassidy, Michael	NDP	Ottawa Centre
Clement, Hon. John T.	PC	Niagara Falls
Davis, Hon. William G.	PC	North Peel
Davison, Norm	NDP	Hamilton Centre
Deacon, Donald M.	L	York Centre
Deans, Ian	NDP	Wentworth
Downer, Rev. A. W.	PC	Dufferin-Simcoe
Drea, Frank	PC	Scarborough Centre
Dukszta, Dr. Jan	NDP	Parkdale
Dymond, Dr. Matthew B.	PC	Ontario
Eaton, Robert G.	PC	Middlesex South
Edighoffer, Hugh	L	Perth
Evans, D. Arthur	PC	Simcoe Centre
Ewen, Donald Wm.	PC	Wentworth North
Ferrier, Rev. William	NDP	Cochrane South
Foulds, James F.	NDP	Port Arthur
Gaunt, Murray	L	Huron-Bruce
Germa, Melville C.	NDP	Sudbury
Gilbertson, Bernt	PC	Algoma
Gisborn, Reg.	NDP	Hamilton East
Givens, Philip G.	L	York-Forest Hill
Good, Edward R.	L	Waterloo North
Grossman, Hon. Allan	PC	St. Andrew-St. Patrick
Guindon, Hon. Fern	PC	Stormont

Member	Party	Constituency
Haggerty, Ray	L	Welland South
Hamilton, Maurice	PC	Renfrew North
Handleman, Sidney B.	PC	Carleton
Havrot, Edward M.	PC	Timiskaming
Henderson, Lorne C.	PC	Lambton
Hodgson, R. Glen	PC	Victoria-Haliburton
Hodgson, William	PC	North York
Irvine, Donald R.	PC	Grenville-Dundas
Jessiman, James H.	PC	Fort William
Johnston, Robert M.	PC	St. Catharines
Kennedy, R. Douglas	PC	Peel South
Kerr, Hon. George A.	PC	Halton West
Lane, John	PC	Algoma-Manitoulin
Laughren, Floyd	NDP	Nickel Belt
Lawlor, Patrick D.	NDP	Lakeshore
Lawrence, Hon. A. Bert R.	PC	Carleton East
Leluk, Nicholas G.	PC	Humber
Lewis, Stephen	NDP	Scarborough West
MacBeth, John P.	PC	York West
MacDonald, Donald C.	NDP	York South
Maeck, Lorne	PC	Parry Sound
Martel, Elie W.	NDP	Sudbury East
McIlveen, Charles E.	PC	Oshawa
McKeough, W. Darcy	PC	Chatham-Kent
McNeil, Ronald K.	PC	Elgin
McNie, Hon. Jack	PC	Hamilton West
Meen, Arthur K.	PC	York East
Miller, Frank S.	PC	Muskoka
Morningstar, Ellis P.	PC	Welland
Morrow, Donald H.	PC	Ottawa West
Newman, Bernard	L	Windsor-Walkerville
Newman, William	PC	Ontario South
Nixon, George	PC	Dovercourt
Nixon, Robert F.	L	Brant
Nuttall, Dr. W. J.	PC	Frontenac-Addington
Parrott, Dr. Harry C.	PC	Oxford
Paterson, Donald A.	L	Essex South
Potter, M.D., Hon. Richard T.	PC	Quinte
Reid, T. Patrick	L-Lab	Rainy River
Reilly, Leonard M.	PC	Eglinton
Renwick, James A.	NDP	Riverdale
Reuter, Hon. Allan E.	PC	Waterloo South
Rhodes, John R.	PC	Sault Ste. Marie
Riddell, John	L	Huron
Rollins, Clarke T.	PC	Hastings
Root, John	PC	Wellington-Dufferin
Rowe, Russell D.	PC	Northumberland
Roy, Albert J.	L	Ottawa East
Ruston, Richard F.	L	Essex-Kent
Sargent, Edward	L	Grey-Bruce
Scrivener, Mrs. Margaret	PC	St. David
Shulman, Dr. Morton	NDP	High Park
Singer, Vernon M.	L	Downsview

Member	Party	Constituency
Smith, Gordon E.	PC	Simcoe East
Smith, John R.	PC	Hamilton Mountain
Smith, Richard S.	L	Nipissing
Snow, Hon. James W.	PC	Halton East
Spence, John P.	L	Kent
Stewart, Hon. Wm. A.	PC	Middlesex North
Stokes, Jack E.	NDP	Thunder Bay
Taylor, James A.	PC	Prince Edward-Lennox
Timbrell, Dennis R.	PC	Don Mills
Turner, John M.	PC	Peterborough
Villeneuve, Osie F.	PC	Glengarry
Walker, Gordon W.	PC	London North
Wardle, Thomas A.	PC	Beaches-Woodbine
Welch, Hon. Robert	PC	Lincoln
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	PC	Scarborough North
White, Hon. John	PC	London South
Winkler, Hon. Eric A.	PC	Grey South
Wiseman, Douglas J.	PC	Lanark
Worton, Harry	L	Wellington South
Yakabuski, Paul J.	PC	Renfrew South
Yaremko, Hon. John	PC	Bellwoods
Young, Fred	NDP	Yorkview

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hon. William G. Davis	*Premier and President of the Council*
Hon. Robert Welch	*Provincial Secretary for Social Development*
Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence	*Provincial Secretary for Resources Development*
Hon. John Yaremko	*Solicitor General*
Hon. Allan Grossman	*Minister of Revenue*
Hon. William A. Stewart	*Minister of Agriculture and Food*
Hon. James A. C. Auld	*Minister of the Environment*
Hon. Rene Brunelle	*Minister of Community and Social Services*
Hon. Dalton A. Bales	*Attorney General*
Hon. Thomas L. Wells	*Minister of Education*
Hon. Fern Guindon	*Minister of Labour*
Hon. John. White	*Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs*
Hon. George A. Kerr	*Provincial Secretary for Justice*
Hon. C. J. S. Apps	*Minister of Correctional Services*
Hon. Gordon Carton	*Minister of Transportation and Communications*
Hon. Leo Bernier	*Minister of Natural Resources*
Hon. Eric A. Winkler	*Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet*
Hon. James W. Snow	*Minister of Government Services*
Hon. Richard T. Potter	*Minister of Health*
Hon. John T. Clement	*Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations*
Hon. Jack McNie	*Minister of Colleges and Universities*
Hon. Claude Bennett	*Minister of Industry and Tourism*
Hon. Margaret Birch	*Minister without Portfolio*

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. D. R. Irvine (Assistant to the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs)

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier)

Mr. A. K. Meen (Assistant to the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs)

Mr. F. S. Miller (Assistant to the Minister of Health)

Mr. W. Newman (Assistant to the Minister of Transportation and Communications)

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Assistant to the Minister of Industry and Tourism)

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources)

Mr. J. R. Smith (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Education)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Speech from the Throne, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 3

Powers of Attorney Act, 1973, bill intituled, Mr. Bales, first reading 8

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to 8

Appendix: List of Members 9

No. 2



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that a vacancy has occurred in the membership of the assembly since the last session by reason of the resignation of Charles Steel MacNaughton as member for the electoral district of Huron.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That has since been remedied. Very appropriately!

An hon. member: Are there any other resignations?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, the damage caused by the extraordinarily high levels of the waters of the Great Lakes, particularly last weekend, is a matter of considerable concern to the government of the Province of Ontario.

I should like to advise the hon. members of the steps which have been and will be taken to alleviate the damage and hardship caused. Both during and since the weekend, the extent of the damage has been assessed by the ministries involved and we now have a reasonably complete picture as to the extent of the damage.

I do not wish to minimize the hardship which the people involved have and are undergoing. The cleanup task will not be easy or without cost. Moreover, the likelihood of a recurrence of the damage is far from remote. We are then faced with both a short- and a long-term problem. The first involves providing assistance now to the people affected. The second involves deciding how a similar situation can be avoided in the future.

Last fall, when similar damage occurred, special funds were made available to the Ministry of Natural Resources to restore and protect diking and roadways on Pelee Island from flooding. At approximately the same time the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, in co-operation with the federal government, provided over $4 million for improving dikes and works, under the ARDA programme, to protect agricultural farm lands from flooding.

Approximately three weeks ago I, along with the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), and our senior officials, met with the Hon. Jack Davis, federal Minister of the Environment, to discuss ways and means to combat damage along the shorelines of the Great Lakes. The federal government at that meeting intimated that it was prepared to assist in three respects.

First, with regard to compensation for damage sustained, the federal government would be prepared to consider participating with Ontario based on a provincial population formula similar to that which has previously been applied in other circumstances. Under that formula the federal government would give no assistance until this province had made a commitment to pay the first $8 million of compensation. Thereafter a sliding scale of federal participation would apply, with the federal government paying one-half of the cost of compensation by the time the amount paid out reached $40 million. Unfortunately, if and when any assistance were to become available under the federal formula it would be highly restricted. It would not, for example, include any compensation for damage to recreational lands or for summer cottages, and with minor exceptions would generally exclude damage to commercial and industrial enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, the logic of the federal government's formula based on population is highly questionable, as damage along the shorelines has no direct relationship to the population of this province.

In spite of this lack of clear and unrestricted assistance from the federal government, the government of Ontario will provide an immediate emergency programme on an 80-20 per cent cost-sharing basis, with those affected municipalities which wish to participate, for dike repair, pumping off of flood waters, temporary diking and road repair.

In addition, the province is prepared to participate with local disaster committees on a matching dollar-for-dollar basis for compensation paid with regard to permanent residences and farm buildings not of the recreational type. This programme would be similar to those previously effected when natural disasters occurred in this province. It is hoped that federal government participation will be forthcoming for this programme so that the compensation fund would be supported one-third from local resources, one-third from the province and one-third from the federal government. We shall press the federal government for such assistance.

This describes the immediate short-term forms of assistance available. The government is prepared to allot funds for the support of this programme and it is establishing a working group, headed by a representative from the Ministry of Natural Resources and including officials from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of the Solicitor General—Emergency Measures Organization—the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

This task force will be empowered to allocate funds immediately and to draw on the physical and technical resources in the appropriate ministries and agencies—for example, for equipment, supplies and engineering support. Affected municipalities should contact the municipal subsidies branch of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs for detailed information as to how to receive financial assistance. The Ministry of Natural Resources should be contacted for all other forms of assistance.

As for the longer term programme of prevention, our recent discussions with the federal government resulted in an indication from it that over the next 20 or 30 years the federal government would be prepared to participate on a 50-50 basis with the province for the construction of a permanent and comprehensive system of shore protection on the Great Lakes.

No detailed planning or assessment has been made, but the required engineering would presumably require at least a year to prepare. The cost of the whole project could run from perhaps $100 million to $200 million over that period of 20 or 30 years.

I should like to make clear to the hon. members that before such a programme is embarked upon some hard decisions will have to be made. While no one would wish to see property destroyed by high water, the public interest must be considered to the extent that the community as a whole has a responsibility to protect property which was originally located in areas likely to be flooded or washed away by high waves. These are not easy questions to answer. Nonetheless, a long-term solution is desirable and this avenue will be pursued further with the federal government.

Lastly, it has been indicated to us that the federal government would be prepared to continue to support expenditures of funds through ARDA specifically for the protection of agricultural lands, again on a 50-50 cost-sharing basis.

Mr. Speaker, these then are the initiatives we as a government have been pursuing. Immediate help is available and long-term preventive measures are being explored.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That is not enough.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They are fighting for the floor over there.

An hon. member: Much too late!

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement concerning a matter involving the Lake Ontario Cement Co. and the disposition of 16.2 acres of land under lease to that company.

As all members are aware, this matter has been of considerable concern to my ministry and to the government of Ontario for some time.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): For a long, long time!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): One would never know it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Last spring I appointed Dr. Walter Tovell, then the associate director of the Royal Ontario Museum and a distinguished conservationist and a geologist in this province, to inquire into and to report to the government on various matters concerning the area under lease to the company.

Dr. Tovell was asked in particular, to study the geology of the area adjacent to Sandbanks Provincial Park as related to the phys-

ical and aesthetic effects on the environment should the Lake Ontario Cement Co. be permitted to continue its operations on the site now being worked. As I indicated at that time, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Tovell's report was to be used by the government and by the company as a basis for discussion leading to a settlement of outstanding points at issue.

Since the receipt of the report, numerous meetings have been held between representatives of the Lake Ontario Cement Co., my legal advisers and officials and myself. Also during this time two actions were brought against both the company and the government by environmental groups. Until these issues were resolved by the courts, negotiations between the company and the government were suspended and it was not possible for me to make any announcement on the progress of this matter.

As hon. members will recall, I made a commitment during the last session of the Legislature that, when these matters had been resolved and periods for appeal had expired, I would announce the government's decision as to how best to resolve this matter. I am pleased to inform the members of the House that no sand has been extracted from the site since last summer and that there has been no reduction in the employment opportunities available at the company's Picton operations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is there any sand left?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am also pleased to say that the company has co-operated fully with the government in agreeing to suspend the extraction of sand. Moreover, both the government and the company have agreed that the government shall acquire the company's interest in the lease of the land in question. Accordingly, it has been decided that the most equitable method of proceeding would be for the Crown to expropriate the lease, pending the hearing of which, efforts to negotiate a settlement will continue. Steps to carry out expropriation have been taken.

It is my hope that this matter will be resolved in the very near future—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): We are buying back what we already own.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and that this area can become an integral part of Sandbanks Provincial Park for use this summer.

CENTRAL REGISTRY SYSTEM

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to make a brief statement to the House as an introduction to two bills that will receive first reading today.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967 the interim report of the select committee on company law recommended the establishment of a central registry for corporate and business names, so that searches from across the province could be carried out with substantially greater despatch. As a result, this government proposed and the House passed the Corporations Information Act, which was proclaimed into force Jan. 1, 1972.

Under section 2 of that Act, Mr. Speaker, any corporation carrying on business in Ontario in a name other than its proper corporate name must register that name with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

The intent of the two bills which will be introduced today is to place partnerships, limited partnerships and sole proprietorships on a footing similar to that of corporations.

The records system, as it exists under present legislation, is in the process of centralization and the proposed legislation is necessary if we are to continue that process. It is this government's intention that, with the passage of these two bills, Ontario will move forward toward a fully integrated business names registry system.

The Partnerships Registration Act was first enacted in 1869. It appeared in the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1877, and has not been substantially amended since that date. The Limited Partnerships Act first appeared in 1877, and it too has remained substantially unchanged since that time. In both cases, the legislation had as its focal point the small county town; and this system simply does not meet the needs of present-day business. In 1971, for example, some 30,000 declarations or certificates were filed in this province under these Acts. More than half the total were made at the registry division for the City of Toronto. It was recognized that the system of filing was no longer workable.

In 1968 an Act to amend the Partnerships Registration Act provided for the establishment of a central registry system. These sections, never proclaimed in force, permitted the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, notwithstanding anything contained in the Act, to make regulations under the Act to bring

a central registry system into operation. To accomplish the goals, however, the changes needed were of such a nature that amendment of the Act and not merely regulation was required.

The proposed legislation provides that the declarations and certificates filed under the Act would expire five years after the date of filing, unless previously renewed. This will clear the backlog of business names which have been abandoned and are no longer in use. Best estimates would indicate that 90 to 95 per cent of present filings would not be renewed.

In the registry office for the city of Toronto, an estimated 204,000 certificates and declarations of partnership are on file. Experience of other provinces, particularly Manitoba, which recently modernized its statutes in this area, indicates that no more than 10 per cent are active. The remainder ceased carrying on business in their partnership names and have failed to register a declaration of dissolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate that under the proposed legislation the system for filing partnerships, limited partnerships and sole proprietorships will be put on a similar footing to that which already exists for assumed names by corporations.

The changes in procedure made possible by these amendments should enable the operation of a central registry by existing staff in the ministry, even though these documents will, for the time being, be accepted by all registry offices throughout the province. A position of registrar of partnerships will be created utilizing the present complement of the companies division in my ministry.

The regulations to be made under the legislation will increase the filing fees from $3 to $10 for each registration to cover the costs of an improved service and possible acquisition of more up-to-date equipment in the future.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the intent of the two bills will be to simplify registration, clean up the backlog of inactive files and ensure that the public has a quick and ready source of information on business operations being carried on in the province.

ACCIDENT ON HIGHWAY 400

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before you leave statements, perhaps the Minister of Transportation and Communications would make a statement on the accident on Highway 400 on Sunday night, similar to the one that he apparently did make public expressing his concern about certain matters on licensing procedures and about the type of investigation he has launched into this matter.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): I have no objection to making a statement on that, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, this has been one of the problems uppermost in my mind since Sunday night.

First of all, there was a press release by the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) that I was expecting to answer today, and therefore of course I have certain concerns that he has in mind that I would like to relate.

Secondly, I do not have a police report as yet. One has not come to my ministry. We had one of our own individuals at the scene of the accident on Sunday and Monday, but there are several matters that I would like to go into in detail.

Thirdly, with respect to illegal leasing, so called, which was one of the matters, I believe, raised by the member for Yorkview; as I pointed out, illegal leasing is a term used in connection with PCV licensing. Whether or not a person is—and I state this, I do not know as yet whether it was, in fact, an illegal lease or not—but whether it was an illegal lease or not has no bearing on safety.

In other words, you could have an illegal lease in effect and have the safest operator and the safest truck meeting all the conditions possible. Illegal leasing relates to the PCV licensing and does not relate to safety. Safety is covered by the Highway Traffic Act, and of course the police enforce that.

With respect to whether or not the truck should have been on the highway on Sunday, that comes under the Lord's Day Act. It is a federal statute and is the responsibility of the Ontario Provincial Police. So, I would suggest that I would defer to my colleague with respect to any statement insofar as that particular aspect is concerned.

One other thing that I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the accident itself; first of all it is my understanding—and I qualify it by simply stating that these are the remarks that have been related to me and from the witnesses that have been interviewed—as I understand it, the truck itself had stopped and that in fact the operator of the truck and his family were able to get out of the truck prior to it being hit by the bus. So, insofar as to whether it was a pup trailer or a tractor trailer or whatever, the

operator had, in fact, brought it to a complete stop. It is my understanding that it did not hit any of the vehicles in front of it. It was while the truck was stopped that it was hit from the rear by the bus and this caused the load to overturn.

So, I think there is a great deal of speculation about this particular accident, Mr. Speaker, and until I get the police report, obviously, I am not able to go into it in too great detail.

I point out that the truck was stopped; so whether it was a tractor trailer, or whether in fact it had been any other kind of load, or even a car for that matter—because there were some 30 cars, as I understand it, that had been stopped after there had been a slight mishap ahead, which involved two cars; then there was a coming to a stop of approximately 30 cars; in other words they all stopped safely; then the truck stopped and then the bus came along later—so whatever may have come along later—whether it was the tractor trailer, another car for that matter, or a pickup truck, or whatever—it's possible there would have been an accident in any event.

I point that out, that I am not aware of the facts that will be stated in the police report, but one peripheral matter relates to pup trailers. Since the accident on Dec. 20 on the Don Valley Parkway—and subsequently another one in February and another one in March involving pup trailers—gasoline trucks I might add—I've had this matter investigated by my ministry officials, and particularly with respect to the hitch. As a result, we are bringing in new regulations with respect to the hitch. But I would again point out I have studied those accident reports and in none of the three cases was the primary hitch the cause of the accident. In other words, it had not become loose because of that particular aspect.

Mr. Speaker, I would again sum up that I do not have the accident report. I think perhaps that with the press reports there has been a lot of speculation as to what may have caused the accident. I am awaiting the police report, and had intended to wait before I made a statement on this matter.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: This was a statement by the ministry. Questions may be brought up under the oral question period.

Any further statements by the ministry?

Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

INQUIRY INTO CRIME IN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he is prepared to amend the terms of reference to the royal commission he announced yesterday in the Speech from the Throne so that the investigation into criminal elements in certain labour unions will not be restricted to Metropolitan Toronto, but in fact be expanded across the province?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the specific terms of reference are being developed at this moment. When they are made public—announced here to the House—I think that would be the appropriate occasion, perhaps, to discuss what those terms of reference contain.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Since the matter was specifically referred to in the speech read by His Honour as being restricted to Metropolitan Toronto, would the Premier undertake to give consideration to this suggestion, in that surely this would unnecessarily hamstring the responsibilities that any royal commissioner might have in investigating the infiltration of certain labour unions by criminal elements?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course we will consider many things. The observations in the Speech from the Throne were relatively general in character, and yet at the same time—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Vague is the word the Premier is groping for.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I think it is also proper to observe that we are anxious for—that is not the correct expression — I think it is also relevant to observe that we are anxious for this royal commission to achieve some specific objectives. We are trying to balance the desirability of not inhibiting the commission while at the same time keeping in mind the objectives, to see if we can't get something or the commission can't get something specific from its deliberations.

Mr. Sargent: Why can't the government widen the area?

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Will the Premier bring the terms of

reference before the House for debate prior to their becoming official?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is not customary to bring the terms of reference here for debate. They will be announced here, and of course the hon. member will have an opportunity to make what observations he may deem fit. I think really the appropriate time to do this would be at the time the announcement is made about the terms of reference and the personnel responsible. Certainly he will have an opportunity, either in the throne debate or perhaps in the question period, at some time, to make whatever observations he might like.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is a meaningless gesture.

Mr. Deans: Doesn't it make sense to the Premier that, in fact, the terms of reference ought to be discussed by this Legislature since the royal commission will be answering at some point to the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am always anxious to have the views of the hon. members opposite but I think it is proper for the government to determine the terms of reference. If the members opposite have some thoughts that perhaps might be incorporated in any amendments, I'm never averse to considering this. I can't give the member an undertaking that it would become a subject of debate on the floor of the House as to the specific terms of reference.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Ottawa East a supplementary?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a supplementary either to the Premier or to the Attorney General (Mr. Bales).

In light of the fact that the Throne Speech specifically mentioned that extensive investigations have taken place, and the Throne Speech specifically mentioned as well the Metropolitan Toronto area, I would like to ask the Premier why this royal commission would not be extended more specifically to the Ottawa area where there is evidence available that there have been problems and that Toronto firms have moved into that area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member has become more specific than the Leader of the Opposition in identifying Ottawa as a specific area. I would think that the answer I gave to the Leader of the Opposition would be just a duplication of what I would say to the hon. member. I think until the terms of reference are announced to the members of the House we are discussing something that is relatively academic.

Mr. Roy: A further supplementary—

Mr. Renwick: By way of supplementary—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Lieutenant Governor's words are academic. The Premier put them in his mouth—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park was attemping to ask a supplementary.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Inasmuch as the speech yesterday specifically singled out one small branch of the construction industry and inasmuch as most of the evidence of crime involves other parts of the construction industry, would the premier make the terms of reference sufficiently wide so that all crime in the construction industry, whether it be in this area or in all of Ontario, be covered?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said earlier. It is the desire of the government not to inhibit the responsibilities of the royal commissioner—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but at the same time to make it clear that we are anxious for the commission to come in, hopefully, with something specific as it relates to this general problem. I would say to the member for High Park that when these terms of reference are made public would be the occasion for him to offer his constructive suggestions.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary—the hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: In view of the alleged criminal offences in the Fidinam affair and the subsequent whitewash of the whole deal, why can't the Premier let himself off the hook and extend the terms of reference to criminal offences in Queen's Park?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The question is certainly not proper. Does the hon.—

Mr. Sargent: Why doesn't he answer?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I'd like an answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Roy: On a point of order!

Mr. Speaker: Yes?

Mr. Roy: I would like, under standing order 27(g), to advise the House—advise you, Mr. Speaker—that we are not satisfied with the response of the Prime Minister and that we will be raising this matter at the adjournment of the House. I shall be giving you written notice accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: I'll be glad to consider the written notice.

MEDICAL CARE COSTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Premier. Can he recall as a member of the policy and priorities board of cabinet, giving approval to a programme brought before the board by the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) which would, in fact, apply a package of restraint on the payments associated with our OHIP programme and which was indicated would save us $50 million during the last fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of discussions; before the policy and priorities board, before cabinet, before the policy field committee; related to the whole question of the delivery of health services, related to the financing and the question of seeing if there are some constraints that could be applied.

The matter is still the subject of discussion within the ministry, within cabinet—the policy and priorities board. When there are policy statements to be made in respect of this, they will be made here in the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the Premier then deny that committee of cabinet gave specific approval to a programme of constraint or restraint which was designed to accomplish such savings, and that this policy, which there is every indication was approved by cabinet, was not implemented by the Minister of Health?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course the discussions within the policy and priorities board are confidential, as they are within cabinet. If there are to be announcements of government policy, they will be made here in the Legislature.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the Premier aware that a senior official of the Ministry of Health has made public papers indicating that such cabinet approval was established, and that the cabinet policy was not carried out by the Minister of Health, and that there are therefore responsible people in this province who feel that he is no longer fit to continue with those responsibilities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that I observe the Leader of the Opposition in one of his more enlightened moments made that observation himself with respect to the Minister of Health, I would like to take this opportunity, in answer to his question, to say that I believe the present Minister of Health is well qualified to discharge his responsibilities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: While the Premier is taking that opportunity to make that observation, would he not take the same opportunity to answer the question? And if he is not prepared to answer the question, then why would he not refer the matter to the standing committee on human resources so that the Minister of Health, Dr. Kinloch, whose name has appeared publicly recently, the OMA and others directly concerned with this matter can testify publicly before a representative committee of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite, if they wish to pursue this matter, will have ample opportunity during discussion of the estimates of the Ministry of Health with the minister.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not if the government is going to stonewall it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no question that this can be done.

Mr. Singer: All the minister wants to talk about is hospitals in Huron county.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Does the provincial secretary believe that the municipalities involved in the flood damage at this point can afford to pay 20 per cent of the cost of the emergency programme that he is outlining?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Can the minister explain what appears to be a conflict in his statement? On the one hand he claims that the municipalities will be carrying 20 per cent of the cost and the province 80 per cent, while on the other hand he indicates that if the federal government involves itself it will be a one-third, one-third, one-third sharing, with the municipalities carrying one-third of the cost.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: The distinction there, Mr. Speaker, is that the 80-20 relates to work to be done immediately in relation to diking, roads and pumping. That is not a question of compensation to private individuals.

The question of compensation to private individuals for damage done to their homes has been separated from that formula. In that case the proportions, I hope and expect, will be one dollar, one dollar and one dollar from the local committee. We had this. for instance, in Sudbury a few years ago, where the local resources provided a dollar, we provided a dollar, and the federal government's disaster fund provided a dollar.

Mr. Deans: A final supplementary question: Why has the ministry waited so long to come up with a programme that at this point meets emergency conditions which have caused considerable discomfort and disaster throughout the province, rather than develop a programme over the last year and a half when the minister was aware of the impending dangers?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that an overall series of engineering works that would have accomplished real protection would have been beyond the capacity of this province during the last six months, year or 18 months. These disasters are not foreseen. As I mentioned in my remarks, it is possible that they could come again.

Mr. Deans: They were foreseen.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister knows they were foreseen. I wrote telling him—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bullbrook: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West was up on a supplementary.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Why won't the minister consider extending the announced assistance to cottage owners, many of whom are retirees and have invested their entire life savings in those cottages? Many of those cottages are now wiped out, and in Essex county occupancy occurs for fully eight months of the year.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question is hardly supplementary to the original question which had to do with the percentage of grants.

The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: A supplementary question to the hon. provincial secretary, if I may:

Would he consider some amendment in his policy in connection with the restrictive nature of the words "private residences," in light of the information that I now give him, that many residences in my riding are themselves not directly damaged, but find themselves eight feet from a huge precipice, an imminent danger?

Mr. Speaker: I take it this was not intended as a supplementary; it was a new question.

Mr. Bullbrook: It was—certainly it was a supplementary. The policy was restricted to the words "private residences," and I am interested that the minister's policy be established as far as their total property is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is no more a proper supplementary than that the hon. member for Windsor West placed. Neither one of them was supplementary to the original question. I would permit additional new questions on that topic, but not as supplementary to the original which had to do with grants only.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, I am talking about—

Mr. Speaker: There was a further supplementary on grants.

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order—and may I suggest that I don't want to begin the session having undue difficulty with the Speaker, or he with me—but in the statement made by the provincial secretary he talked

about a grant structure of one-third, one-third, one-third, as far as damage to private residences was concerned. I am asking if he would consider an amendment to that policy to include the total property rather than just the residence.

Mr. Speaker: The original question from the hon. member for Wentworth asked whether the minister felt that the municipalities could handle the 20 per cent; it was an 80-20 per cent split. He carried that as a further supplementary, asking about the one-third, one-third, one-third.

Now the next question asked by the hon. member for Windsor West had to do with the programme announcements and the indication of what might happen or might not, but it was not supplementary to the original question. A new question could be asked, and I point out to the hon. member for Sarnia that while I ruled the hon. member for Windsor West out of order on a supplementary, the hon. member for Sarnia's question is equally out of order as a supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: I bow to your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I will go back to the hon. member for Windsor West. If he wishes to ask a new question on that topic, he may do so.

Mr. Singer: He can't, it's not his turn.

Mr. Reid: He's forgotten the question.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask another question of the same minister.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): Give him a chance.

Mr. Deans: Is the minister trying to tell the House, by his statement, that the damage which we now see around this province was unpredictable?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, we have been aware of the damage occurring—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Since last fall.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Every 10 years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: The potential of damage has been obvious with the rise in the waters. I don't think the degree of the damage caused by that particular storm was contemplated.

I know that in our discussions with the federal experts and with the people in our own departments in Toronto, they did speculate that for as long as the water was high, there would always be the risk of an extraordinary weather system hitting the province and causing damage, but no one could expect it as such, nor expect the eventual degree of damage.

Mr. Deans: Isn't the minister aware of the ongoing concern that has been expressed, at least by those residents of Lake Ontario from Burlington down to the Niagara Peninsula, about the high water levels and the loss of property and the almost immediate problem of being closer every single day to the water's edge? And isn't he aware that there have been representations made to his departments asking for assistance in erecting some kind of diking arrangement to help offset the emergency conditions that we had last weekend and the weekend before?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the Province of Ontario has never had the capacity, financial or physical, to protect the shores of this province from the erosion involved in the high water levels of 1972 and 1973. Nor have we, as a province, felt that the taxpayers generally should be placed in the position of financially supporting those whose shorelines are being eroded.

Insofar as temporary assistance is concerned —the supply of sandbags and that kind of thing—the best engineering advice we can get is that the enormity of the problem would be virtually unaffected by the kind of Band-Aid assistance that we would be capable of giving.

Mr. Deans: A final supplementary question: What is the point of waiting until after the disaster occurs and then expending considerably more money trying to bring people back to normalcy when we could take a positive approach and have an overall programme for the preservation of the shorelines of the Province of Ontario?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): It's like locking the door after the horse has bolted!

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Move their cottages back and hold on!

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer again is that I have to rely on the

advice of both federal and provincial engineers, and their statements to me have been that to do anything effective in the way of preventive measures will require, as my statement mentioned—

Mr. Stokes: To wait until it happens!

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: —months of engineering; and ironically it will require the waters themselves to recede before anything significant in the way of erosion protection obstacles can be developed.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): We're not doing any better than King Canute!

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Wentworth finished with his supplementaries on that point?

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I have a new question—

An hon. member: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Brand new or on this same topic?

Mr. Singer: A different topic and a different minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: I wonder whether the minister would consider having engineers visit as soon as possible at least the most badly damaged communities to discover what protective measures have been effective and what measures have not been effective in protecting property both against the simple high lake levels and against the violent wave action.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, in view of the fact that many of my constituents presently find themselves landlocked because roads have fallen into the lake, can I assume that very shortly somebody from the minister's secretariat or from the Ministry of Natural Resources will be in touch with my municipal officials in connection with these abject difficulties?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Wentworth have further questions?

PENSIONERS' RENTS

Mr. Deans: One further question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Community and Social Services:

What steps is the minister taking to ensure that pensioners getting an increase in their old age pension on April 1 will not be subjected to unjustified rent increases in the Province of Ontario in regard to apartments, private homes and rooms, in which live many of them who are married, and in regard to homes for the aged and nursing homes?

An hon. member: He thinks that's funny!

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): How can we regulate private homes?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Well Mr. Speaker, this matter relates to government policy. It relates to more than one ministry; it relates also to my colleague, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman). There will be a statement in the near future with reference to this matter.

Mr. Deans: Are there any steps being taken, since April 1 is only a matter of a week away, and will these people be informed as to what steps will be taken prior to April 1?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They will be informed in the near future, Mr. Speaker. For instance, those who are in homes for the aged only receive their cheques at the end of the month; we will try to inform the administrators of the homes for the aged as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has a supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): May I ask the minister if those living in accommodation and receiving rent supplement will be included in any statement that he will make?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a new question.

FIDINAM (ONTARIO) LTD.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: This Fidinam affair will not go away—

Mr. MacDonald: Not as long as the member is around!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: It's a two-part question to the Premier—

Mr. MacDonald: He won't go away.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

An hon. member: Let's try them. Who's ready to resign there?

Mr. Sargent: In view of the fact that the Premier, in the raising of $5 million, was party to a criminal offence, an alleged criminal offence—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The statement is certainly an improper statement and should be withdrawn.

Mr. Sargent: All right. We'll take that back then. But if this were true under US law, the Premier would be impeached.

May I ask what he would do if we requested him to have a royal commission and he was subpoenaed to furnish a list of where his party got its money from in relation to government contracts. If the leader of this party were to suggest that if the Premier did not furnish that list he would lead the official opposition out of the House, what would the Premier do? Secondly—

Mr. Speaker: It's hypothetical and out of order!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Has the member checked with his leader?

Mr. Sargent: As recently as three weeks ago, I am informed, Mr. Kelly put the bite for $50,000 on a firm that had a contract with the government; it came to the Liberal Party because of this disclosure business the Premier is talking of bringing up.

The Premier promised at the last sitting of the House to furnish me with the name of the firm that did all the legal work in this multi-million-dollar deal, and he promised to furnish me with the name of who got the finder's fee—but we've heard nothing about this yet. I'd like an answer to these questions, sir.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly try to get the name of the legal firm. I think the answers to the balance of the question really are self-evident, but I certainly will try to get the name of the legal firm for the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I hope we can get to discuss this—

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to this: In view of the fact that the Throne Speech mentioned that the Commission on the Legislature is studying the question of election expenditures and that the government wants to bring this in this session, should the Premier not advise his people to curtail their fund-raising activities and hence avoid the law that he intends to bring in?

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): Is the member running for something?

Mr. Ewen: Ask him why he didn't make the front row.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't intend getting into debate on fund-raising activities. I would only make this observation: We've had two or three fund-raising activities, including a fund-raising dinner in the riding of the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. I notice the Prime Minister of Canada had a fund-raising dinner the other evening at the Royal York. I anticipate even that his own party at the provincial level has been raising funds; certainly at the federal level they have been raising funds.

Mr. Sargent: That's only window dressing!

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I would only say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargent: It's only window dressing!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I would say that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce probably knows whereof he speaks because he perhaps has some knowledge that I don't have relating to these matters.

An hon. member: A hell of a lot more!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only restate what was said in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker: It is the intent of the government, when we receive the recommendations of the Camp commission related to election reform, that we will introduce legislation related to it.

Mr. Sargent: From here on the government is going to be good, is it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the member should know!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

ACCIDENT ON HIGHWAY 400

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications:

Do I understand from his statement this afternoon that the lumber truck involved in the accident on Highway 400 was operating without a PCV licence and, therefore, apart from the Lord's Day Act, was in breach of the law by being on Highway 400 on Sunday afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, again I preface my remarks by stating that my information is not derived from the police report. I think in all fairness we should wait until that police report gets on my desk. All I can do is inform this House, as I did today, of what had come to my personal knowledge through other sources. I think it's unfair to delve into the matter and deal with these particular problems because I might be doing someone an injustice.

Mr. Young: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister when he plans to bring in legislation to plug this loophole and to deal with illegal licensing of vehicles in the province?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. First of all, again I point out that whether or not that truck was illegally leased has nothing whatsoever to do with an accident on the highway.

Mr. MacDonald: It was a good one. Don't spoil it with undue repetition.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Right! Now that the truck was on the road, again I defer to my colleague. Enforcement of this particular statute is not under my ministry. Insofar as illegal leasing is concerned, I am surprised and I think the hon. member is aware that, yes, I am moving to plug a loophole insofar as illegal leasing is concerned and I will be bringing forth legislation in this session.

Mr. MacDonald: How come that wasn't included in the Throne Speech?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill; a supplementary.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): I would like to ask the minister whether it isn't a fact that Highway 400 has now become a serious highway hazard because the government has jammed six lanes into what was normally a four-lane right of way, and that by eliminating the median strip and the shoulders it has cut down the margin of safety on that highway to a serious extent and that will result in other accidents in the future?

An hon. member: A very good question.

Mr. Givens: Is that not so?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I will get the information insofar as statistics on accidents on Highway 400 are concerned. To my knowledge they are no greater or lesser than any of the other highways. I will get that information for him. It would be interesting to see what the statistics prove.

Quite candidly, it is the drivers who abuse our highways, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think there is any member in this Legislature who will deny that when you are driving on our highways under very difficult conditions you will see cars passing you as if they were driving on a sunny Sunday afternoon, not having any regard whatsoever to icy conditions, to fogging conditions, to other matters that the ordinary prudent driver does give precedence to. I think the drivers in many cases, Mr. Speaker, are the ones who are to blame.

Mr. Speaker: I think there have been sufficient supplementaries on this topic, particularly in view of the hon. minister's replies. The hon. member for Downsview is next.

STATUS OF OPC OFFICER

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Solicitor General. Has the Solicitor General yet been able to gather his facts together so that he is now able to tell us about the mystery of Mr. Thurston's suspension from the intelligence branch of the Ontario Police Commission and about the mysterious disappearance of one Gary Rolph from that commission?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I shall be making a statement with respect to this matter on Friday morning.

Mr. Singer: On Friday?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The New Democratic party is next. The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Nickel Belt!

Mr. Speaker: Nickel Belt. I am sorry.

SUDBURY HOUSING INVESTIGATION

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs: Why have no charges been laid or why has no hearing date been set considering the activities of Ross A. Shouldice in the Whitson Gardens subdivision in Chelmsford?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, charges have been laid as they relate to the Real Estate Business Brokers Act. I don't want to deal with the merits of it until it has been determined, but just so the member will know what has happened, the people who were charged under that Act with offences have appealed, as they have every right to do, and they advised my ministry in early January that they intended to ask for an adjournment. The date was to be set in early February. They appeared before the tribunal and made their request for that adjournment. A solicitor from the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations appeared and opposed that request. In spite of that opposition the date of the hearing was adjourned until, I believe, April 20.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I would ask the minister, is he not confusing the activities of Cambrian Realty versus Trasco and Silhouette who are active in Whitson Gardens? I believe he is mixing up these two firms.

Mr. Roy: Mixed up a bit?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Nothing new of course! I think I may well be confusing the two. I thought the question related to the development there of Cambrian—referred to as Cambrian and Shouldice—and I think there were two individuals who were charged. I am sorry, I misinterpreted the question.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Why is it that although some 18 months ago I requested that Shouldice be investigated, in fact despite that request and all that was going on, the Ontario Housing Corp. gave Mr. Ross A. Shouldice two contracts which are now before a hearing in Blind River?

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Question?

An hon. member: He asked the wrong minister.

Mr. Martel: How is it that when a company lawyer is under investigation another department is giving it contracts?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that because I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. Martel: Well, maybe the minister responsible for housing could answer that question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I must confess that I was unable to hear the question by the hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Why is it—

Mr. Reid: He answered it.

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. minister hear the question?

Mr. Martel: Why is it that when a company is being—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. minister has answered. I couldn't hear it but it was apparently given. The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources—

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East feels he has a point of order.

Mr. Martel: Could that question be answered by the minister responsible for housing? Why is it that a contract is being—

Mr. Speaker: The minister may answer in any manner he sees fit. He has answered. There is no point of order. The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the—

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, apparently he is willing to answer the question if—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Can the minister indicate—

Mr. MacDonald: It is more difficult to keep that minister down than the hon. member for Sudbury East.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): I would like to make it clear that I don't want to avoid answering a question if it is properly directed to me. I look to you, sir, for clarification as to whether I can properly

get up and answer the question. It was directed to me in a very indirect way.

Mr. Roy: You wouldn't want to play politics.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East had, to my knowledge, directed the question to another minister. There was an exchange that took place across the floor of the House, which unfortunately I didn't hear very clearly, but it was intimated that the answer had been given so I don't think two ministers need reply. The hon. member for Rainy River.

MERCURY TASK FORCE

Mr. Reid: To the Minister of Natural Resources, for the fourth time: Can the minister indicate what action his department, or his department in conjunction with the Department of Health, is taking in relation to the Indian reserve located in that minister's riding where the mercury levels in the Indians have been found to be more than those that killed the Japanese some 25 or 26 years ago?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the interdepartmental task force has been working on this particular matter for the past several weeks. They have made a trip into northwestern Ontario and have met personally with the Indian bands from Grassy Narrows and the Indian band at Whitedog. The summary of their report has not been compiled yet. When it is, we will of course be studying their recommendations.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister tell me how long the Ministry of Health has known that the levels of mercury in these people have been so high—higher than the point where it killed other people; how long has the minister known that and why has he taken no action to prevent those people from eating the fish where this mercury is coming from? He is endangering people's health.

Mr. Roy: How many does he want to die?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a health matter and the question should properly be directed to my colleague, the Minister of Health.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: may I redirect my question to the Minister of Health? How long has he known about these high levels of mercury and what action has he taken to stop the people from eating the mercury polluted fish?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I think the information had now better be made available that the high levels of mercury have been brought to the attention of the people in the area and they have been advised of the risks they are taking by continuing to consume the fish, and they are also being warned of the numbers of fish that they can eat safely and what they should do to prevent the levels from increasing.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur, a supplementary.

Mr. Foulds: I am in a bit of a quandary here and I ask for guidance. The question was originally to the Minister of Natural Resources. Can I ask a supplementary of the Minister of Natural Resources or does it have to be directed to the Minister of Health?

Mr. Speaker: No, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources has deferred that aspect of the question to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Foulds: Oh, well then I would direct it to the Minister of Health. Would he agree with his colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, as quoted in the Chronicle-Journal of March 2, that the mercury levels of the fish had been made known to the public but we have let them take their own risks; does he agree with that approach? Has he advised or worked in a co-ordinated programme with the Minister of Natural Resources to make sure that all the so-called "fish for fun" signs are no longer there, as it is no longer a fun matter?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I agree; I don't think it is a fun matter at all. It it my responsibility to bring to the attention of the citizens in the area that there is a health hazard. There is no way you or I or anybody else can stop any individual from eating fish that are contaminated with mercury if they decide they are going to do it.

Mr. Reid: The minister can if he provides them with something else to eat!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Certainly we can bring to their attention the fact that the danger is there. We can point out to them the number of fish they can consume daily without causing them any harm. We will continue to do just that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister confirm that the actual levels of mercury in some of the tested residents of the Grassy Narrows-Whitedog

areas is far in excess of the level that is generally accepted, not just for health but in excess of the level which is known to cause mental disability, leading to death?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I can't confirm that, Mr. Speaker, but I would be delighted to check it out and get the details for the hon. member.

Mr. Reid: Who knows?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: On these very levels, can the Minister of Health assure us that the individual people concerned, most of them Indians in those areas, have been personally informed that these levels are well past any maxima that have been permitted in any other situation? Have they been personally informed that they are in serious danger in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is my understanding that they have been, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Reid: Who is doing the work over there? Who knows what is going on?

Mr. Singer: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member for Port Arthur had the last supplementary. The hon. member for Downsview may now ask one.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us if he is telling the Indians not to eat the fish? Knowing that the Indians haven't too many sources of food, is the government supplying alternative sources of food or is it just telling them not to eat or else they are in physical danger?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't been involved in that aspect, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Who has been?

Mr. Reid: Whose responsibility is it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I was speaking specifically from the public health standpoint.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The hon. member for—This will be the last supplementary; the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the Minister of Health: Has the minister suggested to the Indians any antitoxin or antidote that they might use—

Mr. Reid: The minister hasn't done anything.

Mr. Burr: —if they insist on eating fish?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any antitoxins that would be effective.

Mr. Singer: Don't eat it and starve to death!

Mr. Burr: Is the minister not aware that animal experiments have shown that large doses of vitamin C act as an antitoxin or an antidote?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Again, Mr. Speaker, this hasn't been proved definitely. It is strictly an experimental proposition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South with a new question.

DEFINING BEDS OF NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Has the minister taken any steps now to bring in new legislation to define the beds of navigable waters on Lake Erie, particularly due to the recent high levels of water?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not. I will be glad to get some more information on this particular matter and report back to the member.

Mr. Haggerty: Is the minister going to give any further consideration, perhaps in a year from now when the lake levels go down, to allowing fences to be erected along the shores of Lake Erie out to the low water level?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'll look into this matter, too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich Riverside.

HIGHWAY WARNING SYSTEMS

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: As a result of Sunday's traffic tragedy will the minister—

An hon. member: Oh, come on!

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): The member should be cut off.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to listen to the question before I rule the man out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Good for you!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: And then see if he should be ruled out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what one calls lesson "A" for beginners.

Mr. Speaker: I should not have anticipated.

Mr. Burr: I am moved by your generosity.

Will the minister reconsider his decision not to devise some system of warning lights on our freeways so that motorists can be warned that they are approaching areas of low visibility during storms?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, we have flares that people use on the roads. How would this work, Mr. Speaker? I would be glad to discuss it with the hon. member. How does one know where there is low visibility on any particular day?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): He doesn't know either. If he were out on Saturday, there was low visibility anywhere.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

COST OF TASK FORCE ON WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Labour: Now that the task force on the Workmen's Compensation Board has reached its halfway mark in the expected time it would take for its deliberations, can the minister advise us what the cost of that task force has been to date?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I doubt if the task force has reached the halfway mark of its terms of reference. I could not tell members at this point in time how much the task force cost so far, but I will be able to tell them what the total cost would be.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, if the task force hasn't reached a halfway point, is it reasonable to expect that the government will be able to introduce changes to the benefits received by recipients of workmen's compensation prior to the end of this current sitting?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the Speech from the Throne yesterday indicated that benefits would be increased.

Mr. Deans: By way of a supplementary question, does the minister mean that these benefits will be increased without the benefit of the results of the task force's inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The terms of reference of the task force had to do with the administration of the Workmen's Compensation Board, not the benefits.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the minister informed this House, when I asked the question in the fall, that the task force was going to look into the level of benefits. When I asked why they didn't raise the level of benefits at the same time as they increased the level of Community and Social Services benefits, the minister said he was awaiting the result of the task force inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. minister need not respond to that since the hon. member raised it as a point of order. It is not a point of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member for Sarnia is next.

STUDY OF PAYMENTS FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question of the Minister of Health.

In view of the fact that the average payment to general practitioners in May, 1972, was $3,625 under the OHIP programme, or its predecessor programme, and the average payment to pathologists for that month was $13,004.84, could he advise what his ministry is going to do in connection with the rape of the public purse by these specialists?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There has been for some months now an ongoing study of the whole system of paying for medical services in the province. We have had two task forces, one under the Ontario Council of Health and one internal task force. We have had recommendations from individual citizens and from individual physicians. We have been studying the programmes in other provinces and in other jurisdictions in the world. Within a very few weeks, Mr. Speaker, I will have an announcement to make to the House concerning the constraints that will be introduced.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, I wonder if the minister would be prepared to make available to the public and to the members of the House the publication that came out of his department indicating comparative information relating to health costs in Ontario and other provinces, which was

issued by his department in November, 1972, so that we could have a better idea of the kind of problem that the people of Ontario are facing?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I see no reason in the world why we should not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre is next.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): A question of the Solicitor General—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! There is another supplementary; I am sorry. The hon. member for High Park has a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: Would the minister agree that it would be a sensible solution to the heavy costs of the pathologists and the radiologists, as outlined by the hon. member for Sarnia, to put these particular specialists on salary?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, all of these are matters on which we are now making a decision. As I say, this will be announced very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

DEMONSTRATIONS OUTSIDE HOUSE

Mr. Drea: Would the Solicitor General use his good offices to persuade the Provincial Police who are supposed to protect this government—

Mr. Roy: This government?

Mr. Drea: —from interfering and making a spectacle of this House?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. members will be silent, I will permit the hon. member to complete his question, otherwise the time has expired.

An hon. member: He's a bit mixed up. That's all.

Mr. Speaker: The time has expired otherwise.

Mr. Drea: No, I'm not mixed up. I used the word "government" quite properly, and I think they will understand when I finish my sentence.

To return to the question, would the Solicitor General use his good offices to restrain the Provincial Police and other police departments which supposedly are protecting this government—small "g"—from peaceful demonstrations like this morning? The reason that I ask someone to restrain them is that we have numbers out there that appear to me to be—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may not make a speech; he may direct the question.

Mr. Deans: He can't make a speech.

Mr. Drea: I'm trying to get it put. Would the Solicitor General not agree with me that upon entering these buildings this morning there appeared to be a sufficient number of uniformed police making a demonstration of force that would make these premises appear somewhat akin to Belfast?

An hon. member: Canadian Driver Pool.

An hon. member: That's not a question.

An hon. member: Does he want it or doesn't he?

An hon. member: Ask him to repeat it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to get a report on this matter.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, you have been approached by the government and will be approached again to enlist the combined judgement of all of the members of this House as to what arrangements should be made for both the security of this chamber and its environs and the use of the public with respect thereto. This, I believe, should be a matter of some discussion during the course of the session, and I would welcome the continued participation of the hon. members.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Snow presented the 52nd annual report of the Public Service Superannuation Board and also the report of the Provincial Auditor for 1971-1972.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in filing for the information of the hon. members a copy of the general remarks

and recommendations of the minister's committee on insurance claims.

The extensive report commissioned by my predecessor a little over two years ago under the chairmanship of David I. McWilliams, Q.C., is under detailed review at the present time by the Superintendent of Insurance. A wide distribution of the report has been arranged to assist us in assessing the recommendations and to encourage a dialogue with all those concerned before implementation.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports of debates and speeches in the amount of 2,500 copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the legislative assembly, to the legislative assembly, to the legislative library, to each member of the assembly, to the reference libraries of the province, to the press gallery, to the newspapers of the province as approved by Mr. Speaker, and that the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

ELEVATOR CONSTRUCTOR UNIONS DISPUTES ACT

Hon. Mr. Guindon moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Labour Disputes between Armor Elevator Canada Ltd., Dover Corp. (Canada) Ltd., Montgomery Elevator Co. Ltd., Otis Elevator Co. Ltd., Westinghouse Canada Ltd., Employers, and the International Union of Elevator Constructors, Locals 50, 90 and 96.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for compulsory arbitration in the present labour disputes between five elevator companies and Locals 50, 90 and 96 of the International Union of Elevator Constructors.

MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moves first reading of bill intituled, the Ministry of Government Services Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, this bill revises and consolidates the present Government Services Act and authorizes the implementation of certain recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity. The legislation is brought in line with the reorganized ministry.

CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Crown Attorneys Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CROWN WITNESSES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Crown Witnesses Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Administration of Justice Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have completed a reorganization of the ministry and the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions has been phased out. Due to that change the reference to that office in these three statutes has had to be changed to "the Deputy Attorney General."

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Limited Partnerships Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PARTNERSHIPS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Partnerships Registration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I made comment earlier in statements by the ministry pertaining to those two bills.

CONSUMER PROTECTION BUREAU ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Bureau Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, the amendment to this bill is merely a deletion of one clause. The clause deleted makes it the responsibility of the bureau to promote and assist existing counselling services in respect of consumer credit. This duty has been given to the Ministry of Community and Social Services by section 2 of the Ministry of Community and Social Services Amendment Act, 1972, and accordingly this bill is for purposes of clarification.

COLLECTION AGENCIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Collection Agencies Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, this amendment adds credit unions to the activities exempt from the application of the Act and corrects the reference to the Consumer Protection Bureau Act because of the transfer to the Ministry of Community and Social Services, as per my earlier remarks.

ELEVATOR CONSTRUCTOR LABOUR DISPUTES ACT

Mr. Bounsall moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Labour Disputes between Certain Employers and the International Union of Elevator Constructors, Locals 50, 90 and 96.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker, the purpose and overwhelming desire is to get elevator constructors back to work, and this bill will achieve this purpose. It proposes a novel and original procedure, in that while imposing arbitration on the parties in the dispute, it renders the conclusion not binding, thus allowing for a final opportunity for collective bargaining and avoiding the imposition of compulsory binding arbitration for the first time in a private dispute in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Order for the day for the second reading of Bill 2, the Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is not possible for the government to proceed with second reading of the bill without the unanimous consent of the House. My understanding of the rules, if you would care to point it out to me, is that it is not possible, by rule 45, without the unanimous consent of the House.

If I may explain my point, Mr. Speaker, under rule 45 it says: "Except by unanimous consent of the House, no bill shall be read the second time until it has been printed, distributed and so marked on the orders of the day." I point out to you, sir, that it is not so marked on the orders of the day, and therefore it is not proper for the bill to proceed through this House until unanimous consent has been sought and received.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the hon. member has quoted the rule quite correctly, although in the case of controversy or dispute I think that we can be guided by the practices of the House. Certainly, according to my recollection there have been many occasions upon which bills which were recognized as important pieces of legislation, have not, in fact, been marked on the orders of the day as having been printed and that on many occasions we have dealt with such bills.

If the hon. member, of course, is going to raise a very specific objection to it, I think I would have no alternative but to accept this rule as it is indicated in rule 45—that we must have the unanimous consent of the House. I stand to be corrected on this but it seems to me that we must use this rule as it is printed, regardless of the custom that has been followed in the House of going by the rule to facilitate business. There has been a custom whereby the unanimous consent of the House has not been sought—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The House began yesterday and the bill could have been introduced yesterday. Another one was introduced.

Mr. Speaker: As I say, I will be guided by this rule.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would say that the custom of the House has always been, in my opinion, to require unanimous consent and that the rule is quite clear.

I think that the one rule that is sometimes confused with this one—I have confused it with this one—was an old one we used to have which did not permit a bill to be put forward two stages at one session without unanimous consent. That rule is not on the books now.

This one is quite clear that, without unanimous consent I can't see how we can proceed. I would hope that unanimous consent would be forthcoming, however.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, just to speak to the point of order, I think there is no question as to the rule. I endeavoured yesterday to make it clear to the acting leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Deans) that the government would make available the legislation so that they would have an opportunity to assess it, and I understand that this legislation was made available this morning.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): At 11:30 this morning.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): At 11:15 this morning.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not a very lengthy bill.

I would say, with great respect, that this is a matter of very real urgency, very real public concern. It may be that the New Democratic Party, for reasons of their own, may wish not to support the bill or have some advice to offer. But surely, in a matter of this significance for the public of this province, to introduce the strict interpretation of the rules of the House or to say that we must have unanimous consent to consider this matter that is so important and that they not agree to this, I think would be very regrettable indeed.

I think there has been sufficient notice; the public is aware, and the unions and management are aware. We have all had an opportunity to assess the bill, which is not lengthy by any means, and I think there is a great deal in the public interest to be served here.

I would say, and I would urge, Mr. Speaker—through you to the acting leader of the New Democratic Party—even though the members opposite may not wish to support the bill or the principle of it, for whatever reason they may wish to suggest, that surely the matter is of sufficient importance to the public of this province that we, in this Legislature, can waive the strict interpretation of the rule and proceed with this important public business.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Why weren't we here two or three weeks ago?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, if I may, in answer to the Premier, I would point out that it's not a matter of impeding the progress of the bill but rather that the government had an opportunity yesterday to introduce this legislation and did not.

We have proposed to this House an alternative means of dealing with the dispute which would not impose compulsory arbitration by this government upon the private sector of this province. We would like to give every member of the House sufficient time to view the legislative proposals we have made before we deal with the government's bill. That requires simply that it wait until tomorrow.

If, in fact, such an emergency condition exists in the Province of Ontario that we cannot wait until tomorrow at this time to deal with this bill in all three readings, then this government ought to have called this House together some weeks ago. We don't accept the responsibility that this bill doesn't go through the House today. We ask simply that this government, by the expressed wishes of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon), look at the alternative we have offered before we proceed further with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the hon. members that so far no motion for second reading is before the House. The order has been called; in the orders of the day the second reading of this particular bill has been called.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on a further point of order, with great respect to the minister and with what the Premier has had to say, I certainly will not give unanimous consent to the bill being read a second time today. I do this for two specific reasons, one of which has already been stated, and that is that whatever urgency there is about the bill—and I do not dispute the urgency of the bill—it does not happen to coincide with the day following the date on which the government chose to call the House into session.

Secondly, we have adequate procedures in this House by which bills of public importance are, at least, available to someone outside this chamber for comment and concern before they are debated on principle in the House. I personally object to the autocratic procedures which indicate that on the first

day of the session of this House we, in this little red-carpeted chamber, can see fit, without any public response to this bill, to pass the bill through the legislative procedures of the House.

The bill will be passed. It will be passed undoubtedly—

Mr. Deans: Tomorrow.

Mr. Renwick: —within the next day or so, depending on how the government sees fit to pass the legislation through the House. I reiterate that the practice of this government of attempting to force bills through this House in disregard of the rules, or to put us in a position where we have to apologize for abiding by the rules, is one that I will not countenance any longer.

The procedures of this House are adequate. They are public. It is public business and it is a chance for the people of this province to note the contents of the bill and to see what the terms of the bill are; and for us in this party to obtain whatever reactions may come to the terms of the bill within the next few hours.

We will move as expeditiously and as promptly to deal with the bill and make our contribution as the rules of the House provide.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to abide by your decision. However, I must say I am amazed at this attitude of the New Democratic Party this afternoon. There is urgency.

Mr. Martel: There was urgency three weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Members have mentioned that the public good was at stake. There is public danger and, I presume, the members opposite—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister's own approach was so lackadaisical he didn't even introduce it yesterday when he might have.

Mr. Martel: The minister plays games.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —will take upon themselves the tremendous responsibility for what could happen within the next 24 hours.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): The minister took it upon himself not to print it yesterday.

Mr. Deans: Let's not play games with the bill. This minister has failed miserably in his responsibility to ensure adequate collective bargaining in this dispute.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Deans: He failed to deal with the personal issues.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! An hon. member has pointed out to the chair that rule 45 should be applicable in this particular case and I now put the question to the House. Do I have unanimous consent to permit the introduction of this bill for second reading?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: We do not have unanimous consent, therefore the bill may not be introduced for second reading at this particular time.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Shame. It's an absolute shame.

Orders of the day.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister had to learn lesson A yesterday.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Before I put the motion for adjournment I must point out that I have received written notice, which I have not yet had an opportunity to study, pertaining to the replies given to certain questions during the oral question period. In accordance with section 27(g), I believe, of the standing orders, at the adjournment of the House, based upon whether or not the Speaker deems that the debate may proceed at that particular time and that the question and the answer given to that question is proper—

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Could I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would permit me to finish what I was saying. I must point out to the hon. members that I have not had an opportunity to review the written notices that have been given to me. It has been suggested that this applies only on Tuesday which, of course, is not correct. That's rule 28(a); the section applicable is standing order 27(g). I will read it for the benefit of the hon. members.

Mr. Speaker's rulings, relating to oral questions are not debatable or subject to

> appeal. However, a member who is not satisfied with the response to an oral question or who has been told his question is not urgent may give notice that he intends to raise the subject matter of his question on the adjournment of the House. Such notice, whether or not it is given orally during the question period, must be given in writing to Mr. Speaker not later than 4 o'clock p.m. the same day.

Now, I have received written notice that the two hon. members were not satisfied with the response given to their oral questions and, under this standing order, I feel they have the right to provide me with the notice.

I point out that rule 28(a) is applicable as well as 28(d); (d) is not applicable to 27(g).

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Rule 27—

Mr. Speaker: Standing order 28 refers to Tuesdays only; 27 refers to the oral question period on any particular day.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It looks like Tuesday on the clock.

Mr. Speaker: Just wait for a moment until our esteemed Clerk has the opportunity to direct the Speaker and advise him.

Our Clerk informs me that in his opinion rule 28(d) does apply to the provision under 27(g) and in his opinion this must be done on Tuesday; therefore there can be no debate on adjournment of the House.

Mr. Singer: The Clerk says Tuesday!

Mr. Speaker: I have a motion—I have ruled on this matter.

An hon. member: Be dissatisfied on Tuesday!

Mr. Roy: Can I raise one point?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member usually raises pretty good points; I'll listen to him.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might point out that under standing order 27(g) we have until 4 o'clock to give you notice, Mr. Speaker. And so I would say possibly, in deference to you, Mr. Speaker, and with the greatest respect, that no ruling be made on who can participate in the debate until at least people have had a chance to submit all their notices—until 4 o'clock. It's not 4 o'clock yet.

Mr. Speaker: Well, it says 4 o'clock in the standing orders. If we adjourn prior to 4 o'clock obviously we can't wait until 4 o'clock —any notices served until that time will be acceptable. I do not intend in any way to indicate to the House which notices will be acceptable to me, or if debate in fact shall proceed next Tuesday—but we shall consider it very carefully.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order! The rules clearly permit notices to be served before 4 o'clock. You have two submissions now and I don't think that in a serious matter like this you should try to bend the rules for the government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is quite out of order! He has no point of order! I'm not bending the rules. On the contrary, I am attempting to interpret them and apply them quite clearly.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you didn't know the rules a minute ago. You didn't know the rules yourself a minute ago.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Sargent: What do the rules stand for then?

Mr. Speaker: This House stands adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 3:45 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Great Lakes flood damage, statement by Mr. Lawrence 17

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward County, statement by Mr. Bernier 18

Central registry system, statement by Mr. Clement 19

Accident on Highway 400, statement by Mr. Carton 20

Inquiry into crime in construction industry, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Roy, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Sargent 21

Medical care costs, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 23

Great Lakes flood damage, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Deans, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Bullbrook 24

Pensioners' rents, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Deans, Mr. Newman 26

Fidinam (Ontario) Ltd., questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent, Mr. Roy 26

Accident on Highway 400, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Young, Mr. Givens 28

Status of OPC officer, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Singer 28

Sudbury housing investigation, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Martel 29

Mercury task force, questions of Mr. Bernier and Mr. Potter: Mr. Reid, Mr. Foulds, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Burr 30

Defining beds of navigable waters, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Haggerty 31

Highway warning systems, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Burr 31

Cost of task force on Workmen's Compensation Board, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Deans 32

Study of payments for medical services, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman 32

Demonstrations outside House, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Drea 33

Presenting report, Public Service Superannuation Board, Mr. Snow 33

Tabling report, committee on insurance claims, Mr. Clement 33

Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act, bill intituled, Mr. Guindon, first reading 34

Ministry of Government Services Act, bill intituled, Mr. Snow, first reading 34

Crown Attorneys Act, bill intituled, Mr. Bales, first reading 34

Crown Witnesses Act, bill intituled, Mr. Bales, first reading 34

Administration of Justice Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 34

Limited Partnerships Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, first reading 34

Partnerships Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, first reading 34

Consumer Protection Bureau Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, first reading 35

Collection Agencies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, first reading 35

Elevator Constructor Labour Disputes Act, bill intituled, Mr. Bounsall, first reading 35

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 38

No. 3



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 22, 1973

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have some special visitors with us today. In the east gallery we have a group of new Canadians from Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology, Keelesdale campus; and in the west gallery Girl Guides from the 347th Company of Willowdale.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

PROVINCIAL AUDITOR'S REPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Treasurer pertaining to the Provincial Auditor's report that was tabled yesterday.

Since the standing committee of the Legislature dealing with the Provincial Auditor's report will be meeting over many weeks, and no doubt reviewing it item by item, can the Treasurer tell the House if he has any sort of a special committee in his department that is going to examine the recommendations and the criticisms so that these matters might be set right without delay?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the Deputy Treasurer this morning; I asked him to provide explanation to me on several of the points which were mentioned in the report. And I will certainly be exploring all aspects of the Provincial Auditor's report as they affect my responsibilities.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): By way of a supplementary, if I might, to the same minister: Recalling the filing with flourish of the statements of the restaurants at Ontario Place by the Treasurer, then the Minister of Industry and Tourism, and recalling that the Provincial Auditor says on page 79 that the then department under that minister didn't properly administer such statements, I ask: If he couldn't run Ontario Place how can he run Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: I think I can't let that go by, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): He almost did!

Hon. Mr. White: I think it was Feb. 8, 1972, that I took over that ministry, and within 48 hours—

Mr. Roy: He got rid of it!

Hon. Mr. White: —I had talked to the Premier about setting this up as a Crown corporation. I had informed Jim Ramsay that this was going to be done, that his responsibilities would be diverted away from Ontario Place to other projects, and immediately I went to work on the programme. So I was aware in February 1972 that radical changes had to be made to improve upon the performance which the Provincial Auditor complained about in the 1971-1972 report. I was exactly 13 months ahead of a number of people—including the hon. member for Sarnia.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, having to do with the Treasurer's answer: Can he now assure us, since he has personally taken responsibility for Ontario Place and its reform, that we can look forward to a better performance this summer and maybe even end up a bit in the black instead of the red?

An hon. member: Not white anyway.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) can give us a much more incisive answer. But I have no doubt that this is going to improve year by year, notwithstanding the destructive comments of the members of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth with a supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: He is protecting you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a supplementary.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Perhaps the minister could explain why there were no

contracts signed between the management of the Ontario Place restaurants and the government in regard to the management of that particular facility, Ontario Place?

Hon. Mr. White: I can't remember those details. Once again, I think the Minister of Industry and Tourism should be asked. I'm sorry, I just can't give the member an answer. I'll get an answer, or perhaps my colleague can give one now.

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. member for Sarnia want to have a supplementary?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, I would like to ask a supplementary, so that we have no misunderstanding or equivocation. On the same page 79 of the Provincial Auditor's report, he recommends that the operation of Ontario Place be removed from the Minister of Industry and Tourism to the finance branch of this government under the aegis of the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer think—

Mr. Speaker: State your question.

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the Treasurer feel up to it?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If the minister is correct and things were so badly run that he noticed it within 48 hours of taking over, what are we to think of his predecessor who is now in charge of revenue? Does he feel that minister should remain in his job?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: And, if so, what about the revenue of the province?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): It is coming in very well.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister going to answer?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What steps is the Treasurer prepared to take in order to ease the entry into the civil service of pre-audit staff who are affected by the change in responsibilities of the Provincial Auditor, including specifically one of the people who led to this change, Mr. Tom Smith, who is now barred from entering the civil service?

Hon. Mr. White: The pre-audit staff who would have been in the Provincial Auditor's branch reporting to the Legislature, if they were not classified as civil servants, no doubt will be given top priority, and no doubt there will be opportunities within the operating ministries where this pre-audit function is now being handled. I will certainly look into that matter and, in particular, the member's friend, Tom Smith.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit another question of the Treasurer on the same subject, or at least a related subject because it refers to Ontario Place. Is the Treasurer aware that the estimated deficit this year since the reforms that he has suggested have been put into operation is $1.8 million; and that the Provincial Auditor draws attention to the fact that $40,000 of special advances from the government to certain people working in the commercial aspects of Ontario Place seem to have somehow disappeared from the concern of the government? What about that projected deficit and this $40,000?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to debate the Provincial Auditor's report here, if that's the wish of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I was just asking the Treasurer about—

Hon. Mr. White: It was my clear understanding that this matter was going to go to the public accounts committee where detailed replies could be given to questions like this with the advice of the officials who have day-to-day responsibility for these affairs. This is a great provincial facility and it will be a very successful operation after a difficult transitional period.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the Treasurer feel it is a contribution to the Conservative Party?

Hon. Mr. White: I anticipate a deficit this year.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The whole government is answerable for 87 complaints.

Hon. Mr. White: The 13 very good men and women who constitute that new board of directors and who have worked very hard for

six or eight months are coming up with long-term plans—

Mr. Cassidy: It is bankrupt. It is as empty as the Conservative Party.

Hon. Mr. White: —which will ensure the success of that very fine public facility.

Mr. Singer: The minister didn't tell us there was anything wrong when he had Spence running guard for him.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

STUDY OF PAYMENTS FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health.

Can he advise the House whether the information associated with the overbilling by certain doctors, whose names have appeared recently in the press, is going to be passed on to the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) for suitable action or is the case closed, with the disciplinary action to be undertaken by the College of Physicians and Surgeons?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in all cases where there is any evidence of fraud or any indication of sufficient evidence to proceed with legal action, the information is turned over to the Justice department. At the present time I am told by them that they have sufficient evidence to prosecute three or four doctors. We are waiting for the judge to be named.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: If, as the minister says, in cases where in his opinion he has sufficient evidence to prosecute for fraud he can hand this over to the Attorney General, why have there been no prosecutions whatsoever since 1969 when we know that doctors have been defrauding the plan since that time?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to say why it hasn't happened in the past. I can tell the hon. members what has gone on since I have been in the ministry; I have been telling them all along of the procedures that the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons has instituted over the past six or eight months. It is as a result of these procedures that we now have—

Mr. Roy: What's taking so long?

Mr. Bullbrook: Those people are like Pontius Pilate; they are always washing their hands of everything that happened before.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. minister had the floor; I am not sure whether he was finished or not.

Mr. Singer: Neither is he. That's our trouble.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, I've finished.

Mr. Roy: He said it!

MEDICAL SPECIALISTS' FEES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a further question of the Minister of Health.

Regarding his letters to the boards of the public hospitals advising them that they should have doctors in the various specialties who are prepared to perform their services for the OHIP fee schedule, is he content that they will be sufficient to remove what has come to be a closed shop as far as some specialists are concerned in many of the public hospitals of the province? I refer specifically to North York Hospital in connection with obstetrics, and to many of the hospitals for the service of an anaesthetist.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I can't say that I am content. What I have done is I have referred this problem to the boards of governors whose responsibility it is to administer the hospitals; I have asked them to deal with it. If they don't, and if it becomes necessary, then of course we will have to take the necessary action to see that they do something about it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the minister aware that some of the boards feel that the advisory medical committees have the primary responsibility for this and seem to be experiencing difficulties in achieving what the minister himself has indicated to be the goal? Further to that, if in fact this difficulty continues, is he prepared to amend the Public Hospitals Act, or whatever other Act or regulation would be required, in order to insist that all specialists be granted admitting privileges in the hospitals in their areas?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be prepared to go that far, because I don't think it would be proper to suggest that all specialists in a particular area would be granted admitting privileges in that area. We could well find that a hospital had many more doctors on staff than are needed if we

go too far in this—and I said that last spring when we talked about an appeals board.

Mr. Cassidy: Don't break the club. That is what the minister is saying.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is not a question of breaking the club.

Mr. Cassidy: Sure it is! He has been lining up with the club all along.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cassidy: He is afraid to exercise his powers!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Certainly I am prepared to see that the necessary steps are taken to see that the public have available to them physicians in the hospitals who do in fact participate in the programme.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does that mean then that unless we find that there is a change in the next few weeks in the policies of the hospitals, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, that the minister will instruct the boards that specialists accepting the OHIP fee will be given admitting privileges in all of the specialties, but particularly those specialists who administer anæsthetics and who are obstetricians?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, if we are unable to reach our goal along the lines that we are now pursuing, then I will have to take the necessary steps to instruct the boards of governors of the hospitals to see that doctors who do participate in the programme are appointed to the staff.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Is there a supplementary?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes. Is the minister prepared to take more direct action on this problem and, in view of the inflated earnings of doctors under Medicare, simply to insist that no doctor be able to bill beyond the OHIP level?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I answered the question yesterday concerning the doctors' fees. I made the statement that we are doing a study of this at the present time and I hope very shortly to make an announcement in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

PAYMENT TO PROFESSOR SYMONS

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Premier. Will the Premier move to recover the excess amount paid to Professor Symons? The amount I am talking about is that amount between what would have been chargeable by way of mileage where public transportation was not available and that which was paid on his behalf for the use of taxicabs around the Province of Ontario.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, this hasn't been contemplated. I think it is one of those matters in the Provincial Auditor's report, as the hon. Treasurer just said, that should be dealt with in some detail when the public accounts committee meets. I think that is one item, obviously, the committee will want to get into in some detail.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier could have flown him.

Mr. Singer: And his whole family too; like the cabinet ministers do!

Mr. Deans: Who was responsible for authorizing the payment of those accounts?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't tell who was responsible for the authorization of the accounts. I'm sure when the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) returns he would be delighted to answer that question for the hon. member. I think it is a matter that could be raised quite properly at the public accounts meeting.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Provincial Auditor said the Premier had authorized it specifically.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier determine if any funds are outstanding to Professor Symons and whether these will be attached; and is Professor Symons presently on a retainer from any ministry, board or commission of this province; and why would he be?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Good question!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only say this. If the hon. member still had with him—and from their standpoint it's regrettable, although not from ours—the former member for Peterborough, Mr. Pitman, I think he would say to the hon. member that the then President Symons is a very able man who has made a very distinct contribution on many aspects of public life in this province.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Giving us a snow job!

Mr. Deans: That does not give him the right to rip off the public.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think that the phrasing of the question as to why he should or should not be available to any public body for his expertise and advice really is an improper question.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The province has made a very good contribution.

Mr. Foulds: It is an improper answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With respect to whether he is or is not at this precise moment; to the best of my knowledge he isn't, but he may be. I shall endeavour to find out for the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Very touchy!

Mr. Deans: I would just like to ask a supplementary question: Does the Premier pretend to this Legislature that in fact the worth of Professor Symons as an academic gives him the right to rip off the public of Ontario to the extent that he has?

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): There's a new phrase. Where did the member learn that phrase?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have made no such statement. I only say this, that Professor Symons is a very able, intelligent person who made a contribution with respect to the language commission that I think was in the public interest. I would say, with respect, that if the acting leader of the New Democratic Party disagrees with the commission report—if he doesn't think this had validity, if he doesn't think it was helpful, which is not a view expressed by some of his colleagues, then he should say so.

Mr. Cassidy: But he can't find his way to the railway station.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is not the question.

Mr. Martel: Is he a Tory?

Mr. Singer: We were talking about taxicabs.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not just what he was dealing with.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: I question the right of any individual to take money without justification.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Does the hon. member for Wentworth have further questions?

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Mr. Deans: Yes. I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Does the government consider proceeding by way of a special Act in this Legislature, instead of under the Expropriation Act, to recover for the people of Ontario the sand dunes presently on lease to the Lake Ontario Cement Co. for the amount of the lease, the $1 per year which they have already paid, plus whatever out-of-pocket expenses they may have incurred?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question concerning the problem that exists at the sandbanks, I would point out to the hon. member that we have gone into some very lengthy discussions with the company, and I would say that they have been very co-operative and willing to sit down and talk to us. They have not taken any sand, as I said yesterday, since last summer.

Mr. Deans: I understand.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Here again they have exercised a great degree of co-operation and I'm sure the members will agree with me.

Mr. Martel: How much do they want?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We felt the best course of action to take would be through the expropriation procedures. There would be no controversy or no innuendoes thrown against us in regard to that course.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): By way of a supplementary question: Do I take that to mean the minister intends that the public treasury will pay something called fair market value in order to expropriate that lease? If so, has he given any thought to the estimate of what that amount would be that would be payable for the expropriation of the lease?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, under the expropriation procedures, of course, this would be the course of action that would be followed. I have no estimate in my head of what the cost would be.

Mr. Renwick: I take it the minister has no idea of what the cost would be.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, I have not.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister explain why the government would contemplate paying more than the actual value of the lease as determined at the time of the signing, less the value of the lost sand, plus the out-of-pocket expenses of the company?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's a very unfair question, Mr. Speaker, as I don't know what the Crown will pay for that particular piece of property until that is decided by the expropriation procedures.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, isn't it true that the lands that the minister is presently attempting to expropriate or is intending to expropriate were leased at $1 a year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, that's correct, for a 75-year period.

Mr. Cassidy: Isn't that the value then?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's the value of the lease.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Then $75 would be fair compensation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Be generous. Give them $100.

Mr. Deans: A question of the minister in charge of housing.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): The Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, the Minister of Revenue.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): A shortage of leaders today.

PUBLIC HOUSING RENTS

Mr. Deans: When will the Province of Ontario reply to the federal government in regard to the decision with regard to increases in rents in public accommodation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there is no reply necessary to any so-called request by the federal minister. The federal minister is replying to a request Ontario made to the federal government.

Indeed, the last time there was an increase in pensions we did not increase the rentals accordingly. We don't intend to do so at this time. On a number of occasions we have asked the federal minister to get together with us for the purpose of a complete review of the rent schedules. I've just heard from him—I think it was yesterday or the day before—and in fact he has agreed that we should sit down and discuss this to bring about a complete change in the rent schedules.

He suggested that perhaps this could be accomplished by March, 1974. I have written to him today and strongly suggested that this could be done long before that so there won't be all of these anomalies which have come into existence since the schedule was last revised.

We have asked the federal government, I repeat, on a number of occasions to look at this matter and he has, in the last day or two, agreed to do so.

Mr. Deans: By way of supplementary, is the minister aware that the minister in Ottawa, Mr. Basford, indicated that he was awaiting replies from the provincial governments, including the Province of Ontario, to the request that a freeze be instituted in the area of homes or apartments for senior citizens?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, the impression that the federal minister had ordered a freeze on rentals for senior citizens across the country was entirely erroneous. He has admitted he had no right to do that; in fact what he was referring to was only those senior citizens projects in which the federal government was directly involved.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Ontario Housing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, not Ontario Housing at all. It had nothing to do with that. It was brought to his attention; he corrected his statement. I have the correspondence to that effect; I don't think I have it here but I'd be glad to table all of the correspondence in the House.

I took him to task, as a matter of fact, for unilaterally making such a statement. We have agreements—all of the provinces have

agreements—with the federal government in respect of the rent schedules—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They furnish all the money, eh?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and he should be sitting down with the provincial authorities to discuss with them any changes. As I said a few moments ago we indeed had asked for a change and a review of the schedule some time ago.

He had no authority to order a freeze; he didn't order a freeze. He merely ordered a freeze on those projects in which the federal government was directly involved. We, of course, didn't have to be ordered to freeze the rents for pensioners because we didn't increase them the last time, as indeed we are required to under our agreement with the federal authorities, and I advised him that we weren't doing it at this time either. But we have done this unilaterally, because really we are supposed to increase rentals just as soon as there is an increase in pensions, according to the requirements of the federal government and our agreement with them.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What steps is the minister prepared to take to stop private landlords from raising rents for senior citizens just subsequent to their pension increase?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows perfectly well I have no such authority.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, the minister could get it. He has the authority.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

RYERSON FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I have a question in connection with Ryerson Institute that I would like to direct to the Minister of Colleges and Universities, recognizing that the fault in connection with this question doesn't lie with him but lies with the Premier of Ontario, as he was then the minister. In two parts, through you, Mr. Speaker:

Can the minister advise this House as to what actions his ministry has taken or plans to take with respect to the serious situation that has developed at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, wherein approximately 50 per cent of that school's maintenance staff have been indefinitely laid off as a consequence of the school's unstable financial position? And will the minister undertake to order immediately the fullest possible inquiry into the matter, with a view to examining Ryerson's actual financial position and administrative costs—which are presumed to be in the nature of 45 per cent of their total budget—

Mr. Ruston: Shame!

Mr. Bullbrook: —as well as securing the most equitable method of reinstatement for those men who have lost their jobs and some type of moratorium for those who will lose their jobs tomorrow—four in number—and those who will lose their jobs on Monday—24 in number—in view of the fact that the faculty have offered to reduce—

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is now making a speech.

Mr. Bullbrook: —to reduce—in view of the fact—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. Bullbrook: —that the faculty have reduced their own salaries to maintain these people in their positions?

Mr. Speaker: Speeches are not permitted during this period. No speeches.

An hon. member: That was a good speech.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to ask the hon. member to repeat his question.

Mr. Bullbrook: I will. Through you, Mr. Speaker, to—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): He said he was tempted.

Mr. Bullbrook: I just want an answer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, the president of Ryerson has been keeping me posted by sending me copies of his press releases.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is a very thoughtful chap.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): The Premier will do that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McNie: With regard to the plight of Ryerson, I think it might interest the House to know what their situation is. They have a deficit, a substantial deficit, this year as a result of forecasting a 10 per cent increase in their enrolment which didn't materialize. The moot question is whose fault that is. It is a pretty substantial forecast in view of the obvious trends of enrolment throughout the province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think the Treasurer must have been predicting for them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McNie: With regard to the steps that they have taken, I read in the press, too, of the steps they have taken to reduce administrative costs, particularly with reference to the maintenance staff. I can only recall conversations we had last fall with respect to another—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why doesn't the minister take a taxi down and find out?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McNie: —another institution which also had problems and advertised what they were going to do about it. I might suggest that they have come to cope with those problems, and I think very responsibly, and we have heard very little about them since.

I think that in this particular instance they have been tempted to take advantage of the plight of the maintenance staff, the open college, the radio station and what not, to try to enlist support from the government for these extra special endeavours. I might tell the House something that you haven't read in the press yet, and that is that as of last Thursday we made available to Ryerson, through an adjustment to their part-time formula base, something in the order of $230,000 which they have available to them to deal with some of the kinds of problems that the member has referred to and the press have referred to.

Mr. Cassidy: That's enough for 48 jobs.

Hon. Mr. McNie: We're not steering their programes. We leave it to their discretion to decide how they're going to spend it. Quite frankly, like the members, we are concerned with seeing that some of the programmes which they've initiated—and I think some very good programmes—do not fall by the wayside. We don't think there's any need for it. We think they have the capacity to sustain their open college thrust.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How about CJRT?

Hon. Mr. McNie: As far as CJRT is concerned, they can do it if necessary without the radio station. There are only about eight and a half hours out of 133 hours on CJRT devoted to the open college and the radio only represents one small part of their total open college programme. That in itself is no justification for the government moving in and taking over a radio station, if the government, in fact, could. The Canadian Radio-Television Commission could have other views about that, I'm sure.

The fact is that there are other alternatives that they're exploring right now along with other institutions of post-secondary education. As far as the radio station is concerned, I'm satisfied—

Mr. Roy: The minister has come along pretty well. It took him five minutes.

Mr. Bullbrook: He's had training from the Premier.

Mr. Reid: He was almost as long answering the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I should point out to the hon. minister that the time has lapsed and he's approaching the ministerial statement time.

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, if I answer the hon. gentleman's question—

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Well, it was a long question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: It took almost three hours.

Mr. Bullbrook: In recognizing the charming perambulations of the minister's response—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary question?

Mr. Bullbrook: It is.

Mr. Speaker: Or a statement?

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the minister—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He didn't answer the first one yet.

Mr. Bullbrook: —answer my twofold question? Will he insist on a moratorium in connection with further layoff of maintenance people? Secondly, would he look into the allegations of waste in senior administration at Ryerson Institute?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is no. That's a matter for the institution to handle. I'm sure, like other institutions that have been faced with similar problems in the last few months, they'll find a way of handling it—

Mr. Bullbrook: By laying off people?

Hon. Mr. McNie: —that's fair to all concerned. What was the second part of the member's question?

Mr. Bullbrook: Will the minister look into the question of dinners at La Scala, for example?

An hon. member: Where?

Mr. Bullbrook: Thousands of dollars spent for the office of the assistant to the president of the university—things of that nature—while people are being laid off. Will the minister look into that? Will he have a public inquiry into that?

Mr. Roy: Right.

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, I didn't think so.

Hon. Mr. McNie: However, Mr. Speaker, I'm—

Mr. Sargent: Answer the question.

An hon. member: Maybe he will.

Hon. Mr. McNie: I might add that—

Mr. Germa: He should sit down while he is ahead.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McNie: Thank you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

COMMITTAL ORDER FOR STRIKER

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Is it now the practice in Ontario that a person must be unaccompanied when submitting himself to an order of commitment, in that yesterday the sheriff of Waterloo county refused to take in one of the convicted Dare strikers when accompanied, and threatened that if he did not appear by noon today, unaccompanied, that he would inform the Attorney General that the striker was in default of his committal order? Further, what censure will the Attorney General impose upon this same sheriff when he did accept him for commitment this morning, but threatened one of the convicted Dare strikers who is appealing the decision that his appearance would be detrimental to his appeal?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I'll look into the matter and give the member an answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

An hon. member: That's Waterloo for you.

OHIP PREMIUMS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. I wonder if the minister might advise us when we can expect some senior civil servants to be dismissed, considering that they took it upon themselves not to collect some $55 million in premiums when the switch was made to OHIP? I might point out to the minister, in the light of that fact, that last time an official made a $50 million error, according to the minister, he was fired.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think that it should be understood that it's not a question of $55 million being lost.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: Does the minister know where it is?

Hon. Mr. Potter: If we review the Provincial Auditor's report, it is pointed out that this was due to an amalgamation of the two services and the system of payment. I think the place for this to be studied further is in the public accounts committee.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, can the minister advise if he has

taken some steps, at least, to recover some or part of this money?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Obviously the answer is no, Mr. Speaker. I have suggested that this be reviewed at the public accounts committee so we can determine what the actual facts are.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How would the minister—

Mr. Speaker: There have already been several supplementaries; I think, in fairness to the New Democratic Party, they should have their turn at a supplementary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We want to help them out all we can.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): A supplementary of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. In view of the auditor's indications that the cost of health care in the province does not depend entirely on the public, has the minister ordered that the idiotic commercials that have been played across the province be stopped and, if not, will he do so?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I must disagree with the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. I don't think they are idiotic. I think they are very good commercials and it is our intention to continue them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister a supplementary to the original question. Why did the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, as it was then constituted, have the power to make these decisions unilaterally? Is the minister concerned that any of his present boards and commissions reporting to him have those powers, or perhaps think they have?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that I am not in a position to answer that question. I wasn't here during the period that is being discussed. He knows that the commission—

Mr. Singer: No, it was all those fellows who went before—

Hon. Mr. Potter: He knows that the commission—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Roy: It's the fellows who make the mistakes who get promoted provincial secretary.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Potter: He knows that the commission is no longer in existence and, as I suggested earlier, I think the place to discuss this is in the public accounts committee.

Mr. Speaker: I think there have been sufficient supplementary questions on that particular topic. A new question? The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville will be next.

RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour.

What action does the ministry intend to take on the discrimination on the basis of religion that is being practised and promoted by the Ministry of Education in the directive of Aug. 31, 1972, that precludes a day school student of a senior division of a privately supported secondary school from enrolling in a correspondence course provided by the Ministry of Education?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows, under the Human Rights Code, any discrimination of this kind is investigated. If my hon. friend would send me all the details, I will make sure that the Human Rights Commission will look into it as soon as possible.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman: May I also ask the minister, while I am on my feet, to look into the case of a Miss Jean Lowry, a student of the Catholic Central School in London, who was ruled ineligible to take a correspondence course?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

NO-FAULT AUTO INSURANCE

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Having regard to the serious, if not devastating, criticisms of the general insurance business—particularly in the automobile insurance field—by the minister's committee on insurance claims, is the minister now about to give consideration to establishing a publicly-operated no-fault insurance plan in the Province of Ontario. If he is not already prepared to do that, would he advise the House whether or not any of the members of his ministry are in consultation with the private insurance industry which is desperately endeavouring to come up with a suitable plan for the Province of Ontario?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I take it that the hon. member for Riverdale has had an opportunity of at least perusing the report that I filed yesterday. The question of no-fault insurance is being looked into very carefully. The questions raised, the issues mentioned in the McWilliams report are being studied very thoroughly by the department of insurance under the superintendent. No-fault insurance, I should point out to this hon. House, is not the answer to a maiden's prayer.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Not the member for Riverdale's either!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: We are talking about accidents.

An hon. member: You mean an NDP's prayer.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, considering the age of those who laughed I didn't think they remembered maidens.

We get into a no-fault insurance plan in this province where the loss of an arm is worth $1,500, a loss of a leg is worth $2,200 and this sort of thing. There is no question about fault. That is fine until you are the victim and you feel that you should have greater recompense with general damages for pain and suffering.

It is a very delicate issue and it is one that is worthy of great study. I am not recommending that we go into it at this time. I am waiting for the recommendations of the Superintendent of Insurance and his staff with reference to the McWilliam's report which was filed yesterday.

Insofar as I recollect the last part of the hon. member's question, my advisory committee is considering alternatives to no-fault and will in due course make a report to me upon completion of their study.

Mr. Stokes: And the maiden still waits.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

HEALTH SERVICE COMMERCIALS

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Has the ministry allocated funds for the ad referred to earlier, and if so, how much?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would presume so, Mr. Speaker, but I haven't got the information yet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: I have a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It would be part of the budget for this year.

Mr. Gaunt: Did the minister authorize that particular ad?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes. You mean the commercials on radio and TV?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes? You did?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

EFFECT OF MERCURY ON INDIAN BANDS

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. What is the Premier doing about the devastating effect that mercury pollution has had on the Indian bands at Grassy Narrows and Whitedog reserves?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter was raised, as I recall, yesterday, with two or three of the ministers. I would be quite prepared to discuss this in detail with those ministers who have some interest and get a detailed report for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry I didn't get the import of the question; I agree it was raised at considerable length yesterday.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but we didn't get an answer.

Mr. Speaker: I think the answer is quite sufficient.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the Premier's answer would be consider also pulling the Attorney General into that consultation so that that office may be made available to the Indians in case there is a necessity for prosecution against the polluters?

Mr. Cassidy: That is a nod. Put it in Hansard.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

DESTRUCTION OF OHIP FILES

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Is the Minister of Health aware that some of the OHIP files have been destroyed, and that because they have been destroyed OHIP is unable to advise members of the legal profession who are acting on behalf of their clients, and by statute have to act for OHIP as well, as to how much in fact they should charge in settling negligence cases or in pursuing negligence cases through the courts?

Can the minister tell us how it has happened, and what kind of a solution there might be, so that the members of the legal profession who accept their statutory responsibilities very seriously will know that they have to collect the right amount on behalf of the people of Ontario?

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): Waive your fees, Vern!

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is the first I've heard of that, Mr. Speaker. I'll look into it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Now that the minister has heard about it could he undertake to investigate and advise the House, a) as to how this matter happened; and b) what he proposes to do to safeguard the interests of the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Potter: In view of the fact that there has been considerable amount of information passed out from the Ontario Health Insurance Plan over the last few weeks, I'd be delighted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

SHORTAGE OF TRADESMEN

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): A question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. In regard to a Globe & Mail report this morning attributing statements to the personnel relations officer of Koehring-Waterous Ltd. in Brantford that they are again this year, as they did last year, importing welders and machinists to carry on employment in their industry. Will the minister explain the lack of evaluation of the projected need for trained tradesmen and apprentices in this province?

Hon. Mr. McNie: I'll look into the item that the member referred to.

An hon. member: Notify the Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

ALBERTA NATURAL GAS

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question, in the absence of number two, for the Premier. Can the Premier advise the—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please rephrase that question?

Mr. Reid: To the Premier, Mr. Speaker, through you: Can the Premier advise on the current state of negotiations with the Province of Alberta in regard to the price of natural gas? And can the Premier also advise as to what negotiations are going on with Ottawa in regard to an energy policy both for the Province of Ontario and for Canada as a whole, and what stand Ontario is taking in these matters?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there will be a fairly detailed statement within the next few days and I don't want to be pinned down at this moment as to how many days.

Mr. Reid: The Premier never wants to be pinned down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So why change? With respect to energy, I don't think one could really describe the discussions as negotiations. I don't think it is really a question of negotiations.

There has been a great deal of effort in the past few weeks put into the development of an energy position by the Province of Ontario. My parliamentary assistant is, I think, at this moment discussing the matter with the resources committee and with other federal officials.

I think Ontario's broad position, of course, is fairly evident, and that is that we believe that in the total context there should be a national energy policy. I think this is self evident and something that I'm sure the hon. members opposite would support.

Mr. Stokes: I'm not sure Mr. Lougheed would support that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As it relates to the position related to the suggested price increases by the Province of Alberta, just what constitutional or legal position, or what posture we can adopt here, I'm not in a position to say at this moment. I can only assure the hon. member that this whole area has been the subject of very intensive work over the past three or four weeks—or couple of months now—and that we shall be in a position to make a form of statement setting out some of the problems and some of the possible solutions, hopefully within the next few days. I can't assure the hon. member it will necessarily be next week, but we wish to do it as soon as possible.

Mr. Reid: May I, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Kennedy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for compulsory wearing of seat belts while driving or travelling in a motor vehicle other than a motorcycle. There is evidence that the use of seat belts would result in very significant reduction of both fatalities and personal injuries.

ARBITRATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Arbitrations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the fixing of arbitrators' fees is taken from the schedule in the present Act and will be prescribed by regulation in future under the provisions of this bill.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CROWN ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Proceedings against the Crown Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the amendment in this bill adds the Motor Vehicles Fuel Tax Act to the list of statutes not affected by the Proceedings against the Crown Act. Provisions for trial and appeal of assessments were added to the former Act in the 1972 session.

SECURITIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Securities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, this is a very brief amendment, but in essence it provides that when orders of the director be stayed, they are to take effect immediately, even though under review subject to a stay being specifically granted.

CERTIFICATION OF TITLES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Certification of Titles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments to this bill.

One amendment provides for the repealing of a section in the current Act which provides for the director of titles to have access to registry offices and to documents registered therein. The provisions are obsolete since they all come under the one administration covering persons employed under the Public Service Act.

The second amendment requires the director of titles to hold hearings in claims against the assurance funds.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACCIDENT CLAIMS ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Accident Claims Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that the Superintendent of Insurance be substituted for the Registrar of Motor Vehicles wherever it is referred to in the Act.

Secondly, it provides for a 48-hour period for the production of evidence of insurance instead of the term reasonable time as provided in the current Act.

Thirdly, it provides that the suspension of driving privileges not only applies to the current licence but to any renewal thereof. This amendment is required as the result of a recent case decided by the Ontario Court of Appeal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Roy: This should be good.

Mr. Drea: Is the member still with us? I thought he was going federal.

Mr. Roy: Don't worry, I'll be around when the member is long gone.

Mr. Drea: I don't lose nominations to chiropractors.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who is the member nominating today?

Mr. Roy: Hang on!

APPRENTICESHIP AND TRADESMEN'S QUALIFICATIONS ACT

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualifications Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Why didn't the member whisper it to the judge?

Mr. Drea: Where is he?

Mr. Sargent: It'll never sell!

Mr. Roy: Reluctantly carried. Just wait a second.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, the bill is to establish compulsory certification for persons engaged in the trade of servicing radio and television sets. Simply because you cannot establish honesty and competency at the same time I would like to introduce a second bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Reluctantly carried. Just wait a second; does that amend the first bill?

Mr. Breithaupt: More cabinet reform?

Mr. Bullbrook: The member better include the whole cabinet in that bill. There is no competency over there.

Mr. Drea: There is a little more than in those 22 seats.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide for the mandatory licensing and bonding of television repair servicemen and services and the licensing of repairmen across Ontario. There is an obvious need for it across all Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

Mr. R. F. Nixon moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Hospitals Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for appeal procedures for an applicant who has been refused appointment as a member of the medical staff of a public hospital for the first time.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

ELEVATOR CONSTRUCTOR UNIONS DISPUTES ACT

Hon. Mr. Guindon moves second reading of Bill 2, An Act respecting labour disputes between Armour Elevator Canada Ltd., Dover Corp. (Canada) Ltd., Montgomery Elevator Co. Ltd., Otis Elevator Co. Ltd., and Westinghouse Canada Ltd. employers and the International Union of Elevator Constructors, Locals 50, 90 and 96.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I wish to proceed with legislation introduced into the House yesterday to bring an end to the work stoppage in the elevator industry in Ontario.

May I first express my regret that the government has been forced to take this step. Throughout the negotiations of the past few months it has been my hope that the parties themselves would be able to reach a satisfactory agreement. Regretfully, this has not been the case.

The dispute in Ontario involves five elevator companies—Armour Elevator Ltd., Dover Corp. Ltd., Montgomery Elevator Co., Otis Elevator Co., Westinghouse Canada Ltd.—and about 1,200 members of the International Union of Elevator Constructors, Locals 50, 90 and 96.

The collective agreements between these parties expired last April and negotiations have been under way since that time. In July, the conciliation and mediation services of the Ministry of Labour became involved.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: At the end of August the strike began in Hamilton and spread throughout Ontario and then across Canada. In early December Mr. William H. Dickie, my assistant deputy minister, became personally involved in the negotiations and he and his officers have held a total of 45 days of mediation talks since that time.

On March 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 I met with both sides. By the end of that week I reported the results of these talks to the Premier (Mr. Davis) and he indicated he would like to meet personally with the parties. Two meetings for both management and labour were arranged.

Subsequently, the Premier and I reported to cabinet. The decision of cabinet was that legislation would be introduced early in the session to bring an end to the dispute and on March 14 Premier Davis announced this publicly.

Since that time I would emphasize that the full services of my ministry have continued to be available to the parties. There are those who say that our actions today will have a detrimental effect on collective bargaining in Ontario. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. Since I assumed my portfolio I have frequently stated my belief in the collective bargaining process, in the need for the parties in a dispute to reach their own solutions, and that is a belief which I reaffirm today. The very fact that this is the first occasion that compulsory arbitration has been imposed in the private sector in Ontario certainly speaks well of the state of labour-management relations in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I feel all of us here must agree that there comes a point in any dispute when public considerations must take precedence, when the interest, safety and well-being of the public must be of prime concern. I have received many letters from concerned citizens across the province outlining not merely inconvenience but genuine hardships which this dispute has imposed, and I am sure that every member of the House has received similar correspondence.

We have therefore reached a point at which the government cannot remain passive but must act in the best interests of the majority of the citizens of this province.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Tell us about the companies and how they held up—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, much has been said about precedent established by this bill and that it is the first time the Legislature has considered a law which would end, by compulsory arbitration, a strike that is totally in the private sector. In my opinion it doesn't matter a whit whether it is in the public sector or in the private sector. When the safety of the citizens and the welfare of the community are concerned, then it is our responsibility to act.

My criticism really is that the minister and the Premier of Ontario have not acted sooner in the capacities they have and with the powers they have enjoyed. But I can't understand the feeling that has been expressed by the NDP that there is something special about the circumstances of this particular negotiation because both the unions and the companies are entirely in the private sector. I cannot understand the rationale which on that basis would lead them to resist approving the bill. I have heard the acting leader of that party indicate that this is a major aspect of their opposition, and to me it seems completely irrational.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal very briefly with some of the circumstances and events since the strike began on Sept. 7 and, as a matter of fact, in the Hamilton area on Aug. 28. My mention of Hamilton is significant, because I understand that most of the elevator union locals have already directed their workers to get back to their employ-

ment today in the expectation that this bill will become statute—with the possible exception of those workers in Hamilton, who seem to be even more militant than the others.

There is no doubt that this has been a very tough negotiation between the unions and management. The minister has mentioned the participation of his assistant deputy, Mr. Dickie, and of course I am glad to see that he is sitting under the gallery today. But I suppose this is a substantial disappointment for him, because he and his staff and the negotiators on behalf of the union and management have committed so many hours, according to all reports, to a very careful review of the two positions. Mr. Dickie in particular has attempted to bring them to some kind of meeting of minds that could effect a solution.

Apparently, however, this has not been possible, and hasn't even been nearly possible; the two sides are so remote from this meeting of minds that in the public interest it is necessary now to consider the legislation which we, on our part, are prepared to support.

Mr. Speaker, when we think of those events since the strike began officially on Sept. 7, almost seven months ago, there has been a serious dislocation on the part of many individuals and in some communities of the economy itself. I suppose we can survive most strikes for a few weeks, but once the effects of this kind of strike, which are cumulative, affect the community for many months, then obviously the public interest must be served by action taken by this Legislature and an action which, I suppose, has got to be as definite as this bill is.

I don't see how we can impose compulsory arbitration which is in fact not compulsory. I don't see how we can use the undoubted power of this chamber through the Minister of Labour and the government of Ontario to effect a solution which will put the elevator workers back on their maintenance and installation jobs, without going the whole way and setting up the procedures whereby an agreement will be hammered out and arbitrarily imposed, whether the two sides sign it or not.

I feel that the NDP in opposing this bill do so on the basis of principle, that it interferes with the ordinary course of the negotiations between two sides. I think that that is a stance which certainly is understandable. But when they say there is something special about this because only private parties per se are involved, then I think their approach becomes irrational. Also, by introducing a bill which evidently purports to achieve compulsory arbitration without imposing an agreement, I believe they are trying to have both sides of the issue at the same time, and that their actions yesterday in many respects have lost them the confidence of even a larger segment of the community than they might otherwise have expected.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Even within their own party!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dwell on the events. After all, we have seen the problems in major hotels down the street—the Sheraton Four Seasons, for example. There has been a good deal of publicity about the problems in getting that edifice in full operation.

I'm not concerned about that particularly. I feel sure that once they get it in operation their profit position will be all right as far as they're concerned. But if you don't go quite so far down University Ave. you come to another major edifice, the Mount Sinai Hospital, which has had facilities suspended pending the ending of this strike; and also installations at the subway extension which is going to be opened in a few days. One of the homes for the aged in Sudbury, I believe put up under the auspices of the United Church of Canada, has been suspended in its usefulness.

All of these things, I suppose, while they are tremendously dislocating, can be borne for a long period of time, maybe even longer than seven months. But it's when the chief inspector for elevator safety goes out on a limb, lays his job on the line, and makes a statement publicly without reference to his minister that the situation as far as safety is concerned is approaching crisis proportions that we must take a new look at the situation. That's when, in our opinion in the Liberal Party, there could be no doubt that if solution was not achieved immediately then we would have to resort to the compulsory arbitration that is the principle of this bill.

I would have expected that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Clement), to whom the elevator inspection staff reports, would have made a statement either in the House yesterday or perhaps even publicly before the House began the session, indicating that he was accepting the report of his chief inspector as a valid one and one that in fact should have the impact on the community which it did have.

There were those in Ontario who, when they read the report, pooh-poohed it and said that, it was an exaggeration of the situation. In my view the responsibilities of the chief inspector and his staff are paramount, and further he deserves a medal for taking this independent action on behalf of the citizens of Ontario, an action which his minister should have taken even earlier than it was taken by the inspector himself.

Mr. Speaker, you are aware, I know, that the situation involving the elevator installers and maintenance men has been a matter of prolonged negotiations in the United States as well as in every province of Canada. The American solution, while it was not imposed, did have tremendous pressures, I believe from Washington, exerted upon the two parties so that they did reach a settlement and there was not the situation that we have experienced here of a prolonged strike. President Nixon's imposition of wage and price controls and more stringent controls on the economy in general, I felt, led to that situation in the United States. As a matter of fact, I had the impression since it is an international union that they had settled and really left it to the Canadians to fight the real battle to see just how far they could go in a community where the use of elevators is becoming absolutely of prime importance, and the maintenance and the safety of the facilities are of equal or even greater importance.

You know, Mr. Speaker, as well that, by the constitution—because elevators go up and down and not back and forth across provincial boundaries—this strike fell wholly in the provincial jurisdiction, although of course it had national ramifications. The installation of all elevators and their maintenance is a problem in very community in Canada and all of the workers have been out on strike.

There has been a special situation in BC and Quebec where the strike came under the jurisdiction of special legislation which actually made it illegal, but when in those jurisdictions there has been a work-to-rule and a slowdown so that the situation has been bad in those two provinces as well.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that under those circumstances there has been considerable pressure on the provinces to turn to the federal Department of Labour for at least some assistance in these negotiations. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Minister of Labour for Ontario and the Premier himself did not take the lead in at least requesting the involvement of John Munro, the federal minister, and his staff in attempting to work out some sort of a solution.

It seems to me eminently practical in a strike with interprovincial ramifications—national ramifications—that the federal department should have been involved. As a matter of fact, it would have been one way for the minister to have forgone that black Tuesday, or whatever it was that he called it when he made the decision to go forward with compulsory arbitration, if many months before had had asked the federal Department of Labour to share his responsibility and at least attempt to bring about negotiations.

I wouldn't for a moment suggest to you, sir, that there is anybody in Ottawa who can negotiate with the unions and with management any better than Mr. Dickie and our staff here, but we must remember that the unions have branches all across Canada and they can't all send their people down here to sit down in the Royal York or wherever the minister happens to have his negotiations. Maybe that's not quite luxurious enough for the three sides any more but it certainly would have been a sensible approach to recognize the ramifications of this strike as being national in scope and accept at least some assistance and support at the national level.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting that this has been a matter of contention in Ottawa where the official opposition, the Conservative Party, has been deeply critical of the government of Canada for not intruding itself into this situation and attempting to effect a settlement. The other interesting part is that it has been big news in the press gallery in Ottawa, every time somebody from the opposition raises the question, that the hon. John Munro explains that he has no jurisdiction and that it is at the provincial level.

As far as we are concerned in this province, because of the unnatural decision of the Premier to postpone this Legislature until after the by-elections held last week there has been no opportunity to express these views in this particular chamber. In an attempt to make it an issue outside the chamber, I have found that the community, at least as expressed by the opinions of the press, has been completely uninterested in any aspects or any views that might have been expressed from the opposition side as to whether or not this Minister of Labour and the Premier of Ontario might have taken some initiative much earlier.

One valid point that was made by the NDP yesterday is that it seems ridiculous that the government now considers it to be such a matter of crisis importance that we act on the very day that the Legislature resumes its regular business—when it was the political decision of the Premier of Ontario to postpone this session later than any date since 1872 so that he was not going to ripple the waters of the by-elections and he didn't want political matters to be discussed. Of all the fatuous and ridiculous statements that was ever made that's got to take the cake!

Here is an issue of prime importance that should have been discussed in this House on a daily basis. We should have been bringing pressure on the minister and the Premier at least to make some personal intervention, if not to call in the government of Canada to share these heavy responsibilities. To delay action for seven full months is totally irresponsible. It is directly due to the political decision of the Premier to leave this chamber out of session and the members in limbo as far as expressing views that are our right to express in this chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the minister made a good statement in the introduction of the bill. I accept his protestations that he has expressed publicly over the last two or three weeks on his unwillingness to impose compulsory arbitration. Because of the intransigence of both sides, I would say that he was forced to take this step.

It is true that the unions have called for voluntary arbitration for a considerable period of time and the companies' management have said that: "We have gone as far as we can go; we cannot accept the fact that an arbitrator can move in and order us to give more because it would be the abandonment of the right to manage our own business."

If we have that sort of an attitude then there is no doubt that the Legislature must step in and impose compulsory arbitration; because the statements of management presuppose that the arbitrators, whomever they may be—and the bill calls for three of them —are going to somehow come to a position midway between the two extreme positions; and that may very well be the case.

But we have to have confidence that the three arbitrators, representing the two sides and the public interest—the third arbitrator hopefully representing the general public interest—will arrive at a fair and equitable solution so that the workmen can go back to their jobs and the companies can go back to theirs, which we presume is to make enough profit to pay the members of the union a fair wage and have a profit left over for themselves.

There is no doubt the elevator business must have been one of the most extremely profitable ones in recent years; and if it hasn't been then they must be very bad managers, because the development of the use of elevators has expanded fantastically. The expertise and even the costs have gone up in a skyrocket fashion.

It seems to me the crux of the situation is the fact that the safety of the general public is involved. The situation is intolerable that in some of these high rises older citizens in particular have been marooned for many weeks because they simply cannot make use of the stairs. The prospects of a fire in a highrise is something else that doesn't bear thinking about. And I know that my colleague from York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) raised the matter many months ago of the problems of fires in highrises and the fact that we are ill equipped to cope with them. The chief elevator inspector very specifically said that he didn't think that there was—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The last thing you use is an elevator in the case of fire.

Mr. Cassidy: The first thing you do is shut it down.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We are going to hear some really clever remarks today.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Did the hon. member get a call from Kentucky today?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I don't require a call.

Mr. Singer: The member should have. He would have done better than the member does.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the point that my hon. friends to the left have brought to my attention in chorus—

Mr. Cassidy: Has the Leader of the Opposition ever ridden in an elevator?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —about not using elevators in a fire is well taken. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, I live in an area where highrises don't predominate and the only time I use an elevator is when I am visiting my

friends in St. James Town—and there are a good many of them there.

So, Mr. Speaker, the matter that was certainly brought to the attention of reasonable citizens as far as safety is concerned is not so much that the elevators may drop—I don't think that the chief inspector made that as one of the scare points at all—he simply said that the doors might very well open, exposing an empty shaft with all the dangers involved; that the doors might open between floors and that there was an increasing incidence of this sort of problem, which was bound to increase because of the special permits given to the operators of these elevators to continue their use without their regular maintenance. I am sure they were inspected under their regular procedures. So that is the situation as far as safety is concerned; without regard to the fire hazard, which I take from my advisers to the left, since they are aware of these things, is an item that should not be considered.

So Mr. Speaker, the government must carry not only the responsibility for this legislation—

Mr. Deans: It is not the only area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —that is for the fact that after seven months they must impose compulsory arbitration, but for the fact that over these many months their efforts could have been stronger than they were.

I'm not saying that their negotiators could have worked harder, but that the initiative of the minister and the Premier has been lacking; that they have both been weak and they have both been ineffectual in seizing the alternatives that have presented themselves on more than one occasion to share the responsibility for the negotiations with the government of Canada; or if necessary, well before now, to call the Legislature into session so that this legislation could have been considered and we could have had this strike brought to an end at an earlier date.

As far as the bill itself is concerned, we have examined it carefully and we are going to offer a series, of I believe three amendments, which I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, we hope will be supported on all sides of the House because we think they will improve the concept of the application of compulsory arbitration in this respect to a considerable degree.

The bill essentially puts the elevator workers back on the job so that they can, I suppose primarily see to the maintenance of the elevators presently in function and then proceed with the installations of the new ones. We are prepared to support the principle of the bill mainly because the public safety of the province demands it.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain our opposition to the government bill as it now stands—

An hon. member: That will take some doing.

Mr. Bounsall: —which legislates compulsory arbitration for the first time in a private dispute in the Province of Ontario. This action by itself, as the Minister of Labour has said on several occasions, is a precedent that he would not like to see established; and I think it is a dangerous precedent. It opens wide the door for the public and the press. Although the Queen's Park press gallery may not fall prey to it, certainly the editorial writers of our newspapers would be more prone to use it. It opens the door to their calls for compulsory arbitration in every dispute in this province that runs beyond the time that they might decide is too long.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Who's they?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The editorial writers.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Do they pass bills?

Mr. Bounsall: Capitulation to these demands, which will be successively harder to prevent, will result in the action of one side or in some cases both sides not seriously bargaining in good faith, lengthening the strike or lockout in the hope that the imposition of compulsory, binding arbitration will be imposed, thereby allowing them to say that it isn't we who have gotten ourselves into this labour relation situation with our employees but the government of Ontario which is to blame for the labour relations situation in our particular company and in our particular work jurisdiction.

In fact, once we have imposed compulsory arbitration in the private sector for the first time we needn't look for any further instances of imposition, this one will be enough for a party to a dispute to drag its feet, to not bargain in good faith in the hope of the Ontario government coming in. The Minister of Labour himself, upon hearing that the Premier of this province would impose compulsory arbitration called that day "black Wednesday". I quote: "As far as I'm concerned as Minister of Labour this is a black Wednesday. I've been a member of the Legislature for 15 years—"

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): It was Thursday!

Mr. Bounsall: Thursday? Was it Thursday the minister called "black"?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Get the days right.

Mr. Foulds: The minister hasn't been listening.

An hon. member: He was quoting the minister.

An hon. member: He's not sure what he's talking about there anyway.

Mr. Bounsall: "For 15 years—"

An hon. member: Back to the woodwork!

Mr. Bounsall: "—and this is the saddest day of my career."

An hon. member: Almost resigned I bet.

Mr. Bounsall: Well we have introduced a proposal—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): That is a denturist's bill! There are no teeth in it.

Mr. Bounsall: —that is an alternative to this, a way to save the minister from this step—

Mr. Deans: That is a false interpretation.

Mr. Bounsall: —and one which would not cause him to impose what has hitherto been understood as—

Mr. Good: Ridiculous.

Mr. Bounsall: —compulsory arbitration; the understanding of that phrase being compulsory, binding arbitration.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): They brought the guillotine in.

Mr. Bounsall: It is a way in which we can offer the minister means of not dropping over this precipice which he would so dearly like not to do, in public terms at least.

Our proposal would allow for the immediate stoppage of the strike and would cause the workers to return to work, as indeed they already have—as indeed they said they would, once any government legislation was introduced. They would presumably have been willing to return to work last January, last February or early in March if the government had decided to involve itself sooner. The major difference, of course, is that there would be—

Mr. Singer: And then what happens?

Mr. Bounsall: —a voluntary acceptance of that decision. The important point to be made is that it allows the decision to be not binding and gives the unions and the companies 10 days in which to make their responses.

The purists in the province, labour lawyers and civil servants in the Ministry of Labour, will say that's not arbitration, because compulsory arbitration and arbitration generally has been defined heretofore as binding. Compulsory arbitration involves being bound to the decision. If we all took the attitude that this is the definition of compulsory arbitration and that there is no other way one can change or broaden that definition, not one advance would have been made in our courts or in our Legislatures in response to any needs of the day or in response to any questions that come before us.

Simply because compulsory arbitration heretofore has been written down and therefore understood as being binding in its decisions that is no reason we cannot write down that compulsory arbitration decisions may well be non-binding. It's only purists, who are unwilling to extend any definition of any written word, who say in this respect, "This cannot be done."

We can do it, should we choose to do it. I am suggesting that we chose to do it in this instance; that we add this little bit of originality to this particular long, involved and difficult labour dispute.

One can call this proposal any name one wants. I might say this does differ from simply a cooling-off period; which is familiar in some other jurisdictions, south of the border particularly. It is different from that. One can call it by any other name that one so chooses, but I would prefer to introduce this concept as a further refinement, and possibility therefor, to the definition of arbitration.

The advantages that flow from this, I think, are obvious. The arbitration board hands down a decision and in our bill we have put pretty firm time limits on how long it will take; how long either side can take to appoint arbitrators; how long the minister could, in fact, take, if the parties did not agree in a short time, to appoint the chairman of the arbitration board. On that point I might say that I suspect the minister may well be appointing the chairman of this arbitration board because the parties might not agree. But in this bill that the minister has presented he hasn't given them any opportunity for even three or four days to say

that they can agree on an arbitrator. I don't see why the minister capitulates so early by saying that because there has been intransigence, mainly on the part of one party in this dispute up to this point, that those people cannot change their minds now.

Having formed an arbitration board and having heard the arguments of both sides, we would say that they should report their decision, not just in a reasonable time because that term can be a damned long time before it starts to become unreasonable—I would like to see this bill define that time. I know the Minister of Labour is very aware of situations in which arbitration boards have met, all the evidence has been presented, then the members of the arbitration board have disappeared rather than sitting down with the evidence all before them and banging out their decision.

What our bill would purport to do, as opposed to his, is put the number of days on it—10—in which the arbitration board members would arrive at their decision. Our bill says to them: "You are not returning therefore to your place of business, to your normal activities, to a vacation and then coming back days or weeks later to try to pick up all the points that were presented." We are saying that when the hearings are over, they sit right there and make up their minds on all the issues that are in dispute that this bill, and our bill, purports that they should deal with. So our bills differ in major aspects, apart from the time limits.

Then what happens? We would say that both sides have 10 days in which to render their decision as to whether they accept or reject the arbitration board's conclusions.

Mr. Singer: And then what happens?

Mr. Bounsall: This gives a return, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Yes, and then what happens?

Mr. Bounsall: —to the collective bargaining system.

Mr. Deans: We sign an agreement.

Mr. Bounsall: This allows—and I'll spell it out in a very trite example.

Mr. Singer: We start all over again!

Mr. Bounsall: In any arbitration decision handed down we will probably find one-third of the decision which one side hates with its heart and soul—but there it is. And another third which the other side would find very difficult to live with.

An hon. member: That is nonsense!

Mr. Bounsall: But there is probably a third which both sides could probably live with.

Mr. Singer: Both agree and the strike starts all over again!

Mr. Bounsall: But within that third they would find points which they themselves, in consultation, could improve upon by agreement. This provides a final opportunity for the two sides, heretofore having great difficulties in reaching agreement, to sit down and say to each other: "We can live with what is here but the wording of this would be better, the phrasing of this or the intent of this would be better by a change."

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Why is it final? There is no finality about it at all.

Mr. Bounsall: And with the other side agreed, they could go back and say to the minister: "We accept your decision with these agreed-upon changes by ourselves." And if the minister really believes in the preamble to his Labour Relations Act, which he administers and in which it states: "Whereas it is in the public interest of the Province of Ontario to further harmonious relations between employers and employees by encouraging the practice and procedures of collective bargaining between employers and trade unions," this minister would want to provide every opportunity for the collective bargaining procedure to operate. Therefore, he should be accepting this final and further opportunity for the collective bargaining process to take place.

We hear cries from the group on our right: "What will happen if one of them rejects?" I don't need to point out to the minister that should one of the parties be so foolish as to reject at that point with three completely independent people pursuing arbitration in as rigorous a way as any arbitration is proceeded with, if they should be so foolish as to turn that down, that is the point where we in this Legislature could decide that we would compel some sort of decision. But I am confident that this will not occur because of public pressures in the face of that sort of an arrangement, in view of the rigorous arbitration procedure having been followed and the great public pressure on both sides to accept.

In the case of whichever side says no, I don't need to remind the minister or the officials from the labour department that are here that any arbitrator in a subsequent arbitration, if that is perhaps necessary, takes

into account in his decision and in his conclusions, or tends to take into account in his conclusions, the mood and degree of intransigence that one side has exhibited. So the side which might object to this could be faced with another round of arbitration—meanwhile, I would point out that the workers are completely back to work throughout all of this—and stands a chance of getting a decision which is no better than the one it received, and could well be worse.

Therefore, that is why they will not reject. It is still not compulsory, binding arbitration and it allows the collective bargaining process a last and final chance. I might say to the minister this is a chance that should probably be given in this dispute. With 52 years of peace in this industry, the parties to this dispute are rather like a newly formed union which has never struck before, and which has never had to negotiate under the pressure of a strike. They are not like some of the other unions and companies in our province which are used to the pressures of negotiations which they are suffering financial losses on both sides.

They are rather, in a sense, compared to some of the experienced strikers and struck companies in this province, a little bit naïve, I really think in terms of what is going to happen five years from now and five years after that that the minister should provide them every opportunity to get used to the type of collective bargaining that they should be pursuing and are going to have to pursue in the future.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Good point!

Mr. Bounsall: The minister can grant that. As the bill stands now, having offered this alternative procedure, and having allowed the minister the means by which he needn't fall over the precipice, we must vote against it.

We say to the minister we don't necessarily insist upon the form of our bill. He can tack it onto his bill; he can change the words in his bill. We say to him wait until later on this afternoon, or perhaps even wait until tonight. Take the supper hour to think it over before bringing it back to the committee stage. Think very seriously about the inclusion of that in the bill.

We don't need to remind the minister or his staff in the mediation department of the problems that they have encountered as they have tried to seek peace in this situation. It has been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks that it looked as if the international union was abandoning its Canadian counterpart to fight this out on their own.

Let me make clear what has happened in this international union. In March, 1971, at the international convention held in Miami, the Canadian division of this international union decided that it would acquire for itself complete autonomy, and it did so. At that convention one of the chief items that occurred was the right of the Canadian delegates by themselves, in caucus at that time, to elect by secret ballot amongst themselves four negotiators to undertake the task of negotiating a Canadian standard agreement that fitted the Canadian scene, free from any interference from the US head office. That is what they did, and Canadian negotiators on the union side have been the negotiators in this dispute.

Mr. Foulds: Good point!

Mr. Bounsall: I sympathize with the negotiators from the Ministry of Labour who had to sit through attempts to get proper agreement with these sides, when the company negotiators did not at all have that same power.

Mr. Foulds: Very good point!

Mr. Bounsall: I sympathize with the men that were placed by these companies at the negotiating table too, because they did not have that power—each one of their decisions had to be endorsed and await approval by a labour committee composed of whoever headed the Canadian division of these companies.

These people that would not come to the bargaining table, that could not get involved in the give-and-take, that could not see what progress was being made, could not see at first hand what could be given and what could not; they had to give the decision without having any of the flavour. But even this labour committee, composed of the heads of the Canadian companies, had to defer to orders from the US head offices. So this is a dispute taking place in Canada in which—

Mr. Renwick: No wonder you couldn't make a settlement.

Mr. Bounsall: —the negotiations were conducted by Canadian union negotiators and the other side had to wait for instructions from the US head offices.

An hon. member: Shame, shame!

Mr. Foulds: Why so quiet, Frank?

Mr. Bounsall: In one particular case, and I'll give an example—

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Where do the dues go?

Mr. Foulds: Where do the profits go?

Mr. Bounsall: —which again you are aware of.

Mr. Drea: Just tell me, where do the cheques come from? Where do the dues go?

Mr. Renwick: Where are the decisions made? That's what counts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bounsall: The member from Scarborough is unruly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Who holds the membership cards for the men in the first place?

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, rule the previous speaker out of order, will you please?

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker, I am not telling anything which is not clear to the Minister of Labour or to his mediators in this dispute. In one particular case—

Mr. Drea: Second my bill!

Mr. Bounsall: —it took two days to obtain from the US approval to insert the word "intent" into the text of an article. What kind of progress can be made under those conditions?

And I might say that if our Labour Relations Act was seriously supposed to work in terms of bargaining in good faith, and cause people to bargain in good faith, you would have insisted upon the companies bargaining in good faith in this provision. I know you can say: "But the Act doesn't really provide that we, as the Department of Labour, can step in and say to one side you bargain in good faith." What I am saying to you is that you had better revise your Act, you had better even revise your attitude, and let it be known that if they don't do that you will revise the Act overnight so that you can, in fact, say to these companies: "Get down to bargaining in good faith, and quit this three-way up and down transferral of proposals that are coming forth from the table, and the three-way transfer down of a possible decision."

Mr. Drea: He wants to bring in—

Mr. Bounsall: If this Act was worth its salt, and if you were really concerned and really interested in proceeding with the bargaining in good faith legislation which is there, you would have insisted upon it.

Many times throughout these negotiations the company negotiators demanded that we accept the US agreement or major parts thereof as the Canadian agreement, and the negotiators refused to consider a Canadian proposal. In fact, one of the representatives of these United States-owned multi-national corporations at one point said—and this must make the Premier of our province feel pretty good—"What's good enough for the US is good enough for Canada. Who the hell does Davis therefore think he is?"

An hon. member: Shame on that!

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Who would say that?

Mr. Bounsall: In front of—

Mr. Cassidy: One of the people who contributes to your party.

Mr. Bounsall: —civil servants from the Ministry of Labour. That is the attitude—

Mr. Cassidy: The Premier is losing his natural base of support.

Mr. Bounsall: —of at least one of the representatives of these companies. It is very clear—

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Who the hell is Bill Davis?

Mr. Bounsall: —how he feels about Canada, the Province of Ontario or the Premier of this province.

An hon. member: Shame on him!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, but does he know how we are settling it?

Mr. Germa: How much did he pay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We don't like it any more than the member does.

Mr. Germa: How much did he pay?

Mr. Deans: Oh, I think that's all publicity.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think so.

Mr. Bounsall: I'd just remind the members of the House that the union, in fact, was willing on March 3 to go to voluntary binding arbitration.

Mr. Singer: How can you have voluntary, binding arbitration?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bounsall: Here again it's very evident the members of the Liberal side don't know very much about the definition of arbitration.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: That is being readily revealed.

Mr. Bounsall: For their edification binding, voluntary arbitration means that both sides go voluntarily to arbitration—

Mr. Singer: To arbitration which is binding.

Mr. Bounsall: —in which they agree that the decision will be binding, in which it is understood that all matters in dispute, which is the common—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): That's one of them NDPers and his forked tongue.

Mr. Foulds: Why doesn't the member just mind his jaw?

Mr. Bounsall: —which is common practice with all matters in dispute, go to arbitration.

It was interesting that the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): The member is going off the track now.

Mr. Bounsall —has bought the companies' interpretation of what wasn't going to go to arbitration. They said that they will put all matters in arbitration but the work jurisdiction. In other words, they weren't willing to go to voluntary arbitration of all matters in the dispute.

Mr. Drea: Tell us about that.

Mr. Bounsall: In terms of the work jurisdiction, the Leader of the Opposition has made it sound as if the companies already had something that they were about to give up. Let's get right into that and clear this thing right up now.

Mr. Drea: Tell us about the—

Mr. Bounsall: In terms of the work jurisdiction, we have in this union the hiring hall practice which is very widespread in the entire construction industry. The majority of the construction industry has this practice. It is a practice that dates back to the guild halls of Europe and to the 13th century—

Mr. Drea: And modified by Jimmy Hoffa and Hal Banks.

Mr. Bounsall: —in which the labour on a particular construction job, in a particular division, is supplied through the guild. In North America, it is now supplied through the union. This is something which is here now.

When the companies say they are going to give up some managerial rights by putting that in the dispute, it's a right that they do not have and which the majority of the construction industry does not have. They're bucking a practice which dates back to the 13th century guilds in one small sector. It's a right that they do not have and therefore are trying to establish. The major thing in this issue is not the unions trying to get something new and novel for themselves, but to retain what already exists and is commonly accepted practice in the Province of Ontario, in North America and in Europe with respect to work jurisdiction.

This does not apply, for members who don't understand this or haven't taken the trouble to find out, with respect to layoffs. What the union did ask for, and I don't think any member in this House would find it unreasonable, and what they have said with respect to layoffs, which are a company prerogative, is that they don't think it's unreasonable that they have a small amount of seniority here. Anybody who has worked for 20 years as an elevator constructor or who is over 50 years of age should be among the ones laid off last from a particular job. I don't think any member in this House would find that an unreasonable proposal. They have also proposed at the same time a sequential system of layoffs, where in time of layoffs a probationary person would be laid off first, a trainee, who was not yet fully experienced in the way in which both sides had agreed he should, would be the next one to get laid off, and the permanent employees would be last, with those with 20 years experience or those of 50 years of age laid off as the very last group. I don't think the government would find that very unreasonable.

We have people in this House, 50 years of age or over, claiming that this is unreasonable. Well, if they had worked for 20 years or more in the industry, they might not think it too unreasonable.

Mr. Germa: They are all land speculators. They don't understand.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bounsall: So we have the companies saying they will not agree voluntarily to put all matters in dispute to arbitration. At that point the union said, as I have indicated, that if the government therefore had to go to legislation, the moment that legislation was introduced the men would return to work. They have honoured that commitment which they made in private to the minister and in public.

Those persons in this House on the government side who supposedly were in close contact with both sides, who expressed the belief that there was going to be a delay in the return to work by the workers, which is the important point in this dispute in one sense, did not know or did not believe or forgot that that was the commitment they made. You can see across Toronto today the work being done on the elevators in the north Yonge subway, and virtually across this entire city and in other cities in Ontario you can see that word and that commitment being kept.

What we said yesterday was, "Let's give us one day for us to look further at each other's legislation," knowing full well there would be no delay in the return to work. The only delay would be if the companies decided they wouldn't acept the workers, and then we wouldn't have had a strike any more, we would have had a lockout.

I received a letter at one point early this month from the International Union of Elevator Constructors, in which it said that if at any time prior to the strike date there had been any indication of the company bargaining in good faith, no strike would have been called. They would have continued to negotiate as the settlement neared, as bargaining in good faith continued. If at any time after the strike commenced there had been similar indications, the union would have given serious consideration to ordering a resumption of work by its members.

We are particularly dismayed by the failure of this government to use the provisions of the Ontario Labour Relations Act, those dealing with bargaining in good faith, and the failure to impose penalties in that legislation to force the companies particularly to bargain in good faith.

There is one other aspect of this particular situation, in its international applications, which is interesting. Canada represents only a very small proportion of the construction of elevators by these multi-national companies. I have thought throughout this that they would have let this strike go on forever without any regard for public consideration or public safety in order to win a contract which they could then impose on the 90 per cent of their business which sits south of the border. Ten per cent of its business and its income disappearing for an interim period, I might also point out, is no great inconvenience to these companies.

They looked upon this Canadian sector as a real opportunity to let a strike drag on forever and get whatever kind of lousy contract they would like to see, using Canadians as the guinea pigs. I might further explain that as well as accounting for only 10 per cent or less of their total business, it is only a delay in their business. They don't suffer the same economically as in other strikes where loss of production results in loss of sales. Every elevator that was delayed in construction in Canada is still to be constructed once the strike is settled. There is no one else coming in and constructing elevators while this strike is proceeding. They will get the income from each and every job that they have on their books. It is only a delay of the profits that is occurring. Therefore, they could delay indefinitely and gave every indication that they would so do.

In each of their contracts—although not having been struck for 52 years—they had strike release clauses. So in fact there would be no penalty for them as companies. They did not care how many other companies, some of them Canadian, took financial losses that they might not be able to withstand. They couldn't care; they were "all right Jack" as far as their economic situation was concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest as well that the government has become involved belatedly. I point out that when Mr. Moser, the chief elevator inspector in Ontario said a couple of weeks ago that we had reached a position that could endanger the public safety, you could have had us back here then to settle that strike.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Would the member's position have been different then?

Mr. Deans: How can the Premier tell?

Mr. Bounsall: We were willing then to put the position that we are putting now. The Premier wasn't willing to have us come and put it then, was he?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member wants it both ways and he can't have it both ways on this issue.

Mr. Bounsall: The Premier is still trying to say there was a delay. He is still trying to

say there was a delay in getting the workers back to work by our action yesterday. Well that did not occur. The workers went back to work the day the government introduced legislation. And that could have been done two weeks ago, a month ago; or two weeks ago when Mr. Moser indicated public safety was involved. The only reason the Premier didn't was that he feared an impact on a couple of by-elections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh nonsense!

Mr. Bounsall: There was utter disregard for the safety and convenience of the public for personal reasons. That is why we are meeting now rather than two weeks ago when technical experts told the Premier and the Province of Ontario, and Canada, there was a safety problem involved.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's utter nonsense.

Mr. Bounsall: Now that he has become involved, the Premier has one other responsibility. He has a responsibility to set the priorities as to which projects are now going to be undertaken and in which locations elevators are going to be constructed. The big loss that is occurring in terms of revenue will be passed directly on to the tenants. There are apartment buildings which cannot be occupied, and some of them are for senior citizens who are in desperate need of that accommodation.

We in this Legislature have the onus to say in what order projects are to be now undertaken.

The Four Seasons-Sheraton and some of the commercial buildings, which are occupied by workers maybe eight hours of the day, can take second place to construction of elevators in apartments and for senior citizens' accommodation where people live 16 hours of the day or 24 hours of the day.

And the Premier had better see that this bill contains some provision for the priorities this government in Ontario would like to see in terms of which facilities get their elevators constructed first. And if it doesn't, the Premier is saying he really doesn't care which facilities go into operation first. He's saying let the Four Seasons-Sheraton have its elevator but let the senior citizens' homes in this city and in Kirkland Lake and in Windsor not open for a while; let them open after they've got the Four Seasons-Sheraton's escalators working!

I say to the minister that there are things which we left out of our bill which are left out of his. In this situation, bearing in mind that it is his own legislation in another sector which creates the problems, near the end of this bill he should provide a phrase allowing for voluntary overtime to occur. In this situation, we run the risk of some employees being worked 16 or 18 hours a day—and they cannot get out of that under the Employment Standards Act—and others not being taken back, should the company decide to be intransigent.

The Employment Standards Act has a nice little phrase in it which says: "All the provisions relating to eight hours and 48 hours," and so on—all those provisions can be disregarded if the bargaining agent and the company agree otherwise. When one asks what's the interpretation of that, it means that unless the bargaining agent puts into his collective agreement that overtime will be voluntary the company can force any worker to work any amount of overtime.

Therefore, because that's the minister's interpretation—which I think is faulty—of legislation which he has written in another sector, it's incumbent upon him to add to this bill a phrase that, for at least the length of this arbitration decision, whichever way that arbitration decision is to be, there be voluntary overtime to ensure that many men—perhaps all of them—are working a bit of overtime according to whether or not they can and want to work that overtime. We must not force them to work all kinds of overtime while some other people in this province are not being trained or are not being given an opportunity to construct elevators and work in their field of chosen specialty.

Mr. Drea: They have to get permission from the union to work.

Mr. Bounsall: I would ask the minister to give that very serious consideration before we get to the committee stage. Before we get to the committee stage, I would hope that he will consider very carefully the major provision that we have made and pull himself back from this precipice over which he is about to fall.

I may also say—perhaps the minister's officials for some reason were not aware of it—there is at least one other thing apart from the preamble which can bear some adjustment. That is the section which says: "The employers shall not, except with the consent of the unions, alter the rates of wages," or terms or conditions and so on, dating back to April 30. Perhaps the minister or his officials are not aware that the one-year agreement for automatic adjustment of wages, re-

lated to the average in certain other areas of the construction industry, occurred last July 1 before this strike occurred. If this section is not cleared up the minister is forcing the workers back at an hourly rate which is roughly 50 cents less than what they went on strike for, at the time they went on strike. He had better get that cleared up or make it very clear just exactly what rate he is referring to; is it prior to—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They went back voluntarily today.

Mr. Bounsall: —July 1 or after July 1, 1972?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We are quite aware of it.

Mr. Bounsall: I think, lest I be in danger of being out of order in talking in detail on some of the other things that we would like the minister to consider, we will simply conclude at this point. But I point out that I don't know how—with the preamble we have here, which blames the unions in essence; perhaps not in terms of pure English, but the way anybody reading this would take it—the minister could have the gall to say that strikes by the unions against the employers threaten the public safety and welfare in this province, particularly now when the workers are back to work.

Mr. Renwick: It is the only conclusion one can draw from the preamble.

Mr. Bounsall: And the minister had better change that one too.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): They can't get over that bias they have.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any speakers on the government side before we start alternating?

Mr. Reid: How about the Premier? He has been running things.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would just like to deal very briefly with some of the remarks that have been made regarding this matter.

I think one of the points that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition was the fact that we should have been back earlier to settle this strike, that the Legislature should have been called into session and this type of legislation that we are dealing with now considered by the Legislature.

I don't think it is correct or even reasonable to say that this strike has been postponed as a result of the House not opening earlier.

Mr. Deans: The strike has not been postponed, the strike went on.

Mr. Foulds: It has been extended.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The strike continued yes, and was extended, and it was really only last week that the negotiations finally and completely broke down. It was at that time that the Premier—

Mr. Cassidy: They never got going because of the intransigence of the company.

Mr. Renwick: But if there was a clear and present danger to the public safety, why didn't the government act?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —gave the parties a deadline and they were told that a bill would be introduced on Wednesday and that bill was introduced on Wednesday.

Mr. Deans: He is trying to provoke us.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Now when the hon. members opposite say there were really no negotiations, the information is that there were 45 days of meetings between the parties.

Mr. Bounsall: It didn't produce a thing.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Since September the conciliation officer and the officials of the Ministry of Labour have been involved in trying to settle this strike.

Mr. Haggerty: How many days?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Now how much longer does the public have to wait? I would suggest—although I agree the negotiations were on again, off again—that certainly after 45 days every means is exhausted by the parties to try to resolve their differences. It was as a result of that, and as a result of the personal intervention of the minister and the Premier, that it was necessary to introduce this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should get into a great debate or discussion regarding the merits of the dispute. The member for Windsor West did get into certain aspects of the dispute. He also mentioned the question of bargaining in good faith and that the government in some way should have used the provisions of the Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Deans: They are not adequate.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, I would think that the hon. member certainly knows that under

the provisions of the Labour Relations Act the union can make application to the board to require management to bargain in good faith. I am not aware that that was done.

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the minister know how many successful applications there have been under that scheme

Mr. Deans: Don't play games.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: And I would suggest there is no real evidence that there hasn't been bargaining in good faith—

Mr. Deans: Oh come on, don't be ridiculous!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —if they have met for 45 days.

Mr. Bounsall: There was no seriousness at all.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am suggesting that application could have been made by the union if they seriously felt that management wasn't at least talking to them during this period of time.

Mr. Cassidy: And the history is that they are doomed to fail.

Mr. Deans: With what chance of success, pray tell?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Another point that was raised by the hon. member for Windsor West was the reference to the legislation that his party introduced yesterday. Basically, if I understood the member correctly, his party's legislation would immediately require the union workers to return to work, that there would be a stop to the strike and then there would be voluntary arbitration. There would be a 10-day cooling-off period, during which time the parties would again negotiate to see if they could resolve any outstanding differences that still existed. I think basically that is what he said; maybe I've misunderstood the hon. member.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, he has.

Mr. Foulds: He failed to grasp the subtleties, all right.

Mr. Cassidy: His fine legal mind is at work again.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The point is, does the hon. member really think that when the parties know that down the road, at the end of a certain period of time, there will be compulsory arbitration, that by his bill there would be co-operation, meaningful negotiation and voluntary arbitration during that period?

Mr. Deans: That's our whole argument!

Mr. Bounsall: The minister didn't listen!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We don't think there will be.

Mr. Foulds: Oh, so the minister doesn't believe in the collective bargaining process?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I certainly do; it has broken down in this case.

Mr. Cassidy: Why not let it prove itself? Give it a chance! The problem was to get the men back to work—and not impose compulsory arbitration.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Every effort was made to have voluntary arbitration.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Certainly the hon. members know that a proposal was made by the Ministry of Labour that there be voluntary arbitration. That didn't work.

Mr. Deans: That is a different kind.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The parties wouldn't agree to that because of certain items that had to be included and not included in that particular arbitration. Now the only answer is to bring in a bill where all the issues in dispute at this point will be considered—unless of course there is some agreement in writing that can be handed by the parties to the board that those items would be settled.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there has been every opportunity for collective bargaining here, every opportunity to promote harmonious relations between the parties in this dispute, and every opportunity to negotiate.

Mr. Bounsall: The minister is giving up now, is he?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There certainly has been every assistance from the government, their negotiating team and the conciliator. Now it is time for this legislation. I think any other legislation that will postpone compulsory arbitration will only postpone the obvious, which is the proper settlement of this dispute.

Mr. Cassidy: That is a bankrupt speech.

An hon. member: Why doesn't he speak up?

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't know whether it is exemplary that the Provincial Secretary for Justice should speak on behalf of the government first, because when we as Liberals look at this will we really have to stretch our own personal and collective inclinations to find justice in it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member doesn't agree with his own leader.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are supporting the bill in principle—

Mr. Deans: Here is the other side.

Mr. Bullbrook: —but the fact of the matter is that our general predisposition is not at any time to interfere with the collective bargaining process. I represent a highly unionized riding. I wouldn't sit in this legislative assembly if it weren't for some active support on the part of at least the rank and file of a large international union. I don't say for a moment that I get the support, direct or otherwise, of the heads of that union; they take it upon themselves at each election to support the candidate of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What a waste of time that must be for them!

Mr. Bullbrook: That in itself, as you read the results, shows that the leadership of that particular union doesn't speak on behalf of the rank and file of that union.

Mr. Gisborn: They haven't read the history of the Liberal Party. They haven't seen the ghosts down in Ottawa.

Mr. Bullbrook: What I want to point out more than anything is this: In premising these remarks, on the understanding of the people of Ontario as to what is almost our affection for the Minister of Labour, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, under our system of responsible government, one wonders if the minister shouldn't resign his portfolio.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member's cup runneth over.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): That is the worst mistake the hon. member has made in his entire political career.

Mr. Bullbrook: I say that, Mr. Speaker, because this is the first time that any Minister of Labour has been called upon to bring legislation of this nature before the House.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What would the hon. member do?

Mr. Deans: He's going to support it!

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't necessarily for one moment say that it is the fault of those people who assist him.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He's worse than they were!

Mr. Yakabuski: He has gone away down into the depths.

Mr. Bullbrook: I think frankly that the minister is well served by Mr. Dickie and the other people who assist in conciliation services. Surely the history of success of his department in this province is a foundation for that assertion.

But the minister finds himself in the difficult position—a position that I, my leader and my colleagues find ourselves in—of saying that he believes in the propriety of the collective bargaining system.

Mr. Renwick: Well, the solution to that problem is not to ask the minister to resign.

Mr. Bullbrook: We say that we don't want any interference in that system; and we say, however, in these circumstances—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member should make up his mind.

Mr. Bullbrook: —the public good dictates. As my leader has said, the public good dictates that there must be compulsory arbitration.

I want for a moment to show the House the shallowness of the New Democratic Party in that bill that it put forward. My colleague, the hon. member for Windsor West would have us believe, as I understood him, that the presentation for first reading of that private bill was the catalyst that brought the people back to work. I don't say that—

Mr. Bounsall: No, they volunteered to go back.

Mr. Deans: We didn't say that.

Mr. Bullbrook: —not for one moment. How can members accept that? But as they analyse that bill that is brought before them, they find this section in it, section 8—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I think the hon. member should stick to the bill before the House, not the other bill.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am going to say this—

Mr. Speaker: We are not debating the other bill. We can only debate the bill that is before us.

Mr. Renwick: Particularly when his reference was totally inaccurate.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, I must say, I wonder whether there is justice for all in this House. The member for Windsor West spent half an hour talking about his bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Nothing else!

Mr. Bullbrook: Nothing else! Now I can't make one reference to it.

Mr. Foulds: The principle of it was fundamentally different from the government's principle.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I try to draw some connection then. We are talking about the general principle—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are talking about the general principles of the implications of compulsory arbitration on the collective bargaining process. The other bill put before us for our consideration had compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Drea: The member's leader said before that they were putting in amendments too.

Mr. Bullbrook: The only difference, in effect, was that it wasn't binding arbitration. I wanted to read from that section and, if I may Mr. Speaker, relate that bill to the government bill, and show why we in this party support the government bill and cannot adopt the position of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker: I really don't think it is necessary to refer to the other bill to debate this bill properly.

An hon. member: Any genius can make the argument—

Mr. Bullbrook: May I put this to the minister and to the members of the House, through you Mr. Speaker? The essential difference between the bill put forward by the New Democratic Party and the bill that we are asked to support today is that the former had no binding arbitration.

Mr. Bounsall: Right!

Mr. Bullbrook: They said in effect that the benefit of this bill would be—and these are the very words of the member for Windsor West—the parties would be foolish not to accept the arbitration. Think of that for a moment. Think of the logic of that for a moment, if you will. Where the arbitration is not binding, the parties would be foolish not to accept it; but where the arbitration is binding, what are the parties going to do?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: There's no alternative.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's called an offer you can't refuse.

Mr. Bullbrook: They say in effect that after seven months of bargaining, or be it seven years of bargaining, if you bring together three objective people and they give a decision that is not binding, the parties would be foolish not to accept that decision.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, right, they are going to sit down and put their arms around each other.

Mr. Renwick: They will have to do that across the border.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Don't open up that can of worms.

Mr. Bullbrook: I doubt very much that I've heard such an insipid argument since I first—

Mr. Bounsall: What would the member do?

Mr. Bullbrook: —came into this House. That argument, members have to turn down out of hand; that, they just can't accept at all.

What they have also done in their bill, if I may say, is they have done nothing about the important aspects of compulsory arbitration; nothing is said about the powers of the board itself, and I am going to talk about that.

I am going to talk about the collateral principles in the government bill—that's very deficient—and it is unfortunate that a party that is unilaterally tied to trade unionism couldn't think about its trade union friends in that respect and try to protect them as far as this government bill is concerned, as we in the Liberal Party will protect the rank and file of the trade union movement. Before I get to that, however—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Before I get to that, however, may I for a moment record in the Hansard of this House the comment made by the

Premier in his dialogue with the socialists a few moments ago. The member for Windsor West, with great justification, was talking about the comments of Mr. Moser some 10 days or two weeks ago, and commenting about the ludicrous response made by the Minister of Labour to that party yesterday when he said that "you will be responsible for anything that happens in the next 24 hours." What a cheap, stupid statement to make when two weeks ago one of his own officials told that very government that the people and public of Ontario were in danger—public danger.

Do members know what the Premier of Ontario said to the New Democratic Party? He said: "Would your position have been any different if we had convened this House two weeks ago?" Talk about responsibility from Her Majesty's Premier, right?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That's a good question; that's a good question. What's the matter with that?

Mr. Bullbrook: A good question! What he should have been saying to himself two weeks ago is: "We convene this House immediately and we bring in compulsory arbitration legislation imediately because the government recognizes its responsibility to the safety of the public of this province." And I don't care what his motivation was in calling the House into session now.

Mr. Renwick: There was no danger to the safety of the public.

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't know whether he was motivated by the by-elections; it didn't do him any good in any event. But the fact of the matter is if he truly felt that he had a responsibility, then we should have been debating this two weeks ago and never mind the last 24 hours and trying to put that responsibility on the New Democratic Party. Think of the government's responsibility had there been people hurt in the last two weeks when they knew themselves they had control of it. The New Democratic Party doesn't have control of government business; those people over there do, and it's their sole responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They have control of the unions.

Mr. Bullbrook: Now, the fact of the matter is we are going to support this bill in principle, but—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Oh no!

Mr. Bullbrook: —there are certain other principles.

Mr. Drea: How can they? If they vote for the bill—

Mr. Bullbrook: We support this bill in principle because of the fact that we believe the public good demands—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Bullbrook: —that there be compulsory arbitration. We individually and collectively find it reprehensible so to do, but we must make a value judgement, and we make that judgement in favour of our public responsibility, that's what we do.

Mr. Renwick: Oh! Come, come.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: But it is a little too late.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Vote against it.

Mr. Bullbrook: One other thing, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Provincial Secretary for Justice gets up and mouths—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: —mouths the response to the New Democratic Party that, "We have an obligation to pass this bill."

I want to say to him, through you, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell him an obligation he has. He has an obligation, through himself and his Premier, and it is one place where the Minister of Labour obviously falls short. The next time they bring in a Throne Speech, I pray of them to say something about labour relations in this province.

For the last two Throne Speeches it has been the poor relation of government responsibility, Mr. Speaker. They do nothing about it. We have demanded of them—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are in good shape.

Mr. Speaker: Back to the bill, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: —we asked them—

Mr. Speaker: Back to the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister says they are perfect.

Mr. Speaker: Back to the bill.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Ninety-eight per cent settled.

Mr. Bullbrook: The principle of this bill is the imposition and compulsory arbitration. Compulsory arbitration and its effects should be looked into. New formulae should be looked into—

Mr. Renwick: New formulae?

Mr. Bullbrook: —in connection with compulsory arbitration. Secondary picketing has to be looked into. The question of strike and lockout has to be looked into. Hiring hall tactics—

Mr. Drea: Ah!

Mr. Bullbrook: —have to be looked into.

There should be the establishment of a select committee. Those people over there want to appoint select committees for snowmobiles. I tell them the public of Ontario demand—and we must meet that responsibility—that we have to lead in the field of labour relations.

We can't have ad hoc solutions to garbage strikes and ad hoc solutions to elevator strikes. We have a larger responsibility than that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think the member is a candidate for the leadership!

Mr. Bullbrook: And why don't they do something about it? Why don't they tell the public through their Throne Speech that they are concerned about labour relations?

Mr. Drea: There is arbitration about everything.

Mr. Bullbrook: Now, as far as the ancillary principles of the bill are concerned, may I say this. May I say that we are not a party which will give to this board of arbitration the broad powers that the government wants to give in this bill. We put forward amendments to restrict those powers.

If it's anathema to us that the government imposes upon both management and members of the union a collective agreement that they didn't derive from their own negotiation, it's more anathema to us that nowhere in the statute does it restrict the term of the contract. It might seem an exaggeration, but under the term of this legislation, this board of arbitration could come down with a collective agreement that binds the parties for 20 years. We'll not be a party to that and we're going to bring in amendments to ensure that there is a restriction on the term of the contract itself.

We're going to bring in amendments that have effect also in connection with the question of retroactivity. There is a principle in this bill that says in effect that it's up to the board of arbitration to decide how retroactive the benefits will be. We say that's not good enough. It must go back to the termination of the prior contract. There's a responsibility for us to protect the average worker; and we're going to bring in amendments to that effect.

An hon. member: Sit down!

Mr. Bullbrook: We support the bill, therefore, with reticence. We are going to improve the bill to help the government and the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's quite obvious to you, I'm sure, that we're going to oppose the bill. And we're going to oppose the bill because, in fact, we don't think the bill is necessary in this province at this time. We happen to believe that it's a primary responsibility of government to ensure the safety of the public. We believe that with the alternative legislation that we propose, the safety of the public was, in fact, ensured, and that it is not a responsibility of government to arbitrarily impose a decision to resolve any dispute. These are two distinctly different things and we see them in that way.

We see first of all that if there is any matter regarding the safety of the public of the Province of Ontario at stake at this time, then the return to work of the elevator constructors is necessary. And that is the responsibility of government.

But let's take a look at it. Much has been said in this Legislature by the Leader of the Opposition, by his friend from Sarnia and in fact by other speakers about the safety of the public. They have quoted the chief elevator inspector of the Province of Ontario and have pointed out that he said that the safety of the public was at stake. And yet upon looking at the press statements attributable to ministers of the Crown, we find that on March 8 the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, who is responsible for elevator safety, said: "The number of elevator accidents had actually decreased in the nine-month period ending Jan. 31."

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Well, a lot of them were out of service.

Mr. Ruston: They weren't running, that's why.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Deans: But the fact that an elevator isn't running—

Mr. Ruston: They were walking up.

Mr. Deans: The fact that an elevator isn't running is not in any way involved in the safety of the people of the Province of Ontario, in regard to accidents.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Now another question: How many elevators in the Province of Ontario had to be closed down as a result their not being fit for use? We have never had a statement in this regard by this ministry. But I'm going to say to you, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Drea: Never asked for it, either.

Mr. Deans: —that I believe that there is not likely to be, in proportion to the increased numbers of elevators in use in the Province of Ontario, a proportionate increase of elevators not in use as a result of inspection and deficiencies found during that inspection. The fact of the matter is that the matter of public safety is a red herring in this dispute.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Does the member really mean that?

Mr. Deans: But recognizing that it may have some validity, then the attention of the government should have been paid to that aspect of the dispute and no other. And that could have been resolved by the bill which we proposed to the Legislature yesterday.

We proposed that the workers should return to work; and this government could have proposed that the workers should have returned to work—and the workers would have returned to work. In fact, the workers indicated throughout the entire piece, right from the beginning of bargaining, right through the beginning of the strike and throughout the duration of the strike, that they were prepared to return to work if they were informed adequately that there was in fact a safety hazard—that the public of the Province of Ontario was, out of necessity, using elevators which were a safety hazard.

They did say that they were prepared to service elevators in public institutions were there were problems developing. The companies refused, not the workers.

This is the first and hopefully the last day in the Province of Ontario when we will ever have to discuss legislation of this kind. Hopefully it is the last day when we will ever have to talk about the imposition by government of a collective agreement in a private dispute between two parties.

Mr. Drea: Does the member think arbitration should be compulsory?

Mr. Deans: We happen to think that arbitration per se in labour disputes is wrong. We believe that it is not necessary to impose compulsory, binding arbitration on the work force of this province. We worry about this government's attitudes over the last year and a half toward the collective bargaining process. We worry about the changes of attitude evidenced by this government's actions in dealing with its own employees in the Crown Employees Bargaining Act. We worry about the attitudes of this government as reflected in the Reville report which I suspect is likely to receive an airing in this House and will likely lead to some form of legislation by this government during this Parliament. Frankly, we don't trust this government to impose arbitration in disputes because we recognize that this government doesn't understand the collective bargaining process. This government doesn't believe in the collective bargaining process. This government is bent on destroying the collective bargaining process and this is the first step along the way in the private sector.

There is no question that what we proposed would have achieved the same results by way of public safety, but what we proposed as an alternative to what the government has proposed would have guaranteed that the collective bargaining process would have remained within the hands of the people who understand it best. Secondly, it would have given the government an opportunity to do something which is long overdue in this province.

It would have given the government an opportunity to take a look at section 14 of the Labour Relations Act and to put some teeth into it; to come to grips with what bargaining in good faith really means or what bargaining in good faith really ought to mean in the Province of Ontario. As my colleague from Windsor West so aptly said, bargaining in good faith doesn't mean having

to call back to the United States in order to get permission to change one word in one sentence. Bargaining in good faith means that the parties who are sitting at the table have the sole and proprietary right to reach an agreement and this is not the case in this dispute.

Mr. Drea: Half the union constitutions forbid members to sign without head office approval.

Mr. Deans: This is not the case in this dispute. Bargaining in good faith means that all aspects which are at that particular time being negotiated and all of the conditions which surround those things should be laid open by both parties, in order that there can be access to the records and in order that proper collective bargaining can take place. Furthermore, bargaining in good faith means that there have to be penalties if you don't do it; and, in order to impose those penalties, it must be clearly defined.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that not only are the companies very much the culprits in this particular dispute but this government, by the negligence it has displayed in its attitude toward the bargaining process in this province in repeatedly refusing to deal with the problems that have arisen from time to time as a result of the ambiguity in this section, is equally responsible for the situation which prevails in the province today.

What are the matters which we are talking about? What, in fact, is wrong in the elevator dispute? Let's take a look at it. To begin with, we have a statement by a representative of the Canadian Electrical Manufacturers Association, elevator division—

Interjection by on hon. member.

Mr. Deans: We are talking about whether or not this principle should be passed. The issue in this dispute, they say, is not wages or fringe benefits. It has never been and we agree. The real issue is who shall manage the enterprise, says Mr. Tuff. Who will have control over the hiring of new employees, says Mr. Tuff. The quality of their training and their rate of progression within their trade, says Mr. Tuff; and he is right. He is right to a degree because Mr. Tuff, like the Conservative government of this province, has failed to recognize the growing trend within the work place for the worker to have a say in the things that directly affect 40 per cent. of his waking hours.

Mr. Tuff is of the old school, the school which says that he has something called management's rights which are inviolate, which cannot be broached, which cannot be discussed, which cannot in any sense be changed, and which are not subject to the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Tuff is wrong. When 40 per cent of a man's years are spent in a place of work in which he has to put up with unsafe, unsanitary and unsatisfactory conditions then surely, as I argued with the previous Treasurer, it is his right to speak about those things at the time of negotiation.

When there has been, as there has been in Canada, no regard paid to the changes and the automation that have taken place and to their effects on the employees, then the employees must have a say in determining how they will be treated. When the elevator companies have failed to provide any form of guarantee for the older employees by way of protection against layoffs or for that matter for protection against simply being automated out of existence, then the elevator constructors surely have the right to negotiate those things.

When the company talks about the union's desire to have a hiring hall, the fact of the matter is it is not the union's desire to have it; it already has it. It is the desire of the company to break it. And why? That is the question. The Leader of the Opposition perhaps hit the nail on the head, only he was in the wrong camp. This dispute is an attempt by these American-owned elevator construction companies to impose their wishes on Canada, and we are going to resist it.

This government should have recognized it. It is one of the portions of this bill which I find most obnoxious, and it goes right to the principle of the bill. Written in the explanatory note, it says: "The purpose of this bill is to provide for compulsory arbitration in certain disputes between Canadian elevator manufacturers and the local unions of the International Union of Elevator Constructors." I say to you that it is not; it is between the American-owned elevator manufacturers and the Canadian workers.

I am going to say to the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that if I have to make the choice I'll opt for the Canadian worker every time, and I'll opt for giving him more power. I'll opt for opening more doors for him, and I'll opt for guaranteeing him a greater say in his own future. I'll opt for guaranteeing him a better opportunity to provide for himself and his family.

And that is not accomplished through this particular process of arbitration. We reject arbitration. We reject arbitration as being unnecessary in this instance. We recognize the need for the workers to return to work, which they themselves have recognized.

We offered an alternative. I want to deal very, very briefly with what it would have meant because there are a number of people who don't seem to understand it.

We are not talking about an arbitration process. We are talking about an entirely new process in collective bargaining as yet untried, but which we believe would have provided a new avenue to explore and which we believe would have resulted, were it to have been implemented, in the resolution of this particular dispute and would have, in fact, resulted in the resolution of a great many other disputes yet to come.

What we have suggested is quite simply that recognizing that there may well be some element of public safety, and recognizing that there are old age homes needing elevators, and recognizing that there are senior citizen apartments needing elevators, and recognizing that hospitals require elevators, and that any number of other public institutions require them, the workers should return to work. But we also recognize that, if all of the matters in dispute were placed before a board and that board had the power to consider each and every matter and had the jurisdiction to make a complete and full document available to both parties bearing on all of the matters which were in dispute as a possible collective agreement, we believe that that would have turned out to be acceptable.

Mr. Renwick: No question about it.

Mr. Deans: And that's what we are saying to the House. It's different from conciliation, because you and I both know the conciliation process and that's not what it does. It's different from mediation, because we both know the mediation process and that's not what it does. There is no process in the Province of Ontario—for that matter in any other jurisdiction that I know of—where there is an opportunity for the two parties in the dispute to sit down with a board, to place before them all of the matters and to have that board come forward to them with a complete document which might well be the basis for settlement. As members know, we in fact deal with portions of it in an attempt to try and break down the negotiations to smaller areas and to try and bring about resolution of the problems.

We believe that what we have offered, given that it meets the matter of public safety, would have been more satisfactory, would have dealt with the wishes as expressed by this minister at the time that he indicated that he was going to follow through with the introduction of compulsory legislation in this House. And that would be that the government does not wish, nor does it have any desire, to impose binding arbitration in any dispute. We believe that the government would have lost nothing and gained much by pursuing the avenue that we have proposed to it for perusal. We believe that had it done so, at the end there would have been sufficient basis for an agreement; and we believe that it is not worth the establishing of the precedent which the government is about to establish in this province to disregard what we have offered as an alternative.

We happen to think there are in fact people of good faith who sit down, and if you could just break the management away from its ties, if you could just break the management away from the imposition that is upon it now by its parent company in the United States we would be able to reach an agreement in this province, satisfactory not only to this province but to the entire Dominion of Canada.

We suggest to the government it reconsider what it is doing. We ask it very seriously to reconsider what it is doing.

Just as the policy minister for justice said, when a man knows there is arbitration at the end of the line it impedes the collective bargaining process and he doesn't bargain properly; we suggest to the government that by this measure, in every dispute where there are companies or unions in this province who do not believe in attempting to reach satisfactory agreements they will fall back on this as the precedent and they will sit without collective bargaining taking place and they will ultimately arrive time after time at the doorstep of arbitration imposed by this government, and that's our main fear.

Our main fear is that companies who are not prepared to deal adequately and properly with their employees will find the easy way out and we will be asked time after time to consider the public interest, to consider the public safety. I don't doubt for a moment that the Dare manufacturer who makes the cookies could find some element of public interest or public safety that would require us to take a similar kind of step.

Mr. Reid: Oh don't be ridiculous!

An hon. member: Sure, they are using scabs to put the chocolate chips in.

Mr. Deans: They will find it. There isn't a dispute in the Province of Ontario—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: —where there won't be an attempt made by the company which doesn't want to bargain in good faith to convince this government—and recognizing the inadequacies of this government I'm quite convinced that they would be successful—that it would be in their best interest to impose compulsory arbitration.

We will oppose the government's bill. We will oppose it for those reasons. We believe our alternative is better. We believe it would work. We believe it deserves a chance. If the government honestly means what it says, that it doesn't want compulsory arbitration in the Province of Ontario, it should accept it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Carleton.

Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I'm going to have to be in this House a little longer than I have been before I cease being amazed at the convoluted thinking of some of the people on the New Democratic Party benches.

Mr. Cassidy: Just think of our problem understanding the members on that side.

Mr. Handleman: You know it is coming, you see it is coming, and you don't believe it when it comes.

Mr. Bounsall: Slap them down!

Mr. Handleman: There are many things that can be questioned about this bill—the timing of it, the previous actions of the government and the minister—but not the need for it. And it is the need that is being questioned on the other side. I simply can't accept that.

Mr. Renwick: The member is right about that; there is nothing convoluted about that. That is perfectly direct.

Mr. Deans: The member is very astute at seeing the obvious.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Handleman: Both the hon. member for Windsor West and the hon. member for Wentworth spent great time dealing with the issues in the dispute. I am not concerned about the issues in the dispute.

Mr. Foulds: No, the member never is.

Mr. Handleman: I am not concerned with the workers or management; I am concerned about the innocent victims.

Mr. Bounsall: The member shouldn't bother his head with it; he shouldn't try and find out.

Mr. Handleman: In this province there are thousands of people—

Mr. Renwick: Don't overstate the case.

Mr. Handleman: —who are being subjected to financial, physical and emotional hazards because of this strike.

The record of this government is good in this respect. It has not imposed itself, but there comes a time when the government must protect the public interest; and that's exactly what they are doing.

Mr. Cassidy: And there will be pressure to do it again and again and again.

Mr. Handleman: I know my hon. friends are not very concerned about entrepreneurship in this province, but there are many small entrepreneurs who are being ruined because of this strike—

Mr. Bounsall: The US companies don't give a damn.

Mr. Renwick: That is not public safety!

Mr. Handleman: I am not talking about public safety.

Mr. Renwick: The member is talking about economic disruption.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Handleman: I am talking about hazards—

Mr. Cassidy: Entrepreneurs.

Mr. Bounsall: The entrepreneurs don't care.

Mr. Handleman: Serious hazards to innocent parties!

Look, the workers have gone out voluntarily and management has refused to bargain voluntarily. And they can stew in it as far as I'm concerned. It's the innocent victims of this strike that I'm concerned with, Mr. Speaker, and there are thousands of them.

I haven't heard a word from any member on that side about the innocent victims. They talked about some kind of safety factor. Well there may very well be, but I'm concerned about the people who are suffering because they are being laid off work, because they can't move into their apartments. I am not worried about the companies.

Mr. Cassidy: Never worried about the companies, no!

Mr. Foulds: No, and the member is not worried about the workers.

Mr. Handleman: No, I am not worried about the companies or the workers and I repeat it again. I am not worried about the workers. No, I am not worried about the companies, they can look after themselves.

Mr. Cassidy: The Premier will be proud of him.

Mr. Handleman: Neither side is completely altruistic in this dispute. They're trying to feather their own nests—but at the public cost.

I'm concerned that this strike be settled as quickly as possible and I do not consider this bill to be a precedent. Every bill that comes in here is brand new and if Dare cookies came in they would have to use the same kind of twisted thinking that the NDP uses to show that there was any factor harming the public safety. As far as I'm concerned this bill should be passed, passed today—and let's get on with the job.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has told us both within and without the House that the day he announced compulsory arbitration to settle this matter was a sad day. Yesterday, Wednesday, when he introduced the bill was a sad day in the history of labour relations in this province, and today the debating of the bill and final passage we trust later this evening will also be a sad day in labour relations in the Province of Ontario.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I feel it is also going to be a sad day for the history of the New Democratic Party in this province in the way it has completely abdicated its responsibility to the people of this province in opposing this bill.

Mr. Ruston: They're going down the drain anyway.

Mr. Reid: However, Mr. Speaker, it's probably just another turn in the long road of defeats and problems that party is suffering, but it is sad that without their leader here to direct them that they should have fallen into such a quandary.

I congratulate those members, and I'm sure that when we get to their eighth convoluter, the member for Riverdale, he will do a much better job of trying to justify the position they have put themselves in.

I would say to the member for Windsor West and the member for Wentworth that they can take lessons from the master sitting there in the front benches of the NDP, and no doubt we will hear from him later on in the debate.

Mr. Deans: If there are lessons available I suggest the hon. member enrol.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, anyone who is knowledgeable of the history of labour relations in the Province of Ontario—

Mr. Deans: The hon. member isn't!

Mr. Reid: —will recall that even as recently as the 1930s, the 1940s and even into the 1950s, various labour organizations were struggling for recognition so that they could take part in the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Drea: That was when the hon. member's party used to send the tanks in to show the workers where they belonged.

Mr. Singer: The minister needs help; the member for Scarborough Centre should go down and advise him.

Mr. Reid: To arrive at the stage, sir, where we are now, where hopefully we have two sides in the dispute—

Mr. Drea: And his army!

Mr. Singer: Yes, the minister needs him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Rainy River has the floor.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Drea: Let's not have him rewrite history, Mr. Speaker. It's too dry.

Mr. Ruston: Speaking of dry!

Mr. Drea: Tell us all about Liberal recognition of unions.

Mr. Reid: It has taken a long time, Mr. Speaker, to arrive at the point where management on one side and labour on the other could sit down, equally balanced as opponents, to present their demands and come to some reasonable compromise. The essence of the whole system is that both are free to select those things on which they want to come to an agreement.

That, sir, is the sad thing about compulsory arbitration: The parties involved in the dispute have no choice left to them. The settlement is imposed on them arbitrarily and the whole process that has taken so long to build to the present stage is done away with.

Other speakers in this party, my leader, and the member for Sarnia, have spoken about how we feel with regard to voting in principle for a bill that would impose compulsory arbitration. It is abhorrent to us. We dislike it intensely.

Mr. Renwick: But they are going to vote for it!

Mr. Deans: In typical Liberal fashion: "We don't like it—but!"

Mr. Reid: However, Mr. Speaker, we have a higher duty to the people of this province than our personal feelings in this regard, and we are here to do that duty. As was pointed out by the previous speaker, there is only one issue contained in the principle of this bill: that the Province of Ontario needs this bill to protect the safety and welfare of its people.

Mr. Dean: They don't.

Mr. Reid: If there was any other reason than that, this party and I would not be supporting this bill.

It's unfortunate, as the previous speaker also mentioned—and he was right on when he said this—that we can criticize the government for what they did or what they didn't do. We wouldn't have come to this sad impasse today had the Minister of Labour and the government done what was suggested to them by this party some months ago. The leader of this party suggested that this matter be turned over to the federal Department of Labour because of the complexities of the whole problem.

We're aware of what's happened in British Columbia and we're aware of what's happened in Quebec. It is my understanding—and perhaps we'll hear from the minister again later—that he did go to the cabinet and say, "Look, we had better turn this matter over to the federal jurisdiction."

Mr. Deans: They wouldn't take it.

Mr. Reid: But the cabinet, for some reason unbeknownst to me, declined to accept that offer from the Minister of Labour.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, again to avoid getting into this kind of position of imposing compulsory arbitration, the government had the power to convene this Legislature earlier, even two or three weeks ago, when Mr. Moser made his remarks concerning public safety. The Premier had the power to call us here together to impose a cooling off period of let's say 90 days, in which we could have put the men back to work so that the public safety could be served, and could have told management and told the union that they had 90 days to get together to settle their dispute, at the end of which time we were going to have compulsory arbitration if they hadn't come to their senses by that time.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Reid: This was an alternative that I say to you, Mr. Speaker, was available to the government and which they didn't take up.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there was a prior alternative and that was that we need in this province legislation to handle situations such as this in prolonged strikes. It has already been pointed out previously by my colleague that in the last number of Throne Speeches in this Legislature matters pertaining to labour relations in this province have been abysmally neglected. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Labour—if he remains so, and there is some doubt that he should—will introduce in this session some legislation dealing with technological layoffs, elongated strikes and so on that are against the public interest.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I listened because I couldn't avoid it to the member for Wentworth at great length, and that party—and to some extent, all three parties perhaps—I think are overlooking something of great significance that has happened in labour relations in Ontario. That is that in the late 1960's in particular it came to the public attention, and should have to the legislators', that in a labour dispute there are more than two parties involved. There is not just labour, there is not just management; there is labour, management and the general public.

Mr. Foulds: Does the member think he is revealing inside information?

Mr. Reid: In any discussion, any union and—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is no indication the member for Port Arthur discovered it.

Mr. Reid: —management settlement, the public weal must be taken into regard. Mr. Speaker, in this particular case, not the public's economic welfare is at stake, but public safety is at stake. How the party on the left over there can ignore that prime factor in regard to the principle of this bill is beyond me.

Mr. Speaker, we were going to have a number of amendments to introduce to modify this bill. We don't want to destroy the principle; we want the men back to work and we want the public safety protected, but we are not happy with some of the provisions of the bill. We will be introducing into the bill provisions that will restrict the arbitrary powers that the government bill intends to give to the compulsory arbitration board. We will support the bill regrettably. We hope that the government will bring in legislation in the future so that this kind of situation will not arise again.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Nickel Belt.

Mr. Speaker: Nickel Belt—I'm sorry.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this bill because of the imposition of compulsory arbitration in this dispute. I don't think that it has a place, particularly in this situation.

I think the arguments that have been put forth concerning public safety are no more valid now than they were on March 1 when the unions offered to submit to arbitration. They are no more valid now than they were on March 5 when the chief government inspector indicated there was a threat to public safety. This can only lead us to conclude that it was political expendiency on the part of the Premier to get by his two by-elections so that the introduction of the legislation would coincide with the opening of the legislature, not vice versa.

If there had indeed been public safety involved, how could we conclude otherwise but that the Premier would have called back the House in order to put an end to this threat to public safety.

We must conclude that the long-run interests of labour—if this bill is passed, which I assume it will be—are not being served. The long-run interests of collective bargaining certainly will not be served if this precedent is set. The elevator-construction companies claim that their long-run interests will not be served. The question then remains: Is the long-run interest of the public going to be served by this legislation? I and my party feel that this cannot be so because of what it may do to the collective bargaining process in the Province of Ontario.

This is a precedent that is not necessary because the collective bargaining process has not been exhausted. That is what my colleague from Windsor West is trying to tell the minister. He has not exhausted the collective bargaining process.

Indeed, if compulsory arbitration was brought in now but was not binding, it would accomplish three things. It would bring the men back to work; if, indeed, there is a threat to public safety, it would put an end to that; and it would allow for the completion of the various construction projects across the province. The three things which the minister seems to be so concerned about would be solved if he would take the advice of our colleague from Windsor West. We certainly think that it is worth a try.

A couple of things bother me as well. One is the national aspect, the national ramification. If there was arbitration, but voluntary arbitration and not binding, surely the three parties would be able to keep in mind what the ramifications would be in other provinces, in terms of having the contract accepted by other provinces. If it is imposed upon them by arbitration, there is no guarantee that this will happen at all.

I am concerned also that in section 6(c) the minister has not spelled out that the rate of wages will be that of July 1 with the 50 cent increase as opposed to earlier in the year. I hope the minister will stand up and make that clear to us.

We think, Mr. Speaker, that collective bargaining is a civilized way of solving labour-management problems. We feel that the imposition of compulsory and binding arbitration in this case is indeed going to set a precedent for years to come and that the result will be increasingly bitter confrontations in labour disputes across the province. We cannot support it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill 2. Unlike some of my esteemed colleagues in one particular section across the floor, I am not going to try to rewrite the labour history of Ontario. I find it very difficult to understand how the tanks that went into Oshawa flying the Liberal banner were somehow carrying CARE packages, but we won't go into that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us about the election of 1937.

Mr. Drea: Well, the member would know more about that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Maybe he is right.

Mr. Drea: I always bow to the member when he knows more. We are coming to him in a moment on a couple of little fallacies he has tried to promote here today.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member ought to be losing weight with all that bowing he is doing here today.

Mr. Drea: I am not going to try to rewrite history.

Never before in the history of this province has the collective bargaining system been more abused and more exhausted by the worst pair of antisocial swashbucklers that ever came down the pike. Those are the five American-owned, American-controlled, American-dominated elevator companies; and on the other side the semblance of a branch plant union that exists under the name of the International Union of Elevator Constructors, whatever locals they say they may have in this country.

Mr. Renwick: Shame!

Mr. Drea: Both of them have had one common motto right through this strike and that is 'the public be damned." As of yesterday—or as of this morning and I always give credit for a death-bed repentance—the union did go back to work. But until this morning, the union—and let's put that in quotes; not the men who belong to the union but the "union"—had the mottoes "the public be damned" and "might makes right," and so did the companies.

In the process, ever since last September they have abused, they have mislead, they have done their best to undermine the authority of the inister of Labour of this province. They were only interested in one thing; whatever settlement there was going to be was going to be acceptable in the United States of America. Then the opposition members stand up and say that the Minister of Labour and his staff didn't do their job. Members have seen it on television. They have seen it in the movies. They've heard it on radio and now they see it right here. The two groups are going to use Ontario, an appropriate section of Canada, as a battleground because the economic struggle has too many consequences for the United States.

To his credit, the Minister of Labour in this province didn't bow to that. He didn't kowtow and go down to the United States to the principals and say, "How can we settle this thing in Ontario?" He stood here and he fought here like an honourable man and a minister of the Crown.

I say again, both sides betrayed him—not once, not twice, but right through week by week. Then people stand here and say that he was wrong. If members want hindsight, and I don't want to put words in his mouth—

Mr. Laughren: No, I don't think he wants the member to put words in his mouth either.

Mr. Drea: —he should have knocked their heads together one week after the strike started, because it was futile from the beginning and the members opposite know it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: Does the member like collective bargaining?

Mr. Drea: Imagine my colleague from Nickel Belt standing up and defending an organization and saying it stands for the public good when it has two classes of workers. There are the serfs and there are the elite. There is a permit system in operation, and you know it and I know it. When you go to join that union you can't join. You have to come in as a permit man, as a helper. You get paid, it's true, the same rate as the full union man in cash, but you don't get your pension.

Mr. Laughren: The member served his apprenticeship.

Mr. Drea: I never served. I didn't have to.

Mr. Laughren: He served his apprenticeship in the Tory party before—

Mr. Drea: The union that I belonged to didn't go for two systems of workers.

Mr. Laughren: That $37,000-a-year board he served on was his apprenticeship.

Mr. Drea: The union that I worked for didn't go for two systems.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: You have a union with the elite. For the member: His pension is paid, his dental care is paid, everthing is paid. But the helper, the man who can't get the membership card: His teeth aren't fixed; Oh no! His pension isn't paid.

Mr. Haggerty: Union blackmail.

Mr. Drea: They have got a system and the member is trying to defend it, where the Province of Ontario and all its trade education is bypassed.

How do you get to be a qualified elevator constructor mechanic? You have to go through a joint labour-company examination. Yesterday I asked the company: "Don't you really think that you should have something that conforms with education in Ontario if you need more people? Don't you think that they could come out of the trade school?" They said: "Well no, we fund all of this and we have a very satisfactory relationship with the union." For 50 years the two of these principals have had a most cosy relationship—very cosy. Far be it from me, and I'm not being facetious, to imply in any way, shape or form that there was any kind of a sweetheart deal; let's just leave it at cosy. In the process of that—

Mr. Gisborn: That's what it was.

Mr. Drea: It might be very interesting to take a look at the history of this industry. How many elevator companies were there in the beginning and how many are there now? What has happened to the Canadian elevator companies over this period of time? Yes, they chose Ontario to fight on—

Mr. Bounsall: Canada.

Mr. Drea: —because the cosy relationship just isn't there any more. Having created each other, the two giants are now deciding who is really going to run it when there's only the one side left. That is the essence of the strike.

Mr. Breithaupt: And he goes upstairs to—

Mr. Drea: I said before, and I repeat again, I'm talking about the union leadership. I am not talking about the member. The member is as bewildered as the public and many of the members here.

I think it is a disgrace in a province like this, that when a member has been earning a certain standard of living, his whole economic base is knocked out of him, not for two, three or four or five weeks that he conceivably might be able to budget for, but he is left high and dry for four, five and six months so that the future may be protected of his fellow members south of the line, who are busy installing those high-speed jobs every day of the week. I think it's a disgrace that a Canadian working man is involved in a strike over which he has no real control and that he has to come to members of this Legislature to ask if there is any way he could get a part-time job or something else so that he can hold his house together and everything else.

Mr. Haggerty: Whose fault is it? It is this government's.

Mr. Drea: No, it is not this government. No government has ever bent over further to try to protect the collective bargaining process than this one.

Mr. Laughren: Who was intransigent? Not the union leadership, not the workers.

Mr. Drea: Oh no, don't just say the union leadership. The companies are as intransigent and worse.

Mr. Laughren: They were the only ones who were.

Mr. Drea: Pardon?

Mr. Laughren: They were the ones who were.

Mr. Drea: Both of them!

Now then, during the time of the collective bargaining there was the intriguing proposal from the Leader of the Opposition that we turn it all over to that great marvel in Ottawa, Mr. Munro. And the only reason that Mr. Munro is the federal Liberal Minister of Labour is because Mr. Mackasey did understand the labour movement and the Liberals got rid of him.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: You have a strike that comes to a particular situation because of the economic forces in the industry and it is complicated by technology.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It could have been settled last November.

Mr. Drea: Members opposite had a man in their own government in Ottawa who understood technology and he tried to bring in a bill that would help the worker and they bounced him. So let's not have any more about what the federal Minister of Labour could have done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Breithaupt: What would the government's friends in Ottawa have done?

Mr. Drea: And they say to us, "Why didn't you turn it over to the federal Minister of Labour?" But the same people say one sentence beforehand, Mr. Speaker, "Under no circumstances do we want you to interpret what we are saying today as any criticism of the outstanding ability of Mr. Dickie and Mr. Scott to settle the issue." Do they mean they wanted Mr. Munro to come in as the figurehead and have Mr. Dickie and Mr. Scott do the work?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Unfortunately, our officials were not successful.

Mr. Drea: I see, yes. In fact, has the federal Minister of Labour ever settled anything, let alone a strike? Perhaps the members opposite could help me out on that one.

Mr. Singer: The member for Scarborough Centre needs help.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just take a step to the back.

Mr. Drea: And then we have the member for Sarnia with his delightful, if extremely naive, approach to labour relations. He loves the working man, but doesn't think terribly much of his union leader.

Mr. Bullbrook: He loves some of the working ladies too, I'll tell you.

Mr. Drea: Don't mumble, elucidate.

Mr. Bullbrook: In six years, I haven't been accused of mumbling.

Mr. Drea: Well, the member just did. I wouldn't want him to break his own record but he distinguished himself today with about 17 minutes of prattle. I never could figure out why, if he hated this bill so much, how he could stand there and in good conscience say he is going to vote for it. I would be afraid the lightning would come down.

Mr. Laughren: Good question.

Mr. Drea: In fact, if he does vote for this bill, I am going to get underneath my desk because the leaders up there will come down on him.

Mr. Singer: The member for Scarborough Centre would get a better view.

Mr. Drea: Talk about convoluted thinking: "I hate it but I will vote for it because I am from Sarnia." Wow, wow, wow!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: If the member is going to vote for this, let me know. He really frightens me.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The member for Scarborough Centre should quit while he's ahead.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us about the sweetheart deal, that was good stuff.

Mr. Drea: The member wants to talk about the sweetheart deal?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Drea: Well, the member knows and I know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Is the member on retainer to one of them or—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Let's just turn for a moment—I think I have taken care of everybody over there for the moment—let's get back to this permit system.

I like this one. I too believe in collective bargaining. I am not as fanatical and I don't really believe that the NDP are as fanatical as they may seem to be, because I will tell the members something. If I could arrange to get the Dare strikers compulsory arbitration in the morning, the members know and I know that they would take it. We all know that, so let's not go into this thing that compulsory arbitration or any kind of arbitration to end a strike is necesarily and totally beyond any kind of approval.

Mr. Martel: Why doesn't the member talk about good faith bargaining?

Mr. Drea: I am talking about the situation right now.

Mr. Breithaupt: Two wrongs don't make a right.

Mr. Drea: We also have the intriguing proposition that everything goes; it's a concept of arbitration. I was in the chair when I allowed the member for Windsor West to pursue his thinking. I thought it was pretty germane to this. I think what I am doing is as germane.

You know, it concerns me that here we have a party that is dedicated to organized labour; and it says at the same time, in effect, let the strike go on. The member for Hamilton East really intrigues me. His organization represents people who are laid off because of this strike. His union represents people who might very well be forced to leave the union if some of the demands of the elevator constructors union go into a final agreement. He knows what I am talking about. Look what we had to do in Bill 2.

Mr. Gisborn: I have no idea what he is talking about.

Mr. Drea: The member represents the production workers at Otis Elevator and this union wants to take them over. He knows it and I know. Why did we have to put in in Section 4, subsection (2): "The board of arbitration shall not decide on any matters that come within jurisdiction of the Ontario Labour Relations Board"? Because there is going to be an attempt to scoop the member's workers and the machinists, and he knows it.

Mr. Bounsall: The member realized what that meant, too?

Mr. Drea: Yes, I do.

Mr. Bounsall: We will speak to that when we get to committee.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Straighten this place out!

Mr. Drea: Yes, we certainly will.

Mr. Speaker, to come back to the strike. You know there is another interesting part of this. It has been largely unnoticed but by deliberate design this union hasn't exactly closed down all of the elevator companies. I think it is very nice that the one they left in operation, Beckett, is building the Scarborough Town Centre.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Please try to keep a little closer to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Drea: Yes I am.

Mr. Speaker: The bill as we have it before us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: They don't want to hear about this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: As soon as they are done with their little disturbance I'll be very glad to come back to the point.

Mr. Deans: Don't allow the irrelevancy of it to interfere.

Mr. Foulds: Consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds.

Mr. Drea: That is why the member can utter such proclamations as that. You know, this wasn't a total strike; there was a company left out of it. You see, once again, all of this has been very cleverly designed. We have the old whipsaw thing for one company, Beckett, which actually manufactures elevators and installs them. It is a small company, Canadian, and allowed to operate just on the periphery. That stops the Combines Act from getting into these cosy arrangements.

There are 27 or 28 maintenance companies operating, but somehow you can't get them to work on elevators. There are all kinds of maintenance companies operating—in fact, they say between 28 and 30. Both sides admit this. You can't get them to work on a building. This intrigues me a little bit more. It comes back down to what is the Province of Ontario to do? The chief elevator inspector puts his job and his neck on the line and he tells the truth right across the headlines in the paper.

Mr. Roy: The minister says no.

Mr. Drea: I hope my colleague, the minister who is in charge of that branch, is going to make sure that when this is done with, the civil service does not retaliate against that man because if anybody ever told the truth and stuck his neck out it was he. He said that the situation is a threat to public safety.

Whether you are a fanatic about collective bargaining, whether you are a casual observer, whether you just believe in the principles or whether you hate it all, that is where it ends. Because when the public safety is threatened, no matter how much you dislike the theory of compulsion, you must begin the wheels.

Again, it would have been very simple for the Premier to say, "That is it. It is all over. I am calling the Legislature in and we are going to do it in a day." But once again we went one more time, in the interests of common sense and stability—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He was afraid to call the Legislature in.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: One more time we went to them and we said "For the love of heaven accept your responsibilities to the public." Both of them gave us the back of their hand. The public be damned again!

Mr. Foulds: Who didn't accept it?

Mr. Drea: Both of them.

Mr. Martel: They didn't do it.

Mr. Bounsall: Who was it?

Mr. Drea: Both of them.

Mr. Bounsall: No it was not.

Mr. Drea: Their deathbed repentance came two days ago. The only reason that the union proposed voluntary arbitration is that they knew—

Mr. Bounsall: The member's corporate friends, they were the ones.

Mr. Drea: —the company would not accept it. One's as bad as the other and let's stop splitting the difference. But they came back after that. And again, right down to today, if the union was so interested in the public safety that once we put this bill in, once it was tabled yesterday, it sent its men back, and this indicates that there is a future for collective bargaining; then why, when the Premier announced he was going to go and our Minister of Labour announced many, many days ago—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The night before the election:

Mr. Drea: —that we were going to impose compulsory arbitration, where was that public spirited march back to work? There wasn't any. There wasn't going to be any because they were both determined that might makes right.

Mr. Laughren: Anti-labour speaking today.

Mr. Drea: Now another little fascinating diversion into the NDP.

Mr. Roy: Why didn't the House sit?

Mr. Drea: I hear over and over again compulsory arbitration in the private section is repugnant. Is it not repugnant in the public sector?

Mr. Deans: It's repugnant anywhere.

Mr. Martel: And we voted against it twice.

Mr. Drea: Good, the member had me worried for a minute. I thought he was coming over to our side and we haven't got room for him.

Mr. Roy: The government has two more places over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Good, great, good! The member had me a little nervous, between him and the member for Sarnia.

Mr. Deans: It is too far back.

Mr. Drea: Now then, here we are debating second reading of Bill 2. On the one hand we have a strike conceived, maintained, financed, directed and supervised from—

Mr. Martel: He is going to talk about the bill.

Mr. Drea: —a country that couldn't care less about what happens here.

Mr. Martel: Do branch plants in Ontario bother the member?

Mr. Drea: On the other hand we have a problem, and I believe there is a threat to public safety. I don't think it is a very intense one. I'm glad of that, quite glad that nobody has been injured in this, that it hasn't been proven that there was a very serious and substantial threat. But there is also a tremendous amount of very serious dislocation and inconvenience—older people being forced to walk up long flights in the subway because the escalators cannot be maintained, people unable to use elevators in their apartments, elevators in hotels being put on low speed because they cannot be maintained to a sufficient degree of safety for high speed, construction stopped, and—as a matter of fact I am very surprised this didn't come from members opposite—we have thousands of Ontario Housing units that can't be occupied by the poor and the needy and the deserving because of this strike. Not a word from any of them about that today, not a word. Once again, the public be damned if the union is there.

Mr. Bounsall: The member is saying he is surprised; is he admitting we are more concerned?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: They couldn't care less.

Mr. Drea: They couldn't care.

An hon. member: Where are the priorities in the bill?

Mr. Drea: The member's priorities? When he brought up his priorities he never mentioned Ontario Housing. He talked about homes for the aged or something else. He couldn't care less about the poor and the needy. He is into this because he sees it as a labour-management confrontation that he can make political gain out of, and that's it.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): No wonder their leader stayed away.

Mr. Drea: And again, when we come back to arbitration, I want to talk about a very interesting theory by a noted labour leader in this country. In fact he is one of the leaders of the members' party. About 10 years ago, maybe 11 if memory serves me correct, at the time when labour disputes involving the railways in this country were of some substance and because of another era did really affect the public safety much more so than now, at that time he was asked what a New Democratic Party government would do in the case—

Mr. Martel: He is destroying his argument about public safety.

Mr. Drea: —of a national railway strike when the public safety was threatened. And he said: "I am afraid we would have to exercise one of the prerogatives of government and order the men back to work." His name is William Mahoney. They know who he is.

Mr. Deans: Our bill does exactly that.

Mr. Drea: Now how much more fanaticism about compulsory arbitration can those members opposite take when it is eroded by one of the leaders of their own movement. There has to be a time and a place when public safety takes issue over everything else, and that time is here and now and today. And if they believe that, they are going to have to vote for this bill!

Mr. Martel: Not on March 5.

Mr. Drea: All right, then vote against it.

Mr. Deans: It is not the only alternative.

Mr. Drea: Well this flimsy little thing that if you show up on Tuesday we will talk to you maybe is hardly an answer to anything.

In fact I will tell the member this, his colleague from Hamilton East, who knows something about labour relations in this province, I am going to be fascinated in listening to him defend that; and I hope for the sake of his sanity and mine that he doesn't attempt to do so. I think at that point the member will probably leave too.

Mr. Deans: It is too late for your sanity.

Mr. Bounsall: That is if it is there at all.

Mr. Martel: I was not aware you had any sanity.

Mr. Drea: If there is one thing on which I can agree with the member and his difficulty about getting the telephones, there is one winner in this strike, the Bell Telephone Co. with those toll calls to Philadelphia, because that is where the union headquarters are; and to Pittsburgh and other places. The Bell made a lot of cash, and now that the member is in a position to consult with Kentucky, he can give us a little extra dividend.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is the princess phone.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bounsall: We'll get to the bill yet.

Mr. Yakabuski: I am sure the member's leader will take a different stand.

Mr. Martel: When are we going to talk about the bill?

Mr. Drea: Okay, I'll read members the bill then.

I really think in substance the only thing that is up for argument today is whether the facts which are stated in the preamble, and with all due respect to the member for Riverdale—and I do respect his interpretation of legal documents—I am going to have to seriously dispute one of his interpretations. The only things that are here to debate, really, I say again, are the 'whereas." If those things aren't true, then we shouldn't be here; but I firmly believe that each one of them is true.

It says:

> Whereas the parties have bargained for new collective agreements and to that end have exhausted conciliation services under the Labour Relations Act."

True, no argument!

> Whereas strikes by the unions against the employers have continued since about the 7th day of September, 1972.

This dispute began with a wildcat strike and proceeded on into a legal strike; true. The companies did not lock out.

When they "threaten the public safety and welfare in the province of Ontario", by the member's own admission that is true.

Mr. Foulds: They?

Mr. Bounsall: Who does the member mean by "they"?

Mr. Drea: Both!

Mr. Cassidy: It is by the company refusal to negotiate in good faith that it is there.

Mr. Drea: How can either one of these bargain in good faith, they never had any intention to do so!

Mr. Foulds: Who is the "they"?

Mr. Drea: Both—one, two!

Mr. Foulds: That is not an interpretation of the words; it is a legal document.

Mr. Drea: And "whereas strikes by the unions against the employers"; the union called the strike, the company did not lock out.

Had the companies locked out and that caused the stoppage, then the minister is entitled to put in lockouts by the company. In this case a wildcat strike began it, and it spread on into a legal strike in this province.

Mr. Cassidy: Members opposite never understand that companies provoke strikes, and they do it often.

Mr. Drea: Oh for heaven's sake! And some unions provoke strikes. If the member really wants to get into some of the theories that have been advanced today that arbitration can solve it all, that all you have to do is get the union to agree; why in half of the union constitutions in this province the working man can't accept the agreement unless they okay it in the United States; the member knows it and I know it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: "Whereas intensive conciliation efforts have reached an impasse"—true!

Nobody has worked harder than our Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, his conciliation officers and the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Bounsall: The member should have talked to him and had him explain it.

Mr. Drea: "And the parties are unable to achieve a settlement of a dispute." That is admitted.

"Whereas the public interest and welfare requires that means be provided to bring the strike to an end"—they don't disagree with that; true again. "And to settle all matters that are in dispute"—they agree with that—"between the parties in order that new collective agreements may be concluded between the parties." That is what we all want. It is all true in the preamble. There is no choice.

Mr. Roy: Why didn't the government do that two months ago?

Mr. Drea: If they want them to go back to work, if they want an end to the frustrations—

Mr. Martel: Has the member got himself convinced now?

Mr. Drea: —and the economic and social dislocations: if they're concerned about people ridihg up and down in high-speed conveyances that may injure or maim; if they are at all concerned about stability in the construction industry; if they are concerned about the degree of autonomy for the Minister of Labour so that he doesn't have to go kowtowing down in the United States, then I say to them that they have to vote for Bill 2. There is no other choice.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): There's an old elevator man!

Mr. Deans: He is almost convinced.

An hon. member: He's had his ups and downs.

An hon. member: The bottom fell out of the shaft for the NDP.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, up until the preceding speaker spoke I had wanted to say that this debate had been remarkably free of acrimony. I think that this is significant because a great deal of reference has been made to the feeling that this is a sad day.

I don't regard it as a sad day, because I believe in the old adage that there is nothing as powerful as an idea whose time has come. This day has been coming for a long time. I would think that 10 years ago the kind

of debate we have been listening to today could never have taken place in this chamber, because the whole concept of compulsory arbitration would have been reprehensible to everybody on all sides of this floor.

Society, I think, has become somewhat immune to outrages to its being. There have been so many outrages that people have become immune. I think the time has now come when the public has said, "Enough." Nothwithstanding the sentiments expressed by our friends to the left, everybody I have talked to over the past two or three months—members of the public from all walks of life, all creeds, all beliefs, all philosophies—has said, "Enough is enough. This elevator strike has gone too far." It has led to economic disintegration. It has led to inconvenience. It has led to problems for everybody—physical, economic, financial and in every other way. Businesses have gone to the wall.

I think that the labour unions and the representatives of the companies that are under discussion today, will rue this day. This is an historic occasion. They will rue this day because, unlike somebody else who has said this is not a precedent, I suggest to you with great respect that it is a precedent; now that we have breached the wall the first time, it will be much easier to breach it again and again and again. And they have nobody to blame but themselves—

Mr. Yakabuski: Right!

Mr. Givens: —and I'll come to that point in a minute—

Mr. Foulds: Failed them again! Watch for the member for Renfrew South!

Mr. Givens: —because there are acts that have been perpetrated by both sides to this controversy which have been inhumane and callous. I'll come to that in a moment, because everybody has been speaking in general terms, and I want to be specific about certain acts that have taken place down the street here which I consider inhumane and callous and which I consider show a lack of responsibility on the part of people who are supposed to have a public responsibility, namely the parties to this dispute.

They have rendered a disservice both to management and to labour in allowing this day to take place, this day that has been referred to as a sad day and which I regard as an historic day. People have taken the attitude, and our friends to the left here take the attitude, that "it has cost millions, so what?" So the Sheraton chain will add another 50 cents or $1 on a hotel room! So the apartment builders will add on another couple of bucks to the rents of the tenants! But who is going to pay for the increases in the long run?

An hon. member: We are.

Mr. Givens: The public: The tenants of the apartments, the people who use the hotel rooms.

Mr. Bounsall: Which one first?

Mr. Deans: How does this change anything?

Mr. Givens: And down the street, Mr. Speaker, there is a hospital being built, the new Sinai Hospital. There has been passing reference made to hospitals; you know hospitals grab people right over here. One of the finest hospitals in the world—668 beds—towards which this government and its predecessors have contributed $31,231,867. The members of the board of governors, of which I was a member, contributed close to $15 million on their own and they have been paralyzed with frustration over the past six months. The opening of the hospital will be delayed for at least another nine months—and the government has that heavy investment in it.

Who is to say how many sick people have been unable to have their illnesses cured because they couldn't get a bed in this hospital? Who is to say how many people have been in pain and couldn't have their pain relieved because they couldn't get a bed in this hospital? Who is to say how many people who have had operations postponed have died because they couldn't get a bed in this hospital? And don't be misled by the name, new Mount Sinai. This is a general hospital which serves all categories, all races, all creeds, all ethnic groups.

Nobody has thought for one moment to go into this hospital and at least have two elevators operational so the construction of the hospital could take place and so that the transfer of the services could mesh and could interlock over the next few months. Everybody has ignored this.

Now if this isn't inhumane, if this isn't callous, if this doesn't indicate that the union and the other side, the management, deserve what has taken place today, then I would like to know what is inhumane and what is callous.

Mr. Stokes: This government is closing active treatment centres.

Mr. Givens: All right. Is that a reason for adding to it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: Right in my own riding—right in Thunder Bay.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Those fellows cooked their goose yesterday.

Mr. Givens: This hospital presently has a waiting list of close to 1,000 people. It currently takes four to six weeks for an urgent patient to be admitted to this hospital due to the lack of beds. The elevator strike has delayed the opening of these urgently required new beds resulting in sick patients waiting at home in stress for a bed to become available.

Mr. Laughren: Where is the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter)?

Mr. Givens: The hospital has made several commitments to specialized personnel from all over the world in order that they would arrive in time for the opening. These commitments will have to be honored, even though facilities in the new hospital will not now be available. And I don't know how long it will take for them to become available.

Because of the strike the new hospital is facing cost increases in equipment. The government is going to be asked for increases to the contribution that it has made because suppliers have already let the hospital know that there have been increases in their prices and they want more money. The government is going to have to face up to that situation.

Commitments have been made by the hospital to the faculty of medicine of the University of Toronto, because this is a high class teaching hospital and commitments have been made to accept increased numbers of undergraduate and postgraduate students for medical teaching in the new facilities. The result of the strike will mean that other arrangements will now have to be made. The ill effects of this strike will be felt in this hospital for many months to come because it has completely disoriented this educational project.

New and expanded programmes—and they to the left over here, are always hollering about new and expanded programmes—of patient care, research and community health are being delayed due to a lack of facilities to begin these programmes.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Where is the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman)?

Mr. Givens: Let me give you another instance of inhumanity and callousness. The present hospital—the old hospital, which has 350 beds—has five elevators, one of which is designated as the emergency elevator, so really there are four. These elevators must receive regular maintenance and on several occasions two to four elevators including the emergency elevator, have been out of service.

The elevator company responsible for maintenance made the decision that two elevators—that's 40 per cent—would have to be out of service before they would consider this to be an emergency situation, even though one of these elevators is the emergency elevator. And only when an emergency situation occurs would the company consider sending a service man to the hospital.

This loss of 40 per cent of the elevator service has placed great hardship on the hospital and has caused the hospital's personnel to be seriously concerned with its effect on patient care.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out to the minister in my remarks that the provincial government is in hock here for close to $32 million and it is making contributions to other hospitals where the same thing applies. I am more familiar with the facts in this hospital because I used to sit on its board. But the same thing applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to other hospitals and to an old folks' home up in Sudbury where the government is involved very deeply.

I am appealing to the government. I shall make an amendment at the proper time which I would like the government to add to subsection 11 of section 4, in which I am suggesting with great respect that when the government constitutes this board, and when a collective bargaining agreement has been reached in accordance with the terms that have been set out in this bill, that that won't be the end of it. There is no doubt in my mind that because of the lack of public responsibility indicated, as far as I am concerned by both sides to this dispute, that they will likely continue to be irresponsible.

I am afraid that now that they have gone back to work they will be attracted to the big builders who will be able to offer bonuses under the table and over the table, and who

will be able to offer them employment over a period of years.

An hon. member: Payoffs.

Mr. Givens: They will gravitate to these big jobs, and as far as the one-shot jobs are concerned, like the construction of hospitals or the old folks' homes, they will likely be the bottom men on the totem pole. I am appealing to the government that it should adopt my amendment—it can make the amendment its own—that where public moneys are involved, particularly where the province is contributing public moneys, it should insist—since this is compulsory arbitration and it is compelling them anyway—it should compel both sides to the dispute to see to it that when the working men go back on the job and the contractors go back on the job, those jobs be favoured to which the government is contributing many millions of dollars.

I think it is the only fair thing, I think it is the only reasonable thing, I think it is the only decent thing to do in the light of the circumstances of the case that I've outlined to the House. I will be introducing that amendment, through you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the government will adopt it as its very own for the reasons that I have indicated.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, on most occasions when a member rises in the House to speak and particularly in the Throne debate or the reply to the Throne Speech or the budget debate, he starts off by saying, "I deem it a pleasure," "I am happy" or "I am very pleased to take part in this debate." I can't say that tonight. I don't feel happy about taking part in this debate.

Mr. Haggerty: Is the member happy any time?

An hon. member: Not after the last two by-elections.

Mr. Gisborn: One thing I am happy about though, is that we have a party in this province that can create a balance between the hysteria reaction of the other two parties that exist in this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: I want to make it clear that the member who just spoke previous to my self rising, he or his party, or the party opposite, has no monopoly on humanity toward the people who need attention in this province. Our party has demonstrated that in other measures that have passed with this party.

An hon. member: The member can't even get his own party excited.

Mr. Gisborn: I sat in our caucus and we debated this issue as other caucuses must have.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: There were no divisions, no reservations about the fact that we felt the strike should be terminated.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: And we haven't said that heretofore.

Mr. Yakabuski: What does the member's leader think? Did he get the pulse of the people yet?

Mr. Gisborn: We are in complete unanimity that the strike should be terminated in this province, the strike between the companies and the elevator constructors. But we searched ourselves to avoid the dangerous precedent that was going to be established and we thought we could come up with something that could clear that situation up.

We did not think it was necessary to bring in compulsory binding arbitration to get these people back to work. We have enough precedents; we have the American tribunal system where they have 30-, 60- and 90-day cooling-off periods that have worked in a situation like this time and time again. The other parties are not getting the point and they don't try to catch the point that we can and we have settled this thing; we have got them back to work.

Mr. Yakabuski: We have the point all right.

Mr. Martel: The member never read about it.

Mr. Gisborn: But why do members opposite have to look at every question that comes before them with the idea of throwing the baby out with the bathwater, as the Liberal Party always does in situations of this type? There is no in-between. It's just one way down the road.

I guess the only little political quip I'd like to make before my other few comments, is about the interesting remarks

from the hon. member for Rainy River when he pounded his chest and tried to relate to us the terrific struggles by workers to form trade unions in this province. I hope when he reads past histories that he reads closely that part where Mitchell Hepburn was involved in the establishment of the industrial unions in this province, and he won't feel so proud about the Liberal Party's position. The ghosts of the galloping hussars still prevail and are ready to gallop across that party when the time arises; let's not kid ourselves.

An hon. member: They haven't held their heads up since.

Mr. Gisborn: It's very prominent.

Mr. Roy: The NDP is worse off than we are. It has problems right now.

Mr. Gisborn: My friend from Scarborough Centre touched the nerve centre of the situation; that the company had tried to maintain the hiring hall provision. He didn't deal in entirety with the union's security position. That caused the companies' adamant position on not just relinquishing some of their past rights, but the companies' adamant position in saying to the union, "We're going to change some of the things that have been a harmonious procedure in our relationship for the past 50 years. This year we're going to change that. We're not going to retain something we've had; we're going to take it completely away from you"—that is, their complete union security provision.

An hon. member: And they knew that would cause a strike.

Mr. Gisborn: No, it's not just the dues and the hiring hall situation, because it's very clear what the company says. As a matter of fact, I'm quoting from their position on the strike. The following statement was issued by A. M. Tuff, chairman of the Canadian elevator manufacturers negotiating committee, on the adjournment of talks in Toronto with the Ontario Ministry of Labour mediator, W. H. Dickie:

> As manufacturers we are responsible for ensuring that our product meets the public safety standards required by law for manufacturers' installation, service and operation. The union seeks to deny us this right by demanding control of hiring, training and job progression without any employer say in the matter. At all times we have been prepared to settle on a realistic and reasonable basis with our striking employees. In our view, there is absolutely no reason, beyond union stubbornness, for continuation of a strike that has created so much unnecessary personal and economic hardship.

Now, they have lived with that kind of an agreement heretofore, and when that became the issue in dispute that held the settlement of a strike to this point, that's when the government should have laid down a firm statement saying to that company: "You are now trying to take something away from that union that they have had for the last 50 years. There is no validity in your statement that they are trying to interfere with the quality of workmanship, with the safety factor, because the minute they start to install an elevator in a building it is under close inspection scrutiny. The minute the construction is finished, it's examined and inspected by this government as to its safety provisions and its quality. And when it starts to operate it also falls under the jurisdiction of this government to make sure that it is operated and inspected for its safety factors."

The company's argument completely falls apart in that regard. I am not going to get into that weak position, that is controversial in a lot of reactionary minds, about the hiring hall system.

Mr. Drea: Does the member like the hiring hall?

Mr. Gisborn: I don't like some semblance of it. I don't like the actions of some particular unions and their attitudes, but I have got enough knowledge to know that when the members become dissatisfied with how that operates, they will change it.

Mr. Drea: The same way they did with Hal Banks.

Mr. Gisborn: The member's argument doesn't hold water, because there are so many people who can work on so many jobs. When those jobs are operating in their full capacity, then his argument falls apart. They have for 50 years provided employees and have carried out the operations of the industry.

Mr. Drea: If Local 1005 operated the way that elevator constructors union did, the member would hang a black flag outside the hall, and he knows it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough Centre is out of order.

Mr. Gisborn: That's what the member says. I haven't investigated that part of their jurisdiction. I don't make it my business—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Gisborn: —to delve into the internal workings of an organization. That might be the member for Scarborough Centre's job as a particular member of this Parliament, but I think he would be better off to stick with the dance halls and the beauty parlours.

Mr. Bounsall: That's his natural habitat.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, we have many times in this House debated the pros and cons of compulsory, binding arbitration, whether or not it applied to the public service or the private sector. We have been strongly opposed to that measure. We have also said in argument in those debates, or at least I have myself, that we believe in the least amount of government intervention in industrial disputes.

I am sure that previous Ministers of Labour have accepted those thoughts of the least amount of government intervention being the best, but we realize when we come to a situation like this, then it is the duty of the government to take action. We have said that when we have debated the Hospital Labour Disputes Arbitration Act as being a compulsory measure and when we debated the Crown Agency Act as being a compulsory measure. We said that we could leave those issues, and if an issue arose where the public safety and health was at stake, then the government could bring in legislation to correct the situation, because precedents take place and they are never forgotten.

We support the fact that this strike had to be terminated, but we are just as convinced that there are other measures that this government with its powers could have implemented that did not carry a binding situation. Compulsory back-to-work orders have to be recognized. That step could have been taken. It could have been for 30, 60 or 90 days to give them time to settle down. If they couldn't come to an agreement, then the government has another chance.

But when it comes to a point of making such a serious decision, then you have to take the first best alternate; you don't jump over the cliff. This is the point we are trying to make. We remember quite clearly that the unions said they would go to work the minute the bill was introduced. The government should not have lost track of that fact. The bill should have been introduced on Tuesday.

One has to say to oneself, where does the minister stand in this situation I observed the minister two or three times on television with a weary face and a cracking voice explaining the agony he had gone through in his efforts to bring this situation to a close. I remember the announcement of the Prime Minister that on Tuesday, March 20, he would introduce compulsory legislation. The Minister of Labour stood at his side and he did look pretty weary. I think it was realistic weariness from the efforts that he had put into trying to bring this thing to a close.

I wonder about the political implications in the timing. Was it the fact that we had two by-elections which took priority over this situation?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would find this a convenient point at which to break his remarks.

Mr. Gisborn: I will adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 22, 1973

Provincial Auditor's report, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Deans, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Cassidy 43

Study of payments for medical services, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy 45

Medical specialists' fees, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy 45

Payment to Professor Symons, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans, Mr. Germa 46

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward County, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Deans, Mr. Renwick, Mr. R. F. Nixon 47

Public housing rents, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Deans, Mr. Cassidy 48

Ryerson financial problems, questions of Mr. McNie: Mr. Bullbrook 49

Committal order for strikers, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Bounsall 51

OHIP premiums, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Roy, Mr. Laughren, Mr. R. F. Nixon 51

Religious discrimination in education, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. B. Newman 52

No-fault auto insurance, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Renwick 52

Health service commercials, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Gaunt 53

Effect of mercury on Indian bands, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Foulds 53

Destruction of OHIP files, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Singer 54

Shortage of tradesmen, question of Mr. McNie: Mr. Gisborn 54

Alberta natural gas, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Reid 54

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Kennedy, first reading 55

Arbitrations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 55

Proceedings Against the Crown Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 55

Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, first reading 55

Certification of Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, first reading 55

Motor Vehicles Accident Claims Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, first reading 56

Apprenticeship and Tradesmens' Qualification Act, bill to amend, Mr. Drea, first reading 56

Consumer Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Drea, first reading 56

Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. R. F. Nixon, first reading 56

Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act, bill respecting, Mr. Guindon, on second reading 56

Recess, 6 o'clock 93

No. 4

Ontario

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 22, 1973

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1973

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 3rd order, resuming the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 2, the Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act, 1973.

ELEVATOR CONSTRUCTOR UNIONS DISPUTES ACT
(continued)

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I can't recollect exactly where I left off before the adjournment hour at 6 o'clock, but there are a few concluding remarks I would like to make.

I feel that party politics have entered into this debate just a little bit too much previous to this point and I want to express to the members that I think the situation is a serious one and should be dealt with in that vein. I and this party do not underrate the seriousness of the subject we are dealing with tonight.

I would like to state some of the things that I have found out in regard to some statements made previously and I will be brief. I found, to the best that we can ascertain, that any American interference is strictly on the part of the American companies. I have ascertained that the international office in Philadelphia has had no part whatsoever in these negotiations. I have also ascertained that the local union officers in Ontario have had no assistance and received no interference from international officers in regard to their situation here in Ontario.

I want to put briefly what the companies call their position and they say this:

> The industry's position on arbitration: The elevator manufacturers do not agree that arbitration is a proper method for resolution of the strike and this position has been made clear to Mr. William Dickie, Mr. Vic Scott and Mr. John Speranzini, the Ontario government mediators. Generally unions themselves are opposed to arbitration. We therefore have to regard the elevator union's suggestion for arbitration in this dispute as nothing more than a bargaining ploy.

This union has not defined any terms or conditions of arbitration. We must suspect that the union leaders, having extracted a very rich offer from the companies, through bargaining and mediation, are now setting their sights on gaining still more through proposing voluntary arbitration.

The fact that some interest disputes are arbitrated in the public sector has no bearing here. A great many issues are not even permitted by governments to go to arbitration. Moreover, governments have unlimited resources through taxation and are not running businesses subject to the uncertainties of the marketplace and profit and loss. From the point of view of the companies, there is no real expertise available for arbitration of an interest dispute in the private sector of the economy and little, if any, precedent.

> If a mediator of Mr. W. H. Dickie's stature and experience encounters serious difficulties with the issues, there is no prospect that an arbitrator could find an equitable solution. Furthermore and even more importantly, it is the elevator companies, not the union and not the government, who carry the moral responsibility and the legal and financial liabilities for the safe performance of the industry's products. In these circumstances we cannot abdicate and leave to the uncertainties of the arbitration processes the finding of decisions concerning the hiring, training skills and competency of employees, to mention only some of the crucial issues involved. Since these are issues we cannot compromise with the union, we cannot accept the risk of having them compromised by an arbitrator.

Now that statement alone tells this Legislature and the public that they don't want to submit and agree to arbitration. In other words they are saying the strike must continue, in its uncertainties, as we have seen it in the past few months. That is the indictment against the company. They again say on wages and benefits:

> Wages, and extensions of the formula by which wages are to be based on the average wage of the top four of the 10

> principal building trades, rather than on the average rate of the highest four of the seven trades specified in the previous agreement.
>
> In recent years this has resulted in a 12 per cent wage increase annually.

Now, that statement says absolutely nothing that hasn't been common knowledge ever since the day the strike was called. This formula has been used by these companies and this union, in amicable agreement; this is the way they will settle their wage increases.

This has prevailed for many, many years. I don't approve of that type of formula, but many unions adopt a formula of that nature. We have a plant in Hamilton that is not organized—the Dofasco steel plant—that in policy adopts the wage rates negotiated by the Steel Co. of Canada and their unions through sometimes bitter and lengthy negotiations.

So the companies are not saying very much. There was no grant; there was no real set of negotiations on the money package. A formula was agreed upon. The automatic progression of that formula arrived at a certain amount of money.

So we must agree, Mr. Speaker, that the elevator companies are to blame for the failure of the parties to arrive at an agreement. The company refutes a conclusion of most others that the public health and safety is threatened. That is stated by their spokesman, Mr. E. M. Tuff, who is quoted in the Toronto papers of March 8:

> The six month strike against five elevator companies has resulted in inconveniences to the public, but has not endangered them, the chairman of the negotiating committee said Tuesday.

So in a sense he is saying there is no reason for a cessation of the strike—that the strike should continue under the system of collective bargaining with, as we realize, no solution in view.

The companies refused to agree with arbitration, therefore, they must wish the strike or lockout to continue, while the union has some weeks ago agreed to have this dispute settled by some compulsory method.

Now, in conclusion I would appeal to the minister to accept our position not to impose compulsory arbitration, but a back to work order, a cooling-off period, whatever they might want to call it, and provide one more chance for the collective bargaining process to work. We in this House can unanimously make our decision, while we still have time, in the next few hours during this debate.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to participate? The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have very few comments to make about the bill. I do not intend to discuss the principle of the bill because this has been sufficiently discussed by—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Then the member had better sit down!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would wish to take his seat then?

An hon. member: He's embarrassed with the principle.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: We are discussing the principle of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Well, according to my friend, you see, there—

Mr. Deans: You don't warn them in advance!

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have always attempted to be very straight and honest here and I don't intend to discuss one of the principles of the bill.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): What is the member going to talk about then? What is left?

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): He's just been ruled out of order!

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the principle has been emphasized by other members of this caucus, and mostly by my leader (Mr. R. F. Nixon). The point I want to emphasize here tonight—and I don't think it has been emphasized enough—is that attempts have been made here throughout the day to make our friends to the left the culprits of this whole situation, when in fact it is the fellows sitting across from us. They are the fellows—

Mr. Kennedy: He couldn't say anything else, could he?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): They've been wrong before.

Mr. Deans: There's a proud face!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: At least our friends to the left are standing up for a principle which they feel will bring them some political advantage. Whereas, across the way—

Mr. Kennedy: They have no principles.

Mr. Deans: They have to speak about something other than principles.

Mr. Roy: I just wanted to reply to the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea).

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They admit that they are using it for political purposes!

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that our friends to the left have any principle at all; they just go any way they are pushed.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): And by the Liberals too?

Mr. Roy: I have some difficulty attacking the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon)—

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Trudeau won't like the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: That will read well tomorrow, I'll tell you.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): They'd better pass this bill.

Mr. Deans: We're not holding it up!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, if I've done nothing else I've enlivened the debate anyway.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It isn't the member for Ottawa East; it's the time of the evening.

Mr. Roy: I have some difficulty in attacking the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Gee, I've really pulled their chain, haven't I?

An hon. member: They're all flushed now!

Mr. Roy: Yes, they're all excited now. I woke them up a bit. Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Is this on the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker? Are these irrelevants relevant?

Mr. Speaker: I am trying very hard to decide that.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): In 25 words or less.

Mr. Roy: Yes, in 25 words or less. I have some difficulty, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cassidy: We know that!

Mr. Roy: Thank you. Is that it?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): The hon. member knows better than that!

Mr. Cassidy: Say it again!

Mr. Roy: The Minister of Labour, who is sitting across the way in his usual complacent way and, I must say, with a very sympathetic smile, is a very difficult man to attack because he's such a nice fellow. And I really don't think—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He needs some sympathy.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): What is the hon. member buttering him up for?

Mr. Roy: About the whole attitude taken by this government and the minister's colleagues in this, I feel the minister is not quite devious enough to have approached the problem in this way. This obviously was the making of his leader.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): He is insulting the minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: This was patently obvious when his leader attempted to play politics with the issue. Unfortunately, in law the minister is what we would consider a party to the defence.

Mr. Bounsall: Let the minister get up and deny it!

Mr. Martel: He said something about devious!

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member's deputy leader is walking out on him.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a preamble to the principle?

Mr. Roy: Yes, this is just a preamble, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: He told you he wasn't going to speak about the principle.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: We are just going to keep these fellows here longer, that's all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter), as I understand it, yesterday accused my friends on the left of not caring about the seriousness of the situation—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Order.

Mr. Roy: —of not caring sufficiently about the seriousness of the situation, when in fact the minister's leader attempted to play politics with the whole issue—

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member for York-Forest Hill said that!

Mr. Roy: —by postponing it after the two by-elections. If the matter was as serious—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): If it was before the hon. member accused us of playing politics.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a very serious situation, according to the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Cassidy: He has some difficulty.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: My God, I woke them up. I really woke them up, didn't I? Even our friend from Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) is yelling.

Mr. Foulds: Not for the reasons the hon. member thinks he is.

Mr. Roy: Yes, I should ask them what was on the menu tonight. In any event, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cassidy: The hon. member for Ottawa East has got everybody in the House puzzled.

Mr. Roy: The attempt to play politics with the issue obviously backfired, as we saw in the by-elections. Obviously they lose their integrity—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Oh, the hon. member is playing politics. There is no connection—

Mr. Roy: —when they attempt to put the blame on our friends to the left.

Mr. Turner: Is the hon. member talking about the Premier?

Mr. Roy: And I hear my friend from Scarborough Centre attempting to say that the 24 hr. period is most important.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): If he loves them so much, why doesn't he take a walk?

Mr. Roy: He fails to answer. He failed, Mr. Speaker, to answer the prime question. When the chief inspector talked about the seriousness of the situation, why did the Premier not act right away and call the House into session, if time was so important?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We believe in free collective bargaining.

Mr. Roy: Why didn't the government act three or four months ago on this situation?

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): That is what the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) said.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): We had that speech this afternoon. Put one together yourself.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Why didn't the government act three or four months ago if it was looking at the situation over a 24-hour period?

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Then we would have missed the member for Ottawa East's performance.

Mr. Roy: Yes, you would have. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is an amount of deviousness, an amount of politics in trying to play on this very serious situation.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member has a suspicious mind.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It takes one to know one.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cassidy: I think the member is obstructing the House. It is a prime example of obstructionism.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Sueaker, in closing, really what happened was that I had just written

the preamble and I hadn't had a chance to write the closing remarks of the speech.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member is playing politics.

Mr. Roy: What I wanted to say basically and what I wanted to emphasize in this House is apparently, and it should be obvious to it now, that the government has lost its credibility. It was obvious during the two by-elections that the government has lost all its former credibility. When it goes before the public and says that other parties in this House impede progress or hamper correcting a situation which is very serious—

Mr. W. Newman: Then why did the member seek the Liberal federal nomination?

Mr. Roy: —the public out there just doesn't accept it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Roy: I can see how this is getting the members opposite excited.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): They didn't want him.

Mr. Roy: The government didn't want them. It didn't want those two ministers. In any event, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are still big in Ottawa.

Mr. Roy: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are still big in Ottawa.

Mr. Roy: —what we are trying to say basically is that we are supporting the bill, but we are trying to emphasize—

Mr. Deans: But the Liberal Party is trying to look as if it is not.

Mr. Roy: —that the Conservative Party is trying to play politics with a very serious issue. It didn't get away with it and it will not get away with it. Just bring on more ministers and we'll replace the government gradually. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside. Order, please.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make two or three points as briefly as possible. Let me say at the beginning that, when the elevator workers' unions asked for arbitration and the companies refused, the unions undertook to return to work when the Ontario government introduced legislation, not after the legislation was passed, but just after it was introduced.

Mr. Yakabuski: Good night! The member can't explain away a horrible mistake.

Mr. Burr: This was a very important consideration for members of our caucus in considering the issue, because we recognized the great inconvenience and, in some cases, the serious health hazards that had been created by this dispute. Knowing that we would not be delaying the return to work one day or even one hour, we felt free to propose an alternative to binding arbitration; this the member for Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall) did today. We realize that we could now debate this bill for weeks, if anyone cared to, without further endangering the public in any way, simply because the elevator industry has resumed functioning.

If we had had to make a decision about Bill 2, knowing that for every hour we talked we might be endangering the public safety, then we would have had a very difficult decision to make. Knowing that the government majority ensured that the bill would pass in any event, we would have been in the unenviable position whereby we might have had to support the bill simply to get the industry back to work. Knowing, however—

Mr. W. Newman: Why don't they support it?

Mr. Burr: The industry is back at work for the information of the hon. member. Knowing, however, that the strike was over—

Mr. Yakabuski: What did his leader say over the supper hour?

Mr. Burr: —with the introduction of the bill, we felt free to introduce a bill of our own that would avoid what all three parties have claimed today that they would like to avoid, namely, compulsory arbitration, and this we did.

If the government has been so concerned with public safety the Premier could have, and should have, called the House together weeks ago. If the return to work was so urgent, and I am inclined to feel that it was, why did the government not introduce the bill two days ago on Tuesday instead of waiting for 24 hours and doing it yesterday?

Mr. Yakabuski: We thought his leader would be back.

Mr. Deans: That is novel. Maybe if we had told them, they would have delayed it indefinitely.

Mr. Burr: The only other point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a strike between an autonomous Canadian union and five American companies. Wages are not at stake in this dispute. Seniority is the main issue over which the strike is being fought. The union is seeking to guarantee that men of 50, workers with 20 years of service, may have job security after the dispute is resolved. This is a recognized Canadian tradition in union-company relationships. American companies are trying to destroy this established way of life for Canadian workers. All parties agree that compulsory arbitration is a last resort.

The New Democratic Party is offering a second last resort and we invite the government, Mr. Speaker, to consider it.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to enter the debate before the minister replies? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by several members of the House and I would like to express my appreciation of many of the contributions made by all members of the House in this debate. Of course, we did not get the consensus of opinion; this was to be anticipated. In any event, I do appreciate the comments that were made here today and I think we have all realized the seriousness and the meaning of the legislation which was introduced yesterday.

I should like, first of all, and I think I owe it to my staff, to congratulate my assistant deputy minister, the chief of the mediation services in my ministry and other officers who have worked for so long to bring about a settlement in what was, in my opinion, one of the most difficult and exhausting experiences in the life of the Ministry of Labour.

As I said earlier today, more than 45 days of mediation talks took place during the present strike and some of these meetings have been going on in the very wee hours of the morning. My staff has kept me informed at all times and I have been in touch with them constantly, including weekends.

One thing that no member has mentioned here today is the fact that our staff has been able to get consensus on almost 90 per cent of the issues. Unfortunately, insofar as the other 10 per cent of issues were concerned, there seemed to be no settlement whatsoever. I, as minister responsible, want to congratulate them for the work they've done. I want to assure them that they will always have my support, because one has to know to appreciate how much effort is made by these experts in the field.

Now, in this particular strike — and it hasn't been mentioned here today — there was a unique experience for our ministry. As you know, this union has been bargaining for over 52 years without a strike. That's quite a record. It's a record to be proud of, and if at times we did perhaps, take more time than some people would have liked, it is because the minister and his staff were trying to preserve the character of this union as bargaining on a national basis.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): And the public is damned. That's why the government waited seven months to move.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member's leader is a little more responsible than that.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would like to remind the hon. member—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Compulsory arbitration in October — is that what the member wanted?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, if I may I will remind my hon. friend from Downsview of a similar strike in the United States — with basically the same issues — took 112 days before a settlement could be reached.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but the minister did three times better; three times better before he acted.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, I'm coming to the member's point.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The hon. member wanted compulsory arbitration in October.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: It took exactly eight months in the city of New York before a settlement could be reached. So, as you can see, it wasn't an easy one to settle.

Now, because of the national character of this union we've had a number of delays. We've had a number of occasions where meetings had to be adjourned or suspended pending court cases; particularly in the Province of Quebec, where they had the decree system, and also in British Columbia on occasions. This has taken time and brought about some suspension of meetings and adjourn-

ments. For those of you who have inferred in any way that we were playing politics with this very important strike on our hands—

Mr. Singer: Perish the thought! Bah!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —I can assure you that in the dying days of the discussion we were indeed trying to obtain a voluntary arbitration as had been suggested by labour. We worked for over a week trying to get this voluntary arbitration instead of compulsory arbitration.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And the member knows it.

Mr. Singer: One week out of seven months. That's no record. One week out of seven months.

An hon. member: That's last week.

An hon. member: The member's party would never settle anything.

Mr. Roy: Why didn't they call the House into session before the by-elections?

Mr. Singer: All of the time.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, when I listen to members being so critical—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Guindon —I would wish at times they would some day have the privilege of being the responsible Minister of Labour in the Province of Ontario.

An hon. member: We will.

An hon. member: They never will.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: And I think if they look back—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Let us decide—we'll figure that out too.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): We'll manage that. We'll manage that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We'll take that.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and credit too!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Yakabuski: Better be careful, the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) is coming in tonight.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member for Downsview is flush with victory.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I don't know if my friend is very serious, but if he's talking about resignations—perhaps he's looking for a by-election—but I can assure him it's no use in Stormont. He'd have no chance in Stormont whatsoever.

Mr. Singer: Right, we like by-elections. Let's have a by-election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Pick one! Pick one!

Mr. W. Newman: Is the member kidding? Is he playing with people's lives? He's playing with people's lives!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: The member doesn't care about people. Don't forget that. Let the records show that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think the hon. minister—order, please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!
Would you please grant the hon. minister the courtesy of paying attention to him and letting him deliver his response.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Tell the member for Downsview to be quiet.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Don't pay any attention, but let him make his response.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Seriously, I would like to give assurance to the members of this House that we have acted with integrity, honesty and responsibility throughout this strike.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): That's something new.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I can assure you that the motives of the—

Mr. Singer: Nobody is behind the minister.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —minister, when he intervenes in a strike—and if you look back within the year since I assumed this portfolio, on four occasions I have had to intervene in a strike situation. This is quite unusual, as I'm sure my opponents will admit.

Mr. Singer: If the minister cannot stand it, get out.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: You may question the judgement of the minister as to the timing of intervention. It's not an easy thing to decide the time when the minister should interfere in a strike.

Mr. Roy: The minister's timing is perfect.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: However, I am sure that members cannot question the motive that I have had on every occasion which was, of course, to obtain a negotiated agreement if at all possible or—

Mr. Singer: But he was an honourable man!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —immediate agreement or, failing this, at least voluntary arbitration. In the present case, it wasn't there.

I should like in closing, Mr. Speaker, to express my appreciation to every member who has participated in the debate because at no time have I heard anyone questioning the credibility of the minister and his staff. For this I am very grateful.

Mr. Singer: The minister has got something there.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I can assure the members once a Minister of Labour has lost credibility he has lost his usefulness to this province and to the workers of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: That's what my colleague from Sarnia told the minister this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: And I do appreciate the fact—

Mr. Bullbrook: It's not a question of personal credibility.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Would the member tell his colleague to be quiet?

Mr. Singer: Oh, now, come on!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —there was no question of the credibility and integrity of the minister or even his staff. I certainly would not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I wouldn't tolerate in any event any criticism or accept any suspicion as to the integrity of the minister and his credibility at all times. If by any chance some of the members don't know my background, perhaps I should have told some of the new members that I have been in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, for some time.

I have been elected not once, not twice, but five times.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Not in one riding but in two ridings of Ontario. In the election of 1971—

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister doesn't have to do that. He is bigger than that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I, too, Mr. Speaker, like my hon. friend from Sarnia, represent a highly unionized city of this province. There are great trade unions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: If members look back in the records of the last election, 1971—which is just about a year and a half ago—they will find that I have collected and received 60 per cent of the vote—

Mr. Singer: Let's have another by-election next week.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —while our NDP friends managed to get about 28 per cent and the Liberal candidate in the Liberal stronghold got 12 per cent of the vote.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The member for Sarnia will never get going. He'll never make it.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) has—

An hon. member: Calm down!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —asked me why we did not contact the federal Department of Labour—

Mr. Singer: It was pretty weak, you know. Let's try another by-election.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Why didn't we ask the involvement of the federal government in this dispute. This I can say, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —the federal Department of Labour, for one thing, has no jurisdiction over the construction industry.

An hon. member: Why is that?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Secondly, I doubt if they are geared for it. I can add this—that none of the parties in the dispute, to my knowledge, was in favour of any federal participation in this dispute. That is the reason there was no involvement of them.

An hon. member: No one wants the feds anywhere.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): What was that reason, one more time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nobody wants the feds anywhere.

An hon. member: Because the government didn't want to be involved.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Stanfield wanted them involved.

Mr. Singer: All the Tories wanted to get the government involved.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, it has been said by one or two members—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview does not have the floor. Order!

Mr. Deans: He doesn't have to have the floor.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: One or two members have suggested that one of the parties in the dispute was not bargaining in good faith.

An hon. member: Get the habeas corpus out of here.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: My experience while having discussions with both sides did not demonstrate this. I don't see how they can substantiate this allegation. Both sides, so far as I was concerned, have been negotiating in good faith. It was just one of those situations where you could not get an agreement; you just could not get it. And because of the safety factor for the general public, because innocent parties were victims of the strike, and also because of the impact on the economy of this province, it was felt after six months of strike that the government should no longer be passive but take a forward action.

Mr. Cassidy: Then why did the minister get so angry with the companies if they were bargaining in good faith?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I am not saying we are angry. We are not angry at anyone. The Minister of Labour is strictly neutral. He knows that he has to walk a very tight rope.

An hon. member: That's not what the unions say.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We are providing services—

Mr. Cassidy: You open them up and—

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We are providing services and we did our best in this case, as in most cases. And as you know—

Mr. Singer: Seven months later here we are.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: As you know, if you look over the labour-management relations in this province—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —we have an excellent record, an excellent record. But you can't—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: But you can't win them all.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister will please disregard the interjections.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: That's what I am saying now. So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Closing?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —the hon. members, to support the bill that we have introduced here today.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Up the elevators.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: It was a difficult decision for the minister to make. I hope it doesn't create a precedent, because I've said so before, and I repeat it again, I believe in the collective bargaining process and I'll believe in it in the future as long as I am Minister of Labour for the Province of Ontario. I ask the members to support unanimously the bill they have in front of them, and as they saw in the last section of the bill, once the collective agreements are in operation, this bill, of course, will be repealed.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the minister consider a question before concluding his remarks?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the minister consider a question before concluding his remarks?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the minister care to make response to my comments, made this afternoon, as to the lack of initiative on his part in connection with the Throne Speeches of this government, in connection with general labour legislation, and as to whether he is content to respond to these crises always in an ad hoc fashion?

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): No. No.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member knows that he was quite out of order and that his remarks were repetitious. No response is required. The motion is for—

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the minister going to answer?

Mr. Speaker: No, he is not. He would be out of order.

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 2, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Bounsall
Apps	Burr
Auld	Cassidy
Bales	Davison
Beckett	Deans
Birch	Ferrier
Braithwaite	Foulds
Brunelle	Germa
Bullbrook	Gisborn
Carton	Laughren
Clement	Martel
Davis	Renwick
Drea	Young—13.
Edighoffer	
Ewen	
Gaunt	
Gilbertson	
Givens	
Good	
Grossman	
Guindon	
Haggerty	
Handleman	
Havrot	
Henderson	
Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)	
Hodgson (York-North)	
Jessiman	
Kennedy	
Kerr	
Lane	
Lawrence	
Leluk	
Maeck	
McIlveen	
McKeough	
McNeil	
McNie	
Miller	
Morningstar	
Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)	
Newman (Ontario South)	
Nixon (Dovercourt)	
Nixon (Brant)	
Nuttall	
Parrott	
Potter	
Reid	
Rhodes	
Rollins	
Root	
Rowe	
Roy	
Ruston	
Scrivener	
Singer	
Smith (Simcoe East)	
Smith (Hamilton Mountain)	
Smith (Nipissing)	
Snow	
Spence	
Taylor	
Timbrell	
Turner	
Villeneuve	
Wardle	
Welch	
White	
Winkler	
Worton	
Yakabuski—71.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 71, the "nays" are 13.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Committee of the whole House?

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ELEVATOR CONSTRUCTOR UNIONS DISPUTES ACT

House in committee on Bill 2, the Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act, 1973.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 2; there are 10 sections to this bill. Are there any comments, questions or amendments to the first section?

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): On the recital, Mr. Chairman. On the recital or the whereas preamble.

Mr. Chairman: On the preamble? All right. The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: I move that the recital to Bill 2 be amended by deleting all that portion of the recital after the words "the Labour Relations Act" in the ninth line and substituting therefor the following: "and whereas the unions have engaged in lawful strikes against the employers since about Sept. 7, 1972, and whereas the unions and their members have already agreed voluntarily to submit all matters that are in dispute between the parties to arbitration and to return to work; and whereas the employers have refused to so agree; and whereas it is not in the public interest that the matters that are in dispute between the parties should continue unresolved."

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): As I understand it, the recital is not part of the bill.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Of course it is part of the bill.

An hon. member: It's the crux of the whole thing.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Of course it is part of the bill.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Bring back the CCF. They knew what they were doing.

Mr. Deans: If it is the opinion of the Chair that this is not part of the bill, then we ask simply that it be stricken from the bill entirely.

Mr. Renwick: That's what we are dealing with in this bill.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, it won't be part of the bill when enacted.

Mr. Bounsall: Most recitals appear in the Revised Statutes of Ontario. I have quoted a recital today that appears in connection with the Labour Relations Act and it is most certainly there; the whereas is in full measure.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Good try, but you're wrong.

Mr. Deans: If you want to take it out, we'll let you.

Mr. Chairman: If you will just bear with me for a moment we'll clarify that point. It is the first time it has come up.

Mr. Renwick: We passed an amendment at the last session, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bounsall: If it appears it is part of it.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, there is no need to consult outside the chamber. In a very recent session we enacted a preamble to a bill as part of a bill and it was the subject of substantial debate. It is the preamble that is in the minister's Labour Relations Act.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It's before us. In my opinion that is in order.

Mr. Deans: They are trying to obstruct the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bounsall has moved that the preamble of Bill 2 be amended by deleting all that portion of the preamble after the words "The Labour Relations Act" in the ninth line and substituting therefor the following:

> and whereas the unions have been engaged in lawful strikes against the employer since about Sept. 7, 1972; and whereas the unions and their members have already agreed voluntarily to submit all matters that are in dispute between the parties to arbitration and to return to work; and whereas the employers have refused to so agree; and whereas it is not in the public

interest that the matters that are in dispute between the parties should continue unresolved.

Any comment on this? The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the present preamble makes it appear, whether it is intended or otherwise, that the public safety and welfare of the province have been endangered by the unions as a result of the strike. All the members of this House have heard today the last steps that have occurred since March 1 in the attempted solution to this situation. Just because the Provincial Secretary for Social Development hasn't read it, or hasn't been here to hear it today—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I have read every word.

Mr. Bounsall: You haven't been here to hear any of it today.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I support the bill because it is in the public interest.

Mr. Bounsall: We are not now debating it in principle. You have missed that whole debate. Let me remind you that we are dealing with it clause by clause.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am here to serve the public.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Windsor West has the floor.

Mr. Bounsall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What we have done here by this amendment is simply lay out the situation that has resulted in the last three weeks and that has resulted in this bill coming before this Legislature at all. We have laid out that the unions engaged in a lawful strike, and when they did it. We have laid out that the union members agreed to go voluntarily to arbitration, with the decision to be binding, submitting all matters in dispute to that arbitration. We point out exactly what happened—that the employers refused to enter into voluntary arbitration and to present all matters in dispute, which is what occurs in voluntary arbitration, to that arbitration. We saw what happened last week; what happened prior to black Wednesday. The Premier of this province (Mr. Davis) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) threatened the employers with bringing in this very bill which we have before us today.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It seems to me that the subject matter you are discussing was debated during second reading of the bill.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, I have to explain why we have introduced this particular amendment in this way. This particular point—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. This is really on the principle of the bill. We heard all of this this afternoon.

Mr. Bounsall: All right. To deal further with the actual wording, there can be no dispute with any of the sections that are laid out here as being untruthful or not true to the fact; our amendment lays out the actions which occurred over the last three weeks and which brought this bill before the House.

I don't think any of the Labour Ministry officials or the Minister of Labour would quarrel with this layout, which avoids singling anyone out. Whether or not it singles them out grammatically, the bill certainly appears to single out the unions as being to blame for threatening the public safety and welfare in this province. There are two parties to every dispute, not one. This bill spells it out as if there is only one party in this dispute.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Question!

Mr. Bounsall: —on that basis, Mr. Chairman, we have entered this amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments? The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Yes, Mr. Chairman. I support my colleague from Windsor West in this amendment on grammatical grounds and on grounds of principle.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): It's a good thing somebody does.

Mr. Foulds: I won't go into principle but inadvertently, I hope, although nevertheless it has occurred, in the section of the preamble following the words "the Labour Relations Act" on line 9, there is unfortunately an incipient anti-union bias. The dispute, as we all know, has two sides. Our wording avoids that bias—

Mr. Singer: And transfers it to another one!

Mr. Foulds: Our wording lays out, as my colleague has said, the facts in the situation that have developed over the last few months. My acquaintances in the rump of the Conservative Party on my left seem to think that the word "they" in line 11 is plural and therefore implicates both parties in the dispute. As a matter of grammar, I would like to point out to them that "they" happens to be a pronoun, it needs to have an anteced-

ent, its grammatical antecedent is either, and there is some ambiguity, the word "union" or the word "strikes". I think it is an unfair grammatical construction, and the minister should willingly accept our amendment.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just by way of clarification, the preamble to the bill as presently worded would be as misleading as it would be for the minister to introduce a bill stating that, "Whereas the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declared war on Germany on Sept. 3, 1939, therefore Great Britain caused the war." The parallel is identical.

Mr. Singer: Not quite!

Mr. Renwick: The inference in the preamble of this bill is that the unions and the unions alone are endangering the public safety of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member has better points than this one.

Mr. Renwick: My colleague's wording is for the purpose of having the preamble to the statute reflect the reality of what took place, which is that the union agreed voluntarily, prior to the introduction of the bill, to submit the matters in issue to arbitration; the companies refused. The reality is stated in the amendment introduced by my colleague.

I submit to the minister that he would agree that it would be unwise to leave on the statute books of this province, where there are but three statutes that I know of that have a preamble, one preamble which creates the inference that the unions involved in these lawful strikes have endangered the public welfare of the Province of Ontario. That is not the reality about what the minister has been debating this afternoon. We ask him to accept the amendment.

Mr. Singer: Question!

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of interpretation. I do not interpret the preamble of this bill in the same way. I don't think there is any inference as far as unions are concerned, and I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Those in favour of Mr. Bounsall's amendment will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Deans: Since there are going to be a number of amendments, we prefer to stack them all and have one vote at the end.

Mr. Chairman: This was not to be voted on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I have declared the amendment lost because—

Mr. Deans: We said "aye" and they said "nay". You must at that point then—

An hon. member: You have to stand.

Mr. Deans: We don't have to stand then. There is another procedure. He calls for the "ayes" and the "nays". Learn the rules.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I quite clearly called for the "ayes" and the "nays" and declared the "nays" had it. No one stood up, so I declared the amendment lost.

Mr. Deans: You didn't follow the proper procedure. First of all, you ask whether the amendment carried.

Mr. Chairman: I did.

All right, any comments, questions or amendments on section 1 of the bill?

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments, questions or amendments on any later section of the bill and, if so, which section?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Section 3.

Mr. Chairman: Section 3? The member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman: I have an amendment to section 3, subsection 14, of the bill.

Mr. Bounsall: I have one for 3(6), Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Reid: Section 3, subsection 14.

Mr. Bounsall: Section 3(6).

Mr. Chairman: We will hear from the member for Windsor West first then.

Mr. Bounsall: I move, Mr. Chairman, that section 3(6) be deleted and the following substituted:

3(6)(1) Within five days after the day on which the second of the members is appointed, the two members appointed by or on behalf of the parties shall appoint a third member who has indicated his willingness to act, and such third member shall be chairman.

Then 3(6)(2) of that would read:

Where the two members appointed by or on behalf of the parties fail within five days after the appointment of the second of them to agree upon the third member, the minister shall, upon notice in writing of such failure, given to him by either of them, appoint within 10 days a third member, and such third member shall be the chairman.

This is a very simple amendment even though it is rather lengthy.

Rather than provide for the appointment by the Minister of Labour of the chairman of the arbitration board it simply gives an opportunity for the two parties to agree to appoint a chairman. I might say at this time that I fully suspect that the two parties may well not be able to agree upon a chairman and that the Minister of Labour will have to do precisely as he has done in the shortened form. But here again, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say that this gives another opportunity for the two parties to reach some sort of agreement.

Although your experiences and the experiences of your staff—who, I might say, in my opinion have laboured very hard and long in this strike and very, very meritoriously to try to settle it—have been such that you may well suspect that this is absolutely impossible. I would like to see them have the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, I certainly do appreciate the comments of my hon. friend. It is a fact that in most cases the two nominees have the privilege of appointing a chairman. Now, in this particular case we gave the minister the power to appoint the third member, the chairman, for the simple reason that the number of knowledgeable arbitrators in this type of a strike in industry is limited in this province.

As you can imagine, if by any chance they are all rejected by both parties and the minister later on has to appoint a chairman who has been rejected by one of the parties, we wouldn't be in a very good position. That's the reason why we have given the minister special powers in this case.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour of Mr. Bounsall's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the motion lost and the subsection carried.

The member for Rainy River on section 3, subsection 14.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): I will have subsection 11.

Mr. Chairman: Subsection 11? All right, we'll have subsection 11.

Mr. Gisborn: I want to raise a question with the minister on subsection 11 of section 3. How does he anticipate that this section can work when the whole application of the section depends upon the word "reasonable"? This section has many implications. I wonder if the minister might explain?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I know the term "reasonable time" has been used here because we do need flexibility. However, I would give assurance to the member that it is not our intention to drag out the proceedings, far from it, but we feel that we have to have this precaution, this "reasonable time," although we intend to push ahead as fast as we can.

Mr. Gisborn: I really don't know what's in the minds of the minister or his staff, but certainly it might be an unfair situation in regard to the union and the company. If the board takes as much time as some boards have taken, where it can run into three or four months, and there is no pressure on the board the time element of a decision coming down in the fall or bad weather can in one case be beneficial to management and in another case beneficial to the employees. If the work is caught up in the fall then the management can make up their minds to stall the questions. Don't you think there should be a 30 days, 60 days or some period set as an utmost limit anyway?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm very much aware of this. I again assure the member that no, I can't just give him a definite date, but certainly as we all understand here today, time is of the essence.

Mr. Chairman: Shall subsection 11 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, if I may, we have an amendment to subsection 14 that deals with this very subject and I'd like to say a few words about subsection 11. If our amendment is accepted it would strike out the words "reasonable time limit." We are not dealing with general legislation which is going to last, not forever and ever, but for years to come – with suitable amendments. We are talking about a specific bill to deal with a specific problem in a specific time limit.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this party will support the idea that there should be a specific time limit within which the arbitration board must report to the minister; and we have suggested that this be 30 days after the end or conclusion of the hearings that are held.

We feel that this is more than sufficient time, given the seven months' that the strike has gone on now and the time that will be expended by the time that the arbitration board has been appointed and has its public hearing. We feel that 30 days from the end of those hearings is sufficient time for that three-man committee to arrive at some kind of decision as to the collective agreement.

And we on this side would hope that the minister would take into consideration a specific piece of legislation dealing with a specific problem and accept a specific time limit.

Mr. Chairman: In the meantime, shall subsection 11 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister would consider a response in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I do think that this really would be unenforceable. If, for instance, the 30-day period was extended by one day, 31 days, then we would have to reconstitute a whole board and start all over again. And that's the reason—not that we want to stall things. But supposing it was a case of a day or two extension, then we would have to reconstitute the board and this would delay matters more than it is now.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, surely the minister finds that argument a little specious; 30 days after the end of the hearing is certainly ample time to begin with. Perhaps the minister could then indicate what he feels himself is a reasonable time limit, after the hearings have been held?

Surely 30 days is more than reasonable?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, if it was left to the wish of the minister, the sooner the better. But we don't want to be in a straitjacket; really that's what I'm saying.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I add to what my colleague from Rainy River said? We are not in any way putting the ministry in a straitjacket. What we are saying here in effect is that you are dealing with a piece of legislation that's specific and, I think we all agree, that is essentially—as we said that afternoon—reprehensible to us.

It's all right in general legislation, as you have in the Labour Relations Act where you talk about a reasonable time, but we're saying here that the reason for this legislation itself is a need to expedite the return to work of the employer and the return to a responsible position by the employee. We are not in any way, as you notice, fettering the length of time that that board of arbitration will sit. We particularly made it our intention that we couldn't in any way fetter the board in the time of its deliberations.

We're saying that we cannot have such subjective words in this type of legislation. Who is to decide what is reasonable? It might well be that the minister regards six months as a reasonable time. We particularly don't regard six months as a reasonable time. Surely to goodness, no matter what the volume of evidence or other documentation put before that board of arbitration, 30 days is an adequate time for them to come to some conclusions.

That's the only thing we are attempting to convey.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): We don't want another Hydro strike.

Mr. Deans: Just one comment on the matter, if I may, Mr. Chairman. It strikes me that if all of the matters in dispute which it was possible to make retroactive were made retroactive, then the decision as to the time would not be as important.

If it were possible, for example, to ensure that every single matter in this dispute which could possibly be made retroactive to the starting date of the negotiations was made to be retroactive to that date, then I don't think we would have this discussion about whether or not it takes 30 days, or 40 days or 60 days. I'm just making the point that the problem in this is that there is quite a bit of ambiguity and a lot of latitude as far as the board rendering decisions is concerned.

With each passing day there is a distinct possibility of a continued loss of opportunity both for the employer and the employee. I feel that setting a time limit would, in fact, be beneficial since we are not likely to get the other passed here tonight.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to explain to the acting leader of the New Democratic Party that we entirely agree. If we are able to convince the government to an amendment that would force the board to make its recommendations retroactive to May 1, 1972, there is no need for us to worry about the question of reasonable time.

The problem is that there is an entire congealing of about three aspects of the functions and responsibilities of the board, and we have to take one at a time. As the legislation stands now the arbitration board has no responsibility to make its recommendations reroactive to May 1, 1972, so we must talk about the question of 30 days and reasonable time.

Mr. Deans: I understand. I am only telling you why we feel it is necessary.

Mr. Chairman: We have no amendment before us at this time. We could place it in a moment.

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, further to this same point I recall the last day of the last session in which we were dealing with the amendments to the Hospital Labour Disputes Act. The amendment to that Act was to provide a means by which the whole arbitration procedure was speeded up and decisions rendered more quickly. In that Act, we had the phrase, "within a reasonable time." I argued with the minister — well, the minister and I exchanged views — at that time that a time limit should be put on it as appears in the Police Act of this province. The argument back was that we were dealing with a lot of hospitals and that might hinder it.

What was of concern to the minister at that time, as he saw in certain other arbitration proceedings, was that after the hearings were held the arbitrators went about their normal business and one of them even took a vacation. What we're saying to them by putting a time limit here is, "You do not go about your normal vocation, whatever that may be, and you do not take a vacation. You sit exactly where you are and you bang out your decision."

I think if we leave it open-ended, unless you are willing to put continual pressure on the arbitrators and get them back from their normal employment or forbid them to go away for a weekend or forbid them to go away for a vacation — unless you are willing to do that all the time, it would be much safer and more convenient for you to have a time limit in this bill.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, let me move something and get it on the floor. I would move that—

Mr. Chairman: We have an amendment pending for 14. If we could just move that section—

Mr. Deans: I think this probably satisfies it and it may, in fact, even satisfy the minister. That section 3 subsection 11 be amended as follows: Delete the words "reasonable time" and substitute the following, "30 days of completion of the board's hearings." The section would then read

> Where, after the board of arbitration has been established, either the employers or the unions complain to the minister that it has failed to render its decision within 30 days of the completion of the board's hearings, the minister may, after consulting the employers and the unions and the board, issue whatever order he considers necessary.

Mr. Reid: No, we are leaving it up to the minister and we don't know. Even now, he won't tell us what he considers a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. Deans: Well, I will move it. You can vote against it if you wish.

Mr. Bullbrook: In fairness, would you consider withdrawing it since I think we are of one mind? The Chairman has suggested that perhaps we pass through subsection 11 and go to 14. We have made an analysis of the legislation and the effect of our amendment to 14 would be to wipe out the words "within a reasonable time" in 11. If you would consider going through 11 without voting on it—

Mr. Deans: Well, you were the ones who said you didn't want to do that.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member for Wentworth withdraw the motion at this time?

Mr. Deans: All right. I don't care. I am only trying to get the thing out of the way.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any other comment before subsection 14 then?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would move an amendment to section 3, subsection 14 to

read as follows, ". . . which decision shall be rendered not later than 30 days after the conclusion of the hearings."

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Reid has moved an amendment to section 3, subsection 14, as follows: ". . . which decision shall be rendered not later than 30 days after the conclusion of the hearings." That's to be added at the end of the existing subsection 14.

Mr. Deans: May I ask a question?

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Mr. Deans: And if it isn't, what then? If it isn't rendered in 30 days, then what?

Mr. Reid: Well, under this clause it has to be; that's the whole point.

Mr. Chairman: It says, "which decision shall be rendered . . ."

Mr. Reid: I'd like to say a word or two, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I won't reiterate the arguments I have already put forward when we were discussing subsection 11; they simply require the board to bring down a decision within 30 days. I cannot agree with the minister that this unduly fetters the arbitration board. Surely 30 days is soon enough.

We've heard from the member for Windsor West, who has outlined a case where the people went on vacation and never arrived at a decision. The minister sits in his place and will not give us any indication of what he considers a reasonable time.

We are here passing this bill tonight because there are time limits that make this particular situation critical. In this amendment we are defining for the minister what we consider a reasonable time for a collective agreement to be arrived at, and I would hope that all members would support it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, we don't think we can accept this amendment; we don't think we can enforce it. As I said earlier, if the limit of 30 days is exceeded by a day or two, then we would have to reconstitute another board. This would oblige us to start all over again—in fact, three or four times—just for the sake of a day or two.

Mr. Reid: It doesn't. It obliges the minister to have a report within 30 days.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We know of a case, for instance, where a police arbitration has been taken to court by an employer simply because the arbitration award was issued after the time limit in the Police Act.

Mr. Haggerty: What about the Ontario Hydro strike? That has gone to arbitration and isn't settled yet.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, if the minister is adamant in the position he has taken, then he must make a firm statement now in the House or agree that he will send a letter to the board, when it is established, telling the members firmly—you see, they have got to have some direction as to what their responsibilities are.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's true.

Mr. Gisborn: How long are they going to be before they finish their hearings?

Mr. Bullbrook: I told you, didn't I?

Mr. Gisborn: I am not concerned about rendering a decision, but rather how long they are going to take to come to a conclusion. They could play around all summer, having hearings now and a couple of hearings in the next two or three weeks, and then come back next October and say, "We haven't completed our hearings yet".

If the minister lays down some guidelines and says, "Look, we expect that within 30 days you will have concluded your hearings," then he has the right to say, "I can put the pressure on after a reasonable length of time, which should be 10 or 12 days, to get the reports drafted." Then he can put the pressure on. But we want the hearings concluded at some point, because the hearings can be jockeyed to go on indefinitely—right up until the next set of negotiations start—if there isn't something in the Act or a letter to the board or a statement by the minister to give them guidelines to the effect that, "This is the action I expect from this legislation." If not, then we are being foolish about the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I agree with the hon. member. I certainly will be glad to give instructions, although I would not like to have them in the legislation and then find later on that we are in trouble as a result.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are just going to say in closing, in connection with this part, that we have put our position to the minister and defined that position. We find it a sad commentary that the response from the minister

and his assistants is some analogy to a police arbitration. This is the tragedy of understanding.

This is a specific piece of legislation, which for the first time in this province deals with the intrusion of compulsory arbitration outside the public sector. When the minister starts analogizing to arbitration of the public sector, which is almost a day-by-day, week-by-week occurrence, we don't accept that at all.

We are going to undertake no further argument in this respect, because we have other amendments that are much more important and that we will be much more vigorous with respect to.

Mr. Chairman: I'll place the question then. Those in favour of Mr. Reid's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost and all sections up to subsection 14 carried.

Is there any comment, question or amendment on subsection 15?

Shall section 3 then stand as part of the bill?

Carried.

Any comment, question or amendment on section 4?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, I'd like—

Mr. Reid: Subsection 4.

Mr. Bounsall: Subsection 2.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Anything before subsection 2 of section 4?

Mr. Gisborn: Well, subsection 2. The same as—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, I move that section 4 (2) be deleted.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bounsall has moved that section 4, subsection 2 be deleted. Any comments on this?

The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: I don't know what my colleague had in mind with respect to this; maybe he was proposing a substitution. However, I have a very great problem here. This refers of course, to the arbitration board not deciding on matters that come within the jurisdiction of the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

This might be okay if it weren't for the fact that the arbitration board cannot solve jurisdictional disputes which must be decided by, I believe, the Labour Relations Board. This was a decision which was handed out during the Omega arbitration decision. It was held at that point that the arbitration board could not decide matters of jurisdiction and they should go to the Labour Relations Board. That has been fought, as well, through the courts. I would hate to see that come up here but the matter of jurisdiction certainly is one of the outstanding matters in the dispute.

As you have all read from the material which you have received, one of the items in the dispute is pre-assembly or factory fabrication. This, therefore, is or could be interpreted as a matter of jurisdictional nature. In terms of the pre-assembly and the factory fabrication, to give the history of what has happened—again the minister will know the history of this—for the other members of the House, both sides agree this matter is, more or less, of not very great importance.

When the union was strongly opposed to it and the company said, in words to this effect, "Well, it really won't affect you, so let's put it in," the union replied with, "If it really isn't going to affect us, why put it in?" It was agreed that they would not put it in. They would return to the normal wording of the old agreement which did not have provisions for pre-assembly and factory fabrication.

However, on March 3, when the union proposed voluntary arbitration of all matters in dispute the companies withdrew that offer. Now, according to the bill, it's going to be removed from the jurisdiction of the arbitration board and will end up before the Labour Relations Board and, no doubt, will go through the courts. It's on those grounds, unless the minister can otherwise assure us, that there will be no way that pre-assembly or factory fabrication will be removed from the hands of the arbitration board, that we would move the deletion of this entire section.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that all matters in dispute will be going to the arbitration board. All of them.

Mr. Bounsall: Are you giving me assurance, then, that in no way, because it might be interpreted as a jurisdictional matter, will the issue of pre-assembly and factory fabrication be given to the Labour Relations Board?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I give you the assurance that all matters in dispute are going to

the arbitration board, which means the same thing.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman: may I ask the minister what purpose subsection 2 serves? What is your reasoning for having that in the bill? Why is it there?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): To protect an awful lot of people.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Well, you get up and tell us, then.

Mr. Reid: I hate to admit it, but you know more about what's going on than the minister does.

Mr. Drea: I know that the member for Hamilton East should be very concerned about this.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have a comment to that? Are we ready for the question?

Mr. Reid: Well, why is it there? We'd like an answer.

Mr. Haggerty: Tell us!

Mr. Reid: Did the minister not hear me?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I answered. I said all matters in dispute are going before the arbitration board. Now, any other matters which could come under this will, of course, come under the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

Mr. Reid: What other matters?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, I can't think of any now, but there could be some that might arise.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I invite the minister's response to a possibly specific example?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Right.

Mr. Bullbrook: Suppose the collective bargaining unit is ascertained at the present time. The shrinking of the bargaining unit by some type of contracting out, such as the member for Windsor West refers to, that type of thing would eventually come before the Ontario Labour Relations Board, but I take it that it is not going to come before this board of arbitration. Then surely we are entitled to some type of response as to why this section is placed in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that I think I have made it very clear that all the matters in dispute at the present time are going before the arbitration board. Most of these questions were in the previous collective agreements and they are going before the board. As to any other matters within the jurisdiction of the Ontario Labour Relations Board, there is none at the present time that comes to my mind.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, let the record show then that the minister has subsection 2 of clause 4 in the bill, and he doesn't know why it is there.

An hon. member: Hurry up with the note.

Mr. Deans: Let's not bother about showing whether he knows why it is there or not. If, in fact, all of the matters that are currently in the dispute are going to arbitration, then this particular section isn't necessary in the bill, because they cannot deviate beyond that without mutual consent of both parties. So I would think the minister ought to be able without any difficulty to withdraw the section from the bill, to delete it from the bill, and renumber all of the other sections.

Mr. Reid: The note writer must be a slow writer.

Mr. Deans: Let me wait until he finishes reading his note, if you don't mind.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that the Labour Relations Board retains exclusive jurisdiction in matters such as unfair practices or legality of strikes. The board of arbitration will not deal with such issues, and that is why the section is in.

Mr. Deans: In answer to that, the fact of the matter is the board of arbitration wasn't going to deal with that anyway. The board of arbitration was going to deal solely with the matters which were in dispute. They were not going to deal with any other mattters.

Therefore, if you say that the board shall confine itself to all matters in dispute and other matters of a collective agreement nature which are agreed upon by the two parties, then you don't have to have this section in and you don't then have the worry of the board dealing with some matter which may be within the jurisdiction of the Labour Relations Board and subject to some kind of appeal.

We are liable to find out that the arbitration board will hand down an award. The award will have contained within it something which one or other of the parties will interpret to be within the ambit of the Labour Relations Board and they will apply then for a writ of—which, certiorari or mandamus?

They will apply for a writ anyway which will in fact hold up the—

Mr. Bullbrook: A writ anyway.

Mr. Deans: —I cannot remember which one it is—the application of the award. So what you are really doing is leaving an opening in this particular arbitration legislation which one or the other parties may well take advantage of. They will look through every single section and try to find, if they want, a clause somewhere which can be loosely interpreted to be within the terms of reference of the Labour Relations Board and which therefore could then nullify much of the effort that has gone into it. If it isn't necessary, take it out.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I didn't say it wasn't necessary. As I see it now I think any matters having to do with unfair practices or legality of strikes certainly wouldn't be dealt with by the arbitration board but would come under the Labour Relations Board—and that is why the section is in.

Mr. Chairman: Shall we place the question now?

The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Chairman, I have a question: Can the minister assure the House that in no way will this arbitration award attempt to dragoon people who now belong to unions other than the locals of the International Union of Elevator Constructors into that organization against their will as a condition of employment?

Mr. Deans: That would be a matter for the Labour Relations Board.

Mr. Drea: That is the point.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, in a sense I have to support the minister on this. I think it is necessary for it to be there. I think there are several sections of the Labour Relations Act that could be used by either party that would confuse an arbitration board and they would have to go for legal advice as to whether they could deal with the issue or not.

If it is spelled out here that they can't deal with issues that come within the jurisdiction of the board, then they can just take the Act and prove it to themselves. There are three or four sections. There is the one mentioned for fair labour practices; there are charges of failure to bargain in good faith. I can't see the harm in any kind of a time limit that might be involved being in there, as long as we know what it means.

I think the benefit of discussing it in this manner is that the arbitration board that is set up will be able to read Hansard to get some idea of problems they might run into.

I take it that we have a firm statement that they are going to be able to deal with all those things that were in dispute. The things that concerned me were the status quo of the conditions of hiring in order to still have the right to this practice regarding training and the skills and competency of the employee. And if they have a joint training programme, that it will be part of the consideration of the arbitration board. I think those are the things that are in major dispute at this point between the company and the unions—what we call management's residual rights, or management's rights.

Now, can the minister give me assurance that there is nothing in the Labour Relations Act or in the jurisdiction of the board that will forbid the arbitration board to deal with that question of managerial rights?

I can't remember whether there is any specific clause in the Labour Relations Act or in the regulations that says that this decision has to be dealt with by the board; that is managerial rights. Is there anything in the Act that protects managerial rights? Does any section forbid managerial rights from being dealt with in negotiations? That is going to be the major point.

And when you tell us that they are going to be able to deal with all issues in dispute, we have to take your word that it will be those that exist at the present time regarding the status quo position between those companies and that union; so that we know very clearly that the major issues are going to be dealt with.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I think I've said it three times, and I have made it quite clear; all matters in dispute are going to arbitration.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions?

Those in favour of Mr. Bounsall's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

I declare the motion lost, and the subsection carried.

Any other comment, question or amendment on a later section?

The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: I have an amendment to section 4, subsection 4. I would like to add:

Provided that if the parties hereto are unable to decide upon the length of a collective agreement, then that term in the decision of the board of arbitration shall not exceed a period of one year after the date of the collective agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words in regard to this. The members will hearken back to section 3, subsections 11 and 14. This again is an attempt to limit the arbitrary powers of the arbitration board that we are setting up.

I would remind the minister once again—and I'm afraid that I don't believe he understands the gravity of it—of what we are doing here today in this legislation. We are trying to limit the time in a specific situation for a specific time. We feel that unless we put this limitation on the collective agreement, the arbitration board can arbitrarily set a time of five years, 10 years or 20 years.

The point that has to be made is that this is compulsory arbitration and what this party wants to see is these two parties to the agreement, union and management, back to normal collective bargaining procedures as soon as possible. That, we feel, would be one year after the collective agreement is arrived at.

We don't particularly want to see a compulsory collective agreement lasting for five or 10 or 20 years, because that is a danger-out precedent. We want the two parties to resume normal collective bargaining procedures as soon as possible and that is the reason for this amendment. We hope it would be supported.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, of course we feel the question of term is not a serious issue. We feel that the board needs flexibility and the parties can always agree in writing in the term of the agreement if they prefer not to leave this to the board's discretion. That is the reason why we have that in there. We understand that so far the parties have been talking in terms of negotiating a five-year agreement.

Mr. Reid: May I just pose one question to the minister? Does he think that under this compulsory arbitration we are dealing with it is a good idea to impose on two parties in a compulsory way a collective agreement that lasts more than one year? Should it not be the idea and the end of this legislation to have these two parties resume normal collective bargaining procedures as soon as possible? We are trying to take the sting out of the compulsory aspects of this legislation—

Mr. Deans: It is too late.

Mr Reid: —as much as possible, and I would ask the minister, does he not feel that this is a reasonable amendment under the circumstances of compulsion?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No. We think that the board needs that flexibility; and as I said, the parties can agree in writing, they can agree by themselves if they want to have a two-year, three-year or possibly five-year agreement.

Mr. Bullbrook: But we recognize that on this side of the House. We have envisaged this in our amendments, Mr. Chairman, and we hope that it would come to pass that the parties would agree on the term. I would suggest to you that until the parties know what the terms of the collective agreement are, they are not going to agree on the terms, because they are not going to bind themselves to some unknown equation between themselves, for a length of five years or otherwise, until they know what that particular equation is.

Now my colleague from Rainy River has directly and sincerely put the question to you. He says, in effect, we in this House all profess belief in the collective bargaining system in the free enterprise aspect of our economic operations. We said that today. We spent about eight hours talking about that today. We say superimposed upon that—

Mr. Foulds: The House has not sat for eight hours today.

Mr. Bullbrook: Some of us have said that superimposed upon that, the public good demands this compulsory arbitration. We are not going to permit the type of response that the minister made. The minister responds on the basis of the good faith of the board, that is fine; the understanding of the board, that is fine; the intelligence of the board, that is fine. But what is wrong is that we are passing laws here; we are not dealing in good faith, or understanding, or wisdom, or experience.

We are now setting a precedent for future laws in the Province of Ontario that says that we will impose compulsory arbitration, and we will permit that board of arbitration to compel those two parties to live under a collective agreement, that they had nothing to do with arriving at, for an indefinite length of time. That is not accepted by the Liberal

Party and it won't be accepted by the Liberal Party.

We don't know who the government will appoint. I would presume in the wisdom and stature of the minister's office, that he will appoint as his representative to this board, someone knowledgeable and experienced, and someone who will write a collective agreement based on the objectivity and integrity of his position. But we are writing laws; we can't rely on that.

We have to write laws recognizing that that law says this is now a collective agreement which will bind the economic relationships between those two parties for as long as that board wants them to be bound. And it is not exaggerating to say that that board can bind them for 50 years. The board won't, but that begs the question. It is not what the board will do, it is what the people through their elected representatives permit the board to do. That is the essential ingredient.

The government can't write legislation giving carte blanche effect to any board, no matter how wise or possessed of no matter what integrity. The board can't say it is going to write a collective agreement for as long as it wants; it is impossible for us to conceive. If the very concept is unattractive, surely to goodness how can we even tolerate the thought of permitting a board to write an agreement for as long as it wants? We have to say to it that public pressure, the good of the public, has dictated that we pass this legislation, that we want to minimize the effect of this legislation, and we want to bring these parties back to collective agreement in good faith as soon as we can.

Again, it is inconceivable that it be for less than a year. It is arbitrary to say that it should be for two years. The position of this party will be set out in another amendment that the board must be bound to bring its recommendations back to the effective termination date of the prior contract, May 1, 1972.

We say that we can't tolerate the concept of leaving this legislation wide open. We say that the best avenue of approach is to say to that board, "Do your best, write a report which becomes a collective agreement binding on these people, but only for one year." Let them go back to their collective bargaining process as much as possible, and please don't give me the response saying we might be back here again next year. So be it! I would hope we wouldn't be, that they would learn their lesson as a result of this exercise, but the answer can't be that shallow response, "We might be back here again next year." So what's the difference? That is what we are here for. If we have to pass another law then we will pass it at that time.

The essential principle that I try to convey through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister of Labour is that we have got to minimize the life of that board of arbitration as far as imposing its thought on the parties to this agreement is concerned. Collective bargaining means that people come together of their own volition and arrive at agreement, saying to themselves, "We might not be happy about it, but we will live under it because we agreed to live under it." The government is saying here, "We might not be happy about it, but somebody else will tell you that you will live under it and they will tell you how long you will live under it." We can't accept that.

Mr. Deans: Now we have come full circle, Mr. Chairman. This is where we began this afternoon and we have now arrived at that point where we have decided—the Liberals and ourselves, I think, in all fairness—that the contract should be retroactive to the initial bargaining day. If we were now to adopt this, and we will support it, the termination date for this particular arbitration would be, I think, May 1, 1973.

Mr. Bullbrook: The beginning of the new contract.

Mr. Deans: No, to the beginning of the new contract. It says "at the beginning of May, 1973." It would be one year after the date on which the contract became effective. Therefore, it would begin at the beginning of May, 1973, if we accept the retroactivity feature.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, I am sorry. May I clarify this? Would you permit me to clarify it? The intention of the Liberal Party is this, that the new agreement, when written, would be retroactive to May 1, 1972, and would be effective to the one year after the decision is given. Under the terms of this statute, the decision becomes a collective agreement. This collective agreement might be, for example, two years and 48 days.

We are saying, in effect, that we have a twofold responsibility. One is to make sure that there is retroactivity to the terminal date of the prior contract. And we're saying that the new contract should only be in being one year from the date of the collective agreement, namely, the decision of the board. It

might not be two years. It might be 2½ years. It might be two years and 40 days.

Mr. Deans: I don't interpret the amendment to say that. Nevertheless, if that's the intention of it, again, we'll support it. It's certainly better than to be left in the ambiguous position that we're in.

We happen to have thought all along that it wasn't necessary to impose an agreement. I think, in fact, looking ahead, it wasn't necessary to impose an agreement. I honestly believe that, given enough time, we could have come to some understanding on that. I do think that it's unrealistic to impose anything more than a one-year agreement in this instance. I think it's unrealistic to impose it at all. I think it's unrealistic to permit the board even to consider more than one year.

For a number of reasons, not the least of which is that since this is the first foray into the private section with arbitration, we want to make it as short as humanly possible, and in the interval we want to see the minister amend the appropriate sections of the Labour Relations Act to make sure that collective bargaining will, in fact, take place in the Province of Ontario under more reasonable conditions, at least for these people.

I don't think that it's reasonable to talk about a five-year contract imposed by an arbitration board. I don't think it's sensible to talk about a five-year contract imposed by an arbitration board. In fact, I don't care what side of the contract you're on, because there are going to be matters in that award which are totally unpalatable. To impose them for a period of five years would almost certainly create labour unrest which would result in work stoppages, which would result in a great deal of friction and which would not be healthy for the labour relations of the Province of Ontario.

I do think that the minister could, by an appropriate amendment—I'm not too sure this amendment does what it asks, by the way—limit the term of the contract to 12 months after the date the collective agreement is signed, and at that time the parties could then resume the normal collective bargaining process. I don't think that we want to see arbitration in this province exceed the very minimal length of time that it's possible to establish a contract for it. I think a year is about the minimum. I think a year in this instance should be the maximum. I would ask the Minister of Labour to give very serious consideration to this particular amendment. I think, in fact, it makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: I would rather the situation be left with guidelines presented to the arbitration board at this point. I think that we're too late in trying to decide that. I can't say whether or not one year would be a good term for the board to lay down. I don't know whether two years would be, or whether six months would be. I don't think anybody here can say that. I think that guidelines to the board in relationship to the term of the agreement that is brought down should be decided between the parties, before the board starts to determine the issues. That could properly be done, I think, by a letter of direction to the board to have the parties make their decision first, whether or not they want to agree upon a term for the agreement that will be brought down.

Mr. Bullbrook: They can agree under the statute. That is in there. If they want to make it two years they can make it two years. If they want to make it 20 years they can make it 20 years.

Mr. Gisborn: I don't read the statute as saying anything about the term of the agreement.

Mr. Reid: It says, "any matter they agree to".

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: I was just going to say, Mr. Chairman, that of all the amendments that are likely to come up tonight, this is one which I think the Minister of Labour should give the most serious consideration to accepting.

I don't think the two parties in the dispute have really thought out what term they would be willing to accept under the conditions of an imposed, compulsory, binding arbitration situation. What has been said about their opinion as to whether they would like or dislike the arbitration decision, I think, goes without saying. There are going to be large sections that both parties will not like. Just because they have had a history of five-year contracts, now forced, would cause them to think or feel that five years is the norm. But they have not yet thought about the consequences of living under an agreement, perhaps a third of which both parties find completely abhorrent.

When we are bringing in this legislation,

which compels them to accept the decision made by three other persons, we have the opportunity to further underline that we do not want binding compulsory arbitration to become a precedent or a solution to anything in terms of a dispute in this province. We can further underline this by putting a real but short period of time right into the legislation.

The minister may say, or I may say, to an arbitration board, "Handle this with kid gloves, and don't give them too long or too short a time." But I think it would be better, and there is a real obligation on us, to actually state the time in the legislation. I would hope the minister would accept this amendment as part of his responsibility in this matter to spell it out.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: It is a fact that over the years the parties have had five-year agreements. But I think the member for Hamilton East has made a very good point too. We feel that the board needs flexibility. We feel the issues in dispute, such as the duration of the agreement and the degree of retroactivity, are all interrelated. The board would be most effective if it had the discretion to deal with all these matters; that is the reason for it and the reason why I won't entertain any amendment to this clause.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, the fact of the matter —and I say this most respectfully—is that the minister doesn't entertain this because his advisers don't entertain it. I suggest this with the greatest respect. The question of flexibility is a pure red herring. They have ample flexibility.

If you follow the logic of what the minister is saying, Mr. Chairman, to do a proper job the board must have flexibility as far as two things are concerned. One is the term of the agreement, and the second is the question of retroactivity. The statute doesn't even give them the power to direct the term or retroactivity, because the parties can agree on the terms. It takes it outside the purview of the board. There is no logic in that.

How can the minister say to his colleagues in this House that it's absolutely essential that this board have flexibility as far as writing the term and the question of retroactivity are concerned, when the parties might agree themselves as to the term or as to retroactivity?

We are happy if the parties do that. The fact is that once they do, the board under subsection 10 is no longer vested with the question of term because it only relates to matters in dispute. If the question of term is not in dispute, then the board has nothing to say about it. If the board then has nothing to say about it, how can you stand in your place and say to the members of this House that it is absolutely essential that the board have sufficient flexibility to dictate the term of the agreement?

That is a noxious and unacceptable type of circuitous logic that has no foundation at all. The fact is that it is not a question of the board's inflexibility or flexibility, it is a question of the Ministry of Labour's inflexibility. It absolutely refuses under this legislation to accept the logical premise that under this legislation you are going to permit people other than the elected representatives of the people of Ontario to impose their decision for as long as they want on other citizens of the Province of Ontario, and that is totally unacceptable.

If we said today in this House, and voted on it in this House, that we are going to impose a collective agreement for five years, fine, then the people of Ontario have spoken; they have said through their elected representatives that we are going to bind these people to a five-year contract. But you are not doing that; in this legislation you are not even delegating that authority; you're not even saying that the board must write the contract for five years.

You're saying the board can write the contract for as long as it wants to, and that is not proper. That will never be proper, and this party won't accept that, and we are going to divide the House on that principle, because that principle is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Chairman, once again we are faced with the attempts of a legalistic mind to get into the field of labour relations. I prefer to go along with the member for Hamilton East. He has spoken with his customary insight based upon a good number of years of experience in industrial relations.

Mr. Bullbrook: He has changed his mind, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Chairman, to tie the hands of this arbitration board, whether we make it in the form of legislation for six months, or two years, or three years or five years, there is one inevitable consequences, and it appeals to the legalistic mind. They always like to see the customer twice; we'll be back here again doing it all over again. That is the

inevitable consequence of that type of very peculiar overview.

If we are going to have an arbitration board, we just got finished, under another section, talking about the fact that everything that is in dispute between the parties is going before that arbitration board subject to conforming with the Labour Relations Act of the province. We have just got done saying that that was a very good idea, and then here we are, into another section and we are saying, "Tie the hands of the board."

Mr. Good: They don't agree.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): The member for Scarborough Centre must have failed law school.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Roy: Have you failed law school?

Mr. Drea: I had enough brains not to go there. What's the member for Ottawa East's excuse?

Mr. Roy: You missed the point.

Mr. Drea: What I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that this House does not want to be back here within a specific period of time at the expiration of whatever agreement is consummated, either by compulsion or voluntarily during this arbitration. It wants this thing settled once and for all and then after that, the parties will go through the normal collective bargaining procedure. I say to you that to put a time limit on the duration of the contract—and it's not just how many days or how many months it is going to run—takes away the entire flexibility of the arbitrator.

In the end one man is going to make this decision. We are talking about three; two of them are going to be known to the parties; one man is going to make this. Take away his flexibility to produce a package, and that package includes the time, and the time may be very important in this.

Mr. Bullbrook: It doesn't include the time.

Mr. Drea: If you take away the flexibility in this, all you have done is brought them back here in 30 days or 60 days after the time limit imposed by the arbitrator.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of Mr. Reid's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion the "nays" have it.

All right; it requires a vote. Shall we stack this along with any possible future votes?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Stacked.

Any other comments, questions or amendments on section 4?

Mr. Reid: Subsection 10 of section 4, Mr. Chairman—to amend subsection 10, section 4 so that it shall read as follows: "In making its decision upon matters in dispute between the parties, the board of arbitration shall provide that any of the terms of the agreement shall be retroactive to the first day of May, 1972, and such decision shall be in full force and effect for a period of one year from the date of the collective agreement unless the parties agree otherwise."

I thought the Premier was making a speech outside there for a minute when I heard that noise, Mr. Chairman.

An. hon. member: As long as he does it there, not in here.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, this pretty well was in line with the other amendments we presented. The effect of our amendment in section 10 is really to replace the word "may" with "shall." We feel that the collective agreement as reached by the board of arbitration should be retroactive to the end of the last collective agreement that we're dealing with. In the legislation it again gives the board the arbitrary power to decide when the effective date of the agreement shall be. We feel that as a principle of collective bargaining the new agreement should begin immediately after the conclusion of the old one. We would direct the board that this be necessarily so and that the terms of the agreement be retroactive to May, 1972.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose there's much sense reiterating the argument. I've been disappointed tonight in the inflexibility of the minister and I think his complete misunderstanding of the collective bargaining process, the free choices that are involved by the parties to these agreements. I would hope that this amendment, if nothing else, would be acceptable to the minister as part of the collective bargaining process as it exists.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can well understand and support the intent of the hon. member for Rainy River. I think that all matters which can be made retroactive

should be made retroactive. There are obviously matters in this dispute which there is no possible hope of making retroactive, nor would we want them made retroactive. I think if you were going to have such a section it would have to be worded a little differently. We support the intent of the hon. member for Rainy River because, in fact, we too want to see the terms of the contract for which there is either a possibility of retroactivity or a monetary value which can be applied made retroactive to the date of the termination of the last contract.

I think the minister should, in fact, direct the board to find in that way on matters of wages, on matters of pensions, on matters which are in fact capable of being applied retroactively. It should be a decision of this Legislature tonight that they ought to be applied retroactively. We recognize, and I'm sure the hon. member for Rainy River recognizes, that there are things at this point in this dispute for which there is neither a monetary value nor any hope of retroactivity.

So I would like to ask the minister to make the appropriate change. I would suggest that the change might say, "shall provide that any of the terms which can be applied retroactively shall be retroactive to May 1, 1972."

If that is acceptable then I would say that that we had in fact dealt fairly with the dispute and we had left sufficient leeway for the board to deal with all of the other matters.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. May I point out that the House can no longer sit after 10:30 unless certain action is taken?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): If there is a disposition on behalf of the members—I'm in the hands of the House—I think we might continue. I would ask that the committee rise and report. I think we have to go through that manoeuvre.

Mr. Deans: May I ask a question of the House leader? Would it be his intention to have the Lieutenant Governor come in tonight and give royal assent if this bill were to pass this evening?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is correct.

Mr. Deans: Then the Lieutenant Governor is standing by in the building?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is correct.

Mr. Deans: I want to say that we were not happy with the situation which prevailed prior to Christmas, and we made it known that we don't want to sit beyond 10:30 at any time in this Legislature. But tonight, simply because we are near the end of this bill and simply because we, like the government, perhaps want to see the thing completed, we will agree to sit until 11 o'clock if the House leader will agree that that would be an appropriate time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As I said, I'm in the hands of the House. I would be delighted to do that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress on one bill and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the House sit beyond the hour of 10:30.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I am glad to see the House leader did agree to 11 o'clock.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I did.

Mr. Deans: Thank you.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Order for committee of the whole House; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ELEVATOR CONSTRUCTOR UNIONS DISPUTES ACT

House in committee on Bill 2, the Elevator Constructor Union Disputes Act, 1973.

Mr. Chairman: When we rose, we were discussing Mr. Reid's amendment to subsection 10 of section 4. Is there any further discussion on it before the minister replies? The hon. minister.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Again, Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept the amendment. For instance, their wage formula certainly does not lend itself to automatic and full retroactivity because, as the hon. members know, there was an increase in July 1972, which I think is binding under the former collective agreement. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question? Those in favour of Mr. Reid's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

I declare the motion lost and subsection 10 carried.

Any comment, question or amendment on any later section of the bill? The member for York-Forest Hill. Which section?

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment which will add a section, section 11. My amendment is that section—

Mr. Chairman: Just before we get that far—

An hon. member: It's a subsection.

Mr. Givens: Subsection 11.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, subsection 11 to section 4?

Mr. Givens: Yes, adding subsection 11 to section 4.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Mr. Givens: I move that section 4 be amended by adding the following subsection after subsection 10, to be designated as subsection 11:

The board shall determine an order of priorities of categories of jobs to which the unions and employers shall return to work. Such order of priorities shall give preference to jobs on which public moneys are being expended, with particular reference to the completion of the construction of hospitals, senior citizens' housing, nursing homes and other such public facilities throughout the province.

Mr. Chairman, having regard for the batting average of all the amendments that have been put up here—it is quite evident what's been happening; the boys under the gallery have been sending notes to the minister and there has been a constipation of minds here —I am appealing to the members of the government opposite to try to—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. May I place the motion first?

Moved by Mr. Givens that section 4 be amended by adding the following subsection after subsection 10 to be designated as subsection 11.

> The board shall determine an order of priorities of categories of jobs to which the unions and employers shall return to work. Such order of priorities shall give preference to jobs on which public moneys are being expended, with particular reference to the completion of the construction of hospitals, senior citizens' housing, nursing homes and other such public facilities throughout the province.

The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to the members on the other side that this is not a political amendment. This is something I am proposing so that you can achieve the best possible results from what you are trying to do.

Having gone this far to impose compulsory arbitration you should try to see that you get the best benefit out of it that you possibly can as members of the government. Compulsory arbitration means that this gives you an opportunity to apply leverage so that you can achieve what you want to achieve. You couldn't have this leverage as a government if this was simply another collective bargaining agreement which was achieved between the parties because you are being called upon to impose compulsory arbitration. You have leverage so try to get the best deal that you can.

The second factor involved in this amendment has regard for the fact that there is a tremendous backlog of employment. Surely that is obvious to everybody! There is a tremendous backlog of jobs. Can you expect that today or tomorrow 1,200 people who are coming back to work will be able to get into all the jobs across the province?—the Sheratons, the hospitals, the housing developments and so on—and be able to catch up on that backlog in short order?

What is going to happen, Mr. Chairman, is this. There are going to be inducements offered by the big employers in the field, the big contractors, the big builders. They are going to offer bonuses, inducements. There will be inducements over the table. There will be inducements under the table.

The workers will want to go to the jobs and the companies involved will want to go to the big jobs because these jobs recur every month, every year, whereas a hospital or a nursing home is a one-shot proposition. They deal with a hospital board today; when they've finished the hospital they are through with them. They won't see them any more and there will be reluctance on the part of the workers and the companies to go to these particular jobs.

These are projects in which you have money involved. I mentioned in my main speech on the second reading today the 668-bed hospital down the street, the New Mount Sinai Hospital. You have invested $32 million and more in it, and it isn't only the money that you have got invested in it but the delivery of services that you are counting on over the next two or three years. You aren't going to get them if the workers and the companies are going to be busy finishing the Sheraton Hotel and other commercial developments.

Why don't you empower the board that you are setting up under this compulsory arbitration, which you are going to finalize before midnight tonight, and say to these birds, "We want you to finish the jobs in which the public has a direct and immediate interest"? Never mind whether you are going to be interfering with contractual developments; you are interfering with contractual developments anyway merely by imposing compulsory arbitration.

Surely, it is hypocritical to say on the one hand that you don't want to interfere with contractual involvements while on the other hand you are imposing a contractual involvement by compulsory arbitration. Surely, the members of the government, whose vote I have to have to swing this amendment, can see the importance of it. If you want to finish your hospitals, if you want to finish your nursing homes, if you want to finish your housing developments as quickly as possible, you are not going to do it unless the arbitration board is going to tell these people, both the unions and the contractors, that they are to finish these public jobs first and establish that order of priorities.

There is nothing more that I can possibly say to you because if you don't impose this kind of amendment you are not going to get these jobs finished. They are going to be finishing the luxury jobs first. If that is your idea of public duty, of doing duty to the public and of correcting the inhumanity and the callousness that I talked about earlier, I don't know what I have been doing here all day.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I support wholeheartedly the proposition that the hon. member for York-Forest Hill has put before the House. I don't know at this point whether I can support it as being part of the responsibility of the arbitration board. That's out of my field altogether. I just can't envisage how the board could make that determination in any realistic manner at all. But I certainly think the minister should do some thinking. Is there any member over there who could give some assurance —there are three ministers in the House—to the public that senior citizens' homes and hospitals and these places are looked after first as far as inspection and safe operation is concerned? We've talked about the safety hazard and this has been the nub of the whole situation, producing the bill to provide arbitration to look after these people in these homes and institutions, and there should be something done about it.

I agree that they should get priority with the number of workforces available. But I just can't say that I could support a proposition that it would be the responsibility of the arbitration board. But the government has a responsibility. If they believe that the reasons for this bill were valid then the priorities have to be put where they need to go on behalf of the people who need the services first.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, on this point, I agree with most of the comments which the member for Hamilton East has just made. I find great difficulty in having this type of priority and dictation of what work should be done under the aegis of the arbitration board, which is going to take some time to set up and some time to get agreement. These are not matters that they should be dealing with. They should be dealing with the matters that are in dispute between the two parties to this dispute. They should not be running around the province gathering material on what buildings should be done first.

I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiment that buildings in which the public funds of the Province of Ontario are involved should be completed first where they involve residences, either for senior citizens or families, as far as OHC money goes, then residences and other buildings in the province that don't involve public funds and then the whole class of commercial buildings. I think this can be achieved.

I said in my remarks this afternoon that the government has a responsibility, having brought this bill in with a view to public safety in mind and the inconvenience to the public, to see that priorities are set. I would say to the government that there are a

couple of ways they can do it: As a separate section in this bill, which has nothing to do with the arbitration board, indicating that you the government have the power to set the priorities on what work is to be done; or you now go and you talk to the companies, you review with them what their contracts are, with some flexibility in your own minds as to the length of the possible date they would have got to those contracts anyway, to get the most equitable—in terms of the criteria we have phrased—terms of getting that accomplished. If you meet resistance in that and do not have the power to then enforce those priorities, we would be more than willing to co-operate with you in a short bill that laid out those priorities.

But to give it to the arbitration board is, to me, a bastardization of what the arbitration board should be doing.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, I think the member for York-Forest Hill certainly made a suggestion which has a great deal of merit. However, as has been stated by two other members, we don't think that the arbitration board is really the agency that could do that. For one thing, as was stated, the board would probably not sit for some weeks, and I imagine the setting of priorities would have to be made very shortly. However, as I said, this suggestion has a great deal of merit. Perhaps we can accomplish the same thing and obtain the same goal by asking the minister, whether it is the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) or the Minister of Labour, to get in touch with these people and set priorities for them.

Mr. Givens: What is he going to do? Put salt on their tail?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): They are already working—

Mr. Givens: All right, you will hear about it later.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong the discussion, but I think that the minister should give an assurance to the House that he will introduce legislation or have some directive set out so that there could be priorities set up as to the type of building or buildings that are going to be listed in that series of priorities.

The member for York-Forest Hill certainly has made a real, impassioned plea for the need for the completion of certain very important facilities, such as hospitals that we can't delay. That should have been one of the prime priorities. So should nursing homes and homes that may be dealing with the health of an individual. These are the type. The minister should either come in with legislation or, if you are not able to introduce legislation, issue a directive to the unions and to the management that these be given first priority.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Chairman, I don't think legislation is required at this time, but I would certainly be glad to contact my colleague, the Minister of Health, and see what kind of directives we can get.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question? The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Speaking further to this, I am sure the Minister of Health can apply to the companies in dispute or to them through the Minister of Labour on the areas that affect the Minister of Health, that is, hospitals, nursing homes, and so on. I think there is a wider scope here than what the Minister of Health deals with. I don't think it is within his jurisdiction to say that senior citizen homes per se affect health if they are not completed. But if he can stretch it that far, I don't think he could say that other OHC family highrises affect the health of those people that are in them unless they are completed. I certainly don't think he can say we should complete a particular highrise that OHC has not occupied yet as a matter of health. So, I think the Minister of Labour needs to take a step further than the one step he has taken in consulting the Minister of Health. He needs to take perhaps a step further himself in indicating the social priorities of construction of elevators that need to occur.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Mr. Givens: Mr. Chairman, just one more word, the fact is that I discussed this matter with the Minister of Health. With great respect to the revered gentleman, he ain't got a clue. He is looking to the Minister of Labour for help and the Minister of Labour isn't giving him a helping hand. The responsibility is the Minister of Labour's, and he will hear about it if priorities aren't given in these projects, believe you me. I don't know

why the minister can't put this in this bill right now.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The board is not the body that can do it. It won't be sitting for some time. I think these matters are more relevant through management than they are through the board. I must admit it, and I have already said it, the idea is good; the suggestion is certainly valid. I can assure the member that I will not shirk my responsibility and I will get in touch with these people.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of Mr. Givens' amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it. I declare the motion lost.

Any further comments, questions or amendments to any later section of the bill and, if so, which section?

Mr. Bounsall: Section 5(2).

Mr. Chairman: Anything before 5(2)? The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Just a question of information on this part, I gather that this part in not making the Statutory Powers Procedure Act apply is to ensure, or attempt to ensure, that the arbitration board itself rules on the procedures, and that this would prevent the taking to court under this Act of a procedure that one of the parties to the dispute doesn't like in terms of the way the arbitration board proceeds. My question is, it seems to me, that the same bad procedures that could occur can be challenged under the Judicial Review Act. So why has the minister excluded the Statutory Powers Procedure Act and not the Judicial Review Act? What is the difference between excluding the Statutory Powers Act and not the Judicial Review Act when both of them, I think, could speak to that procedural point of the arbitration?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I am not quite clear, Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. member will agree that the Statutory Powers Procedure Act is one to which you can always appeal, except that in the case of binding arbitration there is no appeal. That's the reason why this arbitration does not come under the Statutory Powers Procedure Act because you just cannot appeal. It's a binding arbitration.

Section 5 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any comments, questions or amendments on any later section of the bill?

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, section 6(2)(c).

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Mr. Bounsall: I move, Mr. Chairman, that in section 6(2)(c) the words "the rates of wages or" be deleted, and a new section (d) be added which reads, "The employers shall not, except with the consent of the unions, alter the rates of wages that were in operation on July 1, 1972," and further, subsection (d) be relettered as subsection (e).

Mr. Chairman: Any comments?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, before we comment on it, could we hear whether the minister might accept this as a reasonable amendment to the Act?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't think you need this amendment. These rights are already guaranteed. They were in the former collective agreement and there was an increase, I understand, in rates of wages as of July 1, 1972. I think this is quite understood. I don't see why you should ask for an amendment.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, if the minister is stating categorically to the House that it is his understanding that the increase in wages that occurred on July 1, post the termination of the contract on April 30, is in fact covered by that contract that expired on April 30, and by making the provision that the employer shall not alter those rates that were in operation on April 30 he has indeed covered that increase that occurred on July 1, then I will certainly have no reason to proceed with the amendment. Do I have your categorical assurance that this will occur and the employees will not suffer a decrease of roughly 50 cents an hour that they had from July 1 until the strike occurred?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: This increase came about as the result of the former collective agreement, and it was agreed that by July 1, 1972, they would. As far as I'm concerned it's agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Is it agreed, then, to withdraw the motion?

Mr. Bounsall: I agree to withdraw it.

Section 6 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other comments, questions or amendments on a later section of the bill?

All right then, we have one amendment to be voted on which was left over from section 4. This we will proceed to do now.

Mr. Reid has moved an amendment to section 4 subsection 4, by adding at the end thereof:

> Provided that if the parties hereto are unable to decide upon the length of a collective agreement, then that term in a decision of a board of arbitration shall not exceed a period of one year after the date of the collective agreement.

The House divided on the amendment which was negatived on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" are 53.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost, and the section carried. Shall the bill be reported?

Bill 2 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion.

Bill 2, the Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act, 1973.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): His Honour the Lieutenant Governor awaits to give royal assent to the measure that has been before us.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed a bill to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following is the title of the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 2, the Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act, 1973.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to this bill.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would like to say that tomorrow we will continue with, I think it's item No. 1 on the order paper—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Or anything on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —and on Monday it will be No. 1, and I suppose possibly No. 1 on Tuesday as well. I would expect if there were time left on either Monday or Tuesday we would do some second readings of the bills that are now on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:16 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 22, 1973

Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act, bill respecting, Mr. Guindon, second reading 97

Elevator Constructor Unions Disputes Act, bill respecting, reported 107

Third reading 127

Royal assent to bill, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor 127

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 127

No. 5



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, March 23, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily Index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1973

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have some special guests with us today. In the west gallery there will be the Asian Immigrant Youth Centre International Institute of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

COURT RULING ON LAND ACQUISITION

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the hon. members that on Wednesday, Mar. 21 last, the Court of Appeal of Ontario delivered to the Lieutenant Governor of this province its opinions on the questions referred to it by an order in council of Sept. 19, 1971. The questions referred to the court related to the effect of certain provisions of the Planning Act on the procedures followed in various types of land acquisition.

The date for the hearing of the argument on the questions referred to the court was extensively advertised in the press and the argument of persons interested in these questions was advanced to the court on Feb. 12 to 16 inclusive last. Counsel was appointed by the court to argue both sides of the questions, and counsel representing interested parties were also afforded the opportunity to make submissions.

The opinion of the court is extensive, covering some 50 pages, and it will provide assistance to those members of the public interested therein and guidance to the government in assessing the present situation. The questions asked of the court and the court's considerations affect the legislation of several ministries. Copies of the opinion have been delivered to those ministries affected for their review as to possible implications for their legislation.

To assist the members opposite I have obtained additional copies of the decision and I'll provide a copy to each of the opposition parties opposite.

STATUS OF OPC OFFICER

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Legislature the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) asked me about the status of an employee of the Ontario Police Commission, Mr. Herb Thurston. At that same time, several speculative stories appeared in the press concerning the security of criminal intelligence information being gathered and analysed by the staff of the Ontario Police Commission.

I undertook at that time to provide the hon. member and the House with a statement on the matter in due course and indicated on Wednesday that I would do so today.

I should explain at the outset that CISO—Criminal Intelligence Services of Ontario—is an organization made up of representatives from police forces operating in this province and members of the Ontario Police Commission. It is concerned with providing facilities for the collection, analysis and dissemination of criminal intelligence to law enforcement agencies with a view to effectively combatting crime.

The 28-man governing body of CISO, to which I will make reference, is composed of the chairman and members of the Ontario Police Commission, the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police, the commanding officer of the RCMP "O" division, and the chiefs of police of any municipal police forces in Ontario having participating members.

Part of the role of the Ontario Police Commission since the formation of CISO in 1966 has included the provision of a repository for the information being gathered from various police forces, and staff resources to undertake the analysis of this intelligence data and their dissemination to operating forces in the field.

At a meeting of the governing body of CISO in September 1972, the question of the security of this system was discussed and a special committee of senior police officials was appointed to investigate the matter. At that time a resolution was passed suspending Mr. Thurston, an intelligence analyst employed by the Ontario Police Commission, as

a member of CISO pending a review of the matter.

Since this action by the governing body of CISO resulted in Mr. Thurston being denied access to criminal intelligence files that he required in the regular performance of his duties, it was necessary for his employer, the Ontario Police Commission, to temporarily withdraw him from this work and later reassign him to other duties outside the intelligence section.

The review was completed in November and it resulted in a number of recommendations being made concerning the physical security of the files, the control of the repository and the procedures of CISO. This was followed by a series of meetings between the committee of the CISO responsible for the review and members of the Ontario Police Commission, during which agreement was reached on the manner and extent to which these recommendations would be implemented.

During this period Mr. Thurston was approached by the chairman of the federal Law Reform Commission concerning the possible employment or secondment with the commission. Subsequently, arrangements were made with the Ontario Police Commission to second Mr. Thurston to the federal Law Reform Commission where he is currently engaged.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is that "second" or "give him away"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Thurston remains an employee of the Ontario government and his salary continues to be paid by the Ontario Police Commission under a reimbursement arrangement with the federal government.

I should emphasize that while the matter of Mr. Thurston's judgement was raised during the course of the CISO investigation, I am assured by those responsible for his supervision that his honesty and integrity are not in doubt.

Returning to the broader question of changes in the direction of CISO as a result of this overall review, a meeting was held of the governing body in February of this year. At that time a new set of procedures was adopted providing for the establishment of an executive committee made up of four members of police forces and three members of the Ontario Police Commission. This committee, with the assistance of a co-ordinator, should help to provide more effective direction to the criminal intelligence function of CISO and a greater degree of ongoing participation in the process for member police forces. In addition to these changes, the physical security of the repository has been strengthened considerably and the staff resources allocated to this activity will be expanded. I should point out that these and other improvements that have been made in the system enjoy the full approval and support of the governing body of CISO.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is evident to all those who have been directly involved in these developments over the last year that their efforts will undoubtedly contribute to a more responsive and effective systerm of criminal intelligence in Ontario, one which will continue to have the confidence and support of all law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Singer: What a whitewash!

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

STATUS OF OPP OFFICER

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, further to the Solicitor General's statement, can he inform the House whether or not the police forces in the various other groups contributing information to CSIO now have had their confidence restored in the security of these files and no longer have that hesitation that evidently had been expressed in forwarding information that would be useful in the control of crime?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I give the Leader of the Opposition, the members of this House and the public at large, the assurance that the review has resulted in these specific items that I have told them. It has the full confidence of all of the participating members, which consist of those people to whom I have referred. The review committee consisted of Chief Adamson, the new commissioner of the OPP, Harold Graham, and Commissioner Lysyk of the RCMP.

What has been implemented has the full support of the total governing body. The police forces of this province now have complete confidence in what has been done.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: Can the minister tell the House whether Mr. Thurston now has been completely exonerated, that is publicly and in the minister's mind, of the minister's suspicion that this is the man who was feeding this confidential information to the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman)?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has intimated that I had a suspicion relating to Mr. Thurston.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What were the minister's suspicions?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Of course, what was involved was only the relationship of Mr. Thurston and the discharge of his duties and his continuing membership as a member of CISO.

I have reiterated in my statement that, although judgement may have been passed upon him, I am assured that his integrity and honesty are not in doubt.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview, a supplementary.

Mr. Singer: Could the minister tell us—it was also a part of my question—whatever happened to Gary Ralph? Could the minister tell us if he is prepared to make available the lengthy report that he sat on for four months and let us see what in fact the investigating group said and not the pap statement of three pages that he gave us today? Could the minister tell us if the Association of Ontario Police Chiefs, which withdrew its support from this intelligence agency, is now back, rather than the two or three people that he mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the services of Gary Ralph were terminated. He was a contract employee of the Ontario Police Commission. They were terminated on May 19, 1972.

Mr. Singer: Why?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): We didn't need him any more.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: His services came to an end.

Mr. Singer: Why?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: His services came to an end.

Mr. Singer: That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: It has nothing to do with this at all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to you that my interest in the matter consists of two items. One is the status of an employee of the Ontario Police Commission, Mr. Thurston. I have now been satisfied as to that.

My second concern as Solicitor General was as to the effectiveness and security of the criminal intelligence services of this province. I am now assured as to that, and I want to repeat for the hon. member, that what has evolved in terms of the CISO procedures, as I've outlined, has the full concurrence of all the participating members of CISO.

As to the police association—I'm not sure that I can recall the member's exact—

Mr. Singer: It is the Ontario Association of Police Chiefs, which expressed no confidence in that whole system.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, that is not so. I don't know who makes up the total membership of the association—

Mr. Singer: The police chiefs of Ontario, for example.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! This sort of debate is entirely out of order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The relevant police forces of Ontario now give their full support to and have confidence in the procedures which I have outlined.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, because I didn't get—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park is entitled to the next supplementary.

Mr. Singer: I didn't get an answer. He won't tell us what happened.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Has the minister been able to locate the source of the leak and does he intend to lay any charges against that person or persons?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, that is part of the internal investigation made by CISO.

Mr. Singer: Oh, sure! We'll never see that. Four months to get three pages of nonsense. Whitewash!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Any action that will be taken in that regard will be dealt with by the CISO, which is fully competent in its makeup and experience to do what is necessary.

Mr. Singer: Yes, very competent!

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member wants to put his supplementary he may have his turn.

Mr. Singer: Will the minister be prepared to let us see the report from which he extracted the three pages of pap that he gave us this morning?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, that was not a report to the solicitor general. The report was a report to the governing body of CISO. I was privy to the information contained in the report. It was not a report to me. That report is the property of CISO.

Mr. Singer: By way of a final supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale may have the next and last supplementary.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether or not Mr. Thurston had a hearing in response to the allegations which were made against him and whether he was given the benefit of the minimum rules of such hearings set forth in the Statutory Powers Procedure Act of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the CISO, which is its own organization, made its own investigation and took certain action. The ministry was not directly responsible for the investigation. Our only role was to take whatever action resulted from that investigation.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

INVESTIGATION INTO OHIP PAYMENTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General.

Has he now received information from the Ministry of Health which he is considering which might lead to charges being laid against certain medical practitioners in the province who have been defrauding the OHIP fund?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, certain cases have been under investigation by my senior counsel and the officers of the antirackets squad. I anticipate that the investigation will be finalized shortly and then it will be decided whether charges can be laid. The investigation is not fully complete yet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: In looking at Hansard yesterday, the Minister of Health made some reference to some delay in the appointment of a judge in this matter. Does the minister know what he was referring to?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Speaker. I read Hansard myself and I asked the minister last night about the meaning of that. The charges have not been laid and until they are—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What did he say?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He didn't know either?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): What was his meaning?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well, he was—he made reference—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. minister would respond only to the Leader of the Opposition. Someone else was on his feet with a supplementary. He will not respond to the question from a member who is seated.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, to be of assistance to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, there was some reference to it yesterday; I was not in the House at the time and that's the reason I checked in Hansard. The investigation is proceeding; and as quickly as that can be finished and I receive the report I will know whether the officers are recommending prosecution and the nature of the charges to be laid.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary: Is the minister aware of an intervention or a recommendation from the College of Physicians and Surgeons that charges not be laid in one specific case?

Hon. Mr. Bales: My concern is not really with the College of Physicians and Surgeons but rather with what the investigation produces.

Mr. Shulman: My question was is the minister aware of the intervention?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, I am not aware of that. We are carrying out an investigation independent of anything they may do.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

MISSISSIPPI RIVER CONTAMINATION THREAT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment.

Does he recall issuing a certificate of approval allowing a firm called Nuclarus Ltd. to build a lagoon in the drainage basin of Mazinaw Lake in the Mississippi River system into which, it is alleged, chemical wastes can be dumped with the threat, if the lagoon is not functioning properly, of contamination of that whole lake and river system?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, just off the top of my head, as I recall some time ago this firm made an application for approval for a lagoon. They didn't pursue it and I believe they didn't give us all the details that were required, so about perhaps two months ago we wrote and told them that their application was no longer current and that we weren't considering it. I don't think we have heard anything from them since.

I'll get the actual detail for the Leader of the Opposition. I remember having a number of letters from people in that area—I can't say exactly when, but I think it was around the end of September—and I looked into it and that basically was the situation. They had proposed this, they had made an application to us, they had not given us the detail that we required and then we wrote and told them that their application was no longer current and if they still wanted to proceed they would have to make a new application; and there has not been one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that the people in the area who are concerned are under the impression that a certificate of approval has been issued by the ministry and that the date was just, I believe, Dec. 28, 1972?

Would the minister, as he has promised, get the details of this so those concerned can be properly informed?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

METRO CENTRE PLAN

Mr. Deans: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the provincial Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

What has become of the report which a previous Treasurer, now a parliamentary assistant, indicated would be available to me on June 27, 1972, regarding the ownership of the 55 acres of land which is currently in dispute in the Metro Centre development?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I'll find out and inform the hon. member.

While I am on my feet perhaps I could respond to a question asked yesterday by the acting leader of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker: I think that would be in order.

PROVINCIAL AUDITOR'S REPORT

Hon. Mr. White: The hon. member asked what provisions, if any, were being made for those members of the staff of the Provincial Auditor whose jobs were being phased out as the pre-audit function was being shifted to the operating ministries. I have inquired and I have found that most of those so affected have been taken into the civil service through a mechanism established by the Civil Service Commission. There are, I think, something like 16 people left in Mr. Groom's branch and a small number of additional transfers may be anticipated.

More particularly he inquired about Mr. Tom Smith who has apparently attempted without success to find a permanent civil service position within one of the operating ministries. This is no doubt lamentable, but understandable, having in mind that he also applied for a job opening in the NDP caucus office and was found apparently not to be qualified. So—

An hon. member: Great questions members opposite ask!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: We have much higher standards.

Hon. Mr. White: However, I am given to understand that the position he occupies within the Provincial Auditor's staff will continue to provide employment for him.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the answer. I didn't ask the question. It was asked by the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) and I'll relay the minister's answer to him.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Don't blame it on him.

Mr. Deans: Further to my question, would it be possible to receive an answer in regard to this 55 acres of land within some reasonable length of time, say perhaps shorter than the time it took to get the last answer?

Hon. Mr. White: Oh yes.

Mr. Deans: Good!

Mr. Reid: Not much!

Mr. Deans: Not much. I'd like to ask a question of the parliamentary assistant in charge of energy. Is it within the parliamentary secretary's terms of reference to consider suitable legislation to make mandatory an independent—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member addressing his question to one of the parliamentary assistants?

Mr. Deans: I'm trying to.

Mr. Speaker: It's out of order.

Mr. Deans: Well, I'm asking him in the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier)—

Mr. Speaker: Questions may only be directed to the ministry.

Mr. Singer: They don't speak.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier refers to him as "my assistant."

Mr. Deans: That's a shame, because I know he had the answer right on the tip of his tongue.

An hon. member: Tell them to get into line over there!

Mr. Reid: He's No. 2, so he tries harder!

Mr. Deans: Okay. I have a question—

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): The member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) is neither fish nor fowl!

Mr. Deans: We thought he had been promoted, to tell the truth. It just shows that he isn't any higher up than he was before.

Mr. Reid: Only the name has been changed!

METRO HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. Deans: I want to ask a question then of the Minister of Revenue.

What action is contemplated by the Minister of Revenue with regard to housing starts in Metropolitan Toronto in order to offset the desperate need in public housing and in order to try to provide some balance to the unusually high rate of increase of housing costs in the private sector?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Speaker, all we can do is find as many locations as is possible to carry out a programme of housing, both so-called public housing and under the new programme which has been announced—I don't know whether the hon. member is familiar with it—of an integrated community housing programme as between the private sector and the Ontario Housing Corp. The hon. member knows perfectly well that one of the problems which has caused the great decrease in housing starts is that there is considerable objection to public housing in many municipalities, particularly the larger ones.

Mr. Deans: That's because they build objectionable houses.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wouldn't say we build objectionable housing, Mr. Speaker. There are thousands of people who find the housing not objectionable. It's like many other programmes of government. There is pressure to provide a service for people. As a matter of fact, some people might say that the success of a programme put into effect by government to some extent is measured by the degree of backlash to the success of that programme.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Some people would. Intelligent people wouldn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are among those in this province who thought the Ontario Housing Corp. should be building more and more public housing in this province.

Mr. Deans: Right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We did build more and more public housing.

Mr. Bounsall: They could also do better!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The great need at that time was to provide shelter for people; it was all motherhood at that time. But now that we

have provided thousands upon thousands of people with housing, there is an understandable desire that the community and recreational facilities incorporated in these housing facilities should be of a better quality. We all agree with that.

Indeed, I remember being at the opening of Regent Park, which was a city of Toronto project. That in its day was considered just about the finest in North America. But when we look back upon it now, it's not quite what we would build today.

Mr. Speaker: Anything further, I believe, would constitute a speech. The hon. minister has given his reply.

Mr. Singer: That's not a reply, it's a speech.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A speech.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do I take it, Mr. Speaker, that it's more in order to make a speech when you're asking a question than it is when you're answering one?

Mr. Reid: He's not answering. He's avoiding the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In any case, Mr. Speaker, perhaps to clarify it for the hon. member and for the House generally, I will make a statement in this House to explain our new housing programme, which was announced a week or two ago in conjunction with the federal government. It will not, of course, offset the numbers of units that are being blocked from being built now and we have been able to build in the past. There's only so much land; and there are only two ways to go—we can go up and we can go sideways, unless the hon. member or someone else has an idea of how we can go subterranean. There's only so much land in the city—

Mr. Germa: We've got a suggestion for the minister!

Mr. Deans: I suggest if he doesn't hurry up and get finished he is going to go underground.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and, of course, we've used a great portion of that land and it has become more difficult. However, as I said, I'll make a statement to the House to explain the new programme which I announced the other day.

Mr. Singer: Let the minister explain now what he said.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: How can the minister possibly expect the number of houses that are presently being built in Metropolitan Toronto to meet the need, which is reported to be something over 12,000 units required in Metropolitan Toronto, and only better than 1,000 units built in the year 1972.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't, Mr. Speaker, expect it will meet the need.

I only extend an invitation to the opposition, as I did last year, and add that that question would come better if the members of the party opposite would appear at public meetings where there is objection to public housing and stand up and be counted and say that they are in favour of that housing and do what they can to change the views of many ratepayers' associations which object to public housing.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question to the minister, who obviously doesn't follow me around the province because I do attend such meetings. What became of the massive housing project announced in the Throne Speech one year ago? Where are the houses?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will be specific—I'll wait for him to get the facts—be specific about what massive programme he is talking about, and where he feels we have failed; I'll be glad to answer.

Mr. Singer: Is that the minister's foot in his mouth?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Need all those jobs?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the minister will stop making a statement, a supplementary question pertaining to the long waiting list here in Toronto, and I believe there is a waiting list in at least one other centre of which I am aware. Why would the minister give the answer he has this morning when in the special review of the financial situation brought out by the Treasurer just before the by-election, in which he found another $300 million, one of the areas where there was the largest amount of unexpended money in government programmes was his own programme, in housing. Money that had already been budgeted for and been made available still had evidently not been spent, and there are no plans to spend it this year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well the answer to that is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker. There

had been unexpended funds. Because of local pressures we have not been able to proceed with the projects which had been planned.

Indeed I had in my desk at one time, I think at least seven or eight orders in council for approval of projects which may have, in Metro Toronto alone, provided, well I'm just speaking off the top of my head, perhaps 1,000 or more units. Because of local pressures of ratepayers' groups and councils within Metro, these were not signed because of the objections to them.

Now what would the hon. member suggest? This is what has accounted for the unexpended funds by and large.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This matter is of great importance. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you would agree. I wish I could remember the specific sum, but I think it's $80 million or $100 million that's been approved for public housing and the minister says now that he can't spend it because he can't find any place to build the buildings.

Why doesn't he use, for example, the land that the government owns and has serviced at Malvern?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's been used.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How could he possibly come forward with a programme and ask us to approve these huge sums of money without knowing where he was going to build the buildings? It seems to be irresponsible. I think that his duty has not been fulfilled.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to Malvern. Malvern is going according to programme. The money that was laid aside for Malvern is being used. The first phase is almost completed, some 600 odd units. On the second phase, I should tell the hon. member that the council, the council of North York, has sent back to their Planning Committee—

Mr. Singer: The minister doesn't even know which municipality it is in, it is in Scarborough.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm sorry, the council of Scarborough has sent back to its planning board the plans for the second phase because of some objections it has. The money that was laid aside for Malvern by and large has been used and is up to date.

You cannot build all of Malvern at one time, it would be physically impossible anyway. For the other, I referred to those programmes which we had which had to be stopped because of local pressures of councils and ratepayers' groups. Money that was provided for those projects is unexpended, and I regret it just as much as I take it the hon. Leader of the Opposition regrets it. I regret we have not been able to go ahead with those projects, as I presume the hon. Leader of the Opposition regrets it. I wish he would get up publicly and talk to those ratepayers' groups and those councils and ask them to give us support.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): That'll be the day! Oh, will that be the day.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would just like to ask the minister if his chubby colleague behind him, who comes from Scarborough, was at those meetings supposedly bolstering the contention that the minister has put forward, trying to persuade the residents of his area to change their minds?

Mr. Drea: No way! You stay out of my riding.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's absolutely ridiculous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether my colleague was or wasn't, but at least he is not getting up in this House and taking me to task for not being able to build in those communities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister has the power and the money and the need is obvious.

Mr. Speaker: Order! There has been sufficient time spent on this topic. The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

DIAL-A-BUS SYSTEM FOR TORONTO

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Whatever happened to the dial-a-bus system that his leader so fervently promised several months ago to relieve the congestion that he created in northwest Metro? Whatever happened to that system?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker,

it is an excellent programme and it will be in effect next November.

Mr. Givens: Next November? We need the bus system now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario South is next.

NEW COMMUNITY OF NORTH PICKERING

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): A question of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs: I would like to ask the minister if he is still in charge of the North Pickering development project; and if he is, will he be making a statement on it prior to the closing date for briefs on the regional government, which is the end of March?

Hon. Mr. White: I suspect that I am technically responsible, Mr. Speaker, but the fact of the matter is that the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) has had this responsibility. Now that he is Minister of Industry and Tourism, the Premier is giving thought to replacing him in that particular role.

In the meantime, without knowing much about it, I have had some conversations with Mr. Basford in Ottawa. I am having another such meeting with him, I think it is next week. I had a conversation with the Premier (Mr. Davis) yesterday on this subject and have undertaken to see Reeve Williams, who has a particular course of action to recommend. I am attempting not to get drawn into this too deeply if somebody else is going to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The minister is up to his neck now.

Hon. Mr. White: However, I am holding the breach and pressing the Premier to appoint somebody to take the job from me.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

OIL SPILL IN KELLY LAKE

Mr. Germa: A question of the Minister of the Environment: Is the minister aware of the spilling of more than 30,000 gallons of used automobile oil into Kelly Lake in Sudbury? Is he aware that lack of contingency plans by his department creates certain confusion over responsibility for cleaning up? Is it not incumbent upon the minister to devise contingency plans to alleviate the confusion which is caused when these accidents do occur in the province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the report that I have on that spill is that vandals victimized the depot owned by Mr. K. R. Thompson last weekend. They were responsible for the release of about 2,000 gallons of waste oil, some of which is presently trapped in Kelly Lake. The oil is contained on the ice in a pool 20 ft wide and in the slushy conditions that applied then it couldn't be removed by pumping equipment.

We conducted an investigation at the site. As in the case of any spill, we carried out an investigation to verify the cause and to determine what measures are required to contain it. The policy of our ministry is not to clean up these spills with public funds unless it is impossible to establish who is the owner of the material that was spilled. My understanding is that the owner has been taking the necessary steps to remove this oil which, as I said, is approximately 2,000 gallons not 35,000.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a waste oil operation and we are checking to see just what sort of security precautions there were on the tanks which apparently were vandalized. I can't tell the hon. member whether there were locks and the locks were broken or exactly what was the physical condition of the tanks. I expect to have that information shortly and I will pass it along to him as soon as I have it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce is next.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury with a supplementary.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that this individual does not have the expertise or the equipment to recover this oil presently trapped in the ice?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The information I have, Mr. Speaker, is that our people put him in touch with people who had the proper equipment, once they could get away from the slushing condition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

ASSESSMENT OF CHURCHES

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Why is the assessment branch of his ministry assessing churches? Since this is being done, is it the intention of the government to have the churches pay property tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the policy of the government with respect to the taxation and assessment of churches has not changed. If there are members of the assessment staff visiting churches they are probably visiting to find out which portion of the church, if any, is subject to taxation. The hon. member knows, of course, that that portion of the church or any place of worship which is not used exclusively for religious purposes is subject to assessment and taxation. I presume it would be necessary in some instances, if in fact they are doing that, to visit the church to find out precisely what portion of it may be subject to taxation.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since my information is that the place of worship is also being assessed, would the minister look into this particular situation, particularly from the point of view of seeing if the assessment people are applying the market value principle applicable to other properties?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know what the market value of a church would be, but I would hope that the hon. member isn't confusing the assessment with taxes. I mean there is certainly nothing wrong with assessing a church so long as there are no taxes assigned.

Mr. Gaunt: But what is the point?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member is asking what purpose is being served, I think there is a purpose being served. I think it is useful for the citizens of the province to know the value of all the property which is in existence in this province.

Mr. Singer: The minister is adaptable.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If they are assessing them I don't see any harm in that. The question is, are they being taxed and to what extent? The hon. member has asked me whether there is any change in policy. There isn't, in respect to taxation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Singer: Which answer do we believe?

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: Would the minister undertake to review this matter, particularly in the light of some of the assessment figures which have come forth indicating that in one particular case a church was assessed for $80,000 and it was sold for $17,000? Now I simply ask the minister, is this market value assessing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will give me the details of that I will be glad to look into that particular case.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

TESTING OF MEDICAL STUDENTS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain why applicants to the University of Western Ontario medical school are told they must first apply to a US corporation headquartered in New York to take a psychological test to see if they are fit to become Canadian doctors?

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the particular test that the member is talking about. I am familiar with such tests, but not with the details; I would be very happy to get the details for him.

Mr. Shulman: If the minister is not familiar with the test, can he explain why we have to go down to the United States to determine if we are fit to become doctors in Canada?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I would just as soon get the details on it before responding.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Haggerty: A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Will ARDA funds be made available for other areas along Lake Erie which are suffering from flood damage? Will the minister indicate that some assistance can be provided for the eastern lake basin?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I am not quite sure, Mr.

Speaker, of the intent of what the hon. member is asking. Will he rephrase that question? Is this agricultural land the hon. member is referring, to or cottage land?

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, I am referring to agricultural land.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I couldn't quite hear the question. Yes, consideration is being given, Mr. Speaker. We are trying to evolve a programme. We haven't as yet got the details on the total cost, but it would be similar to the programme that we have already worked out with the federal government through the ARDA agreement, which would involve some type of diking facilities for agricultural land only.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question asked previously by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER CONTAMINATION THREAT

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I have just checked with the office, and we have never issued a certificate of approval for the lagoon by Nuclarus. The hearing was held by the environmental hearing board on Nov. 14 and site approval was requested at that time. We asked for more information on the technical aspect of the lagoon, which we have never received. So we advised the company on February 14 that if they wanted to continue they would have to start all over again.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

OLD SANDWICH PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Government Services.

Is the minister considering favourably the request of the city of Windsor that the old Sandwich public library be turned over to the public school men teachers of Windsor to be developed as a school museum?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I have had correspondence from representatives of the men teachers' association in Windsor regarding this property. In fact, I discussed the disposition of this property and the possible future use with Mayor Wansbrough and the staff of the city on one of my visits to Windsor.

Prior to disposing of this property in any way, we went through the normal process of contacting all other ministries within the government as to their possible interest or use for the said property. It was found that this site was considered to be a very excellent site for the construction of a senior citizens' housing project, and consequently the site has been transferred to the Ontario Housing Corp.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker, did the minister contact the Minister of Colleges and Universities, particularly since this was originally a teachers' college building, with a view to retaining it as a museum of this kind as it ties in with this announced programme of collecting history in the colleges and universities area in this province?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I'm sure all ministries were contacted, but of course this property was originally under the Minister of Education and was declared surplus by that ministry and was turned over to us for disposal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

WINDSOR RACEWAY

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

When will the ministry make public the results of the hearing of the Ontario Racing Commission into the alleged fixing of races at the Windsor Raceway?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the results of that hearing will be made known if any criminal charges flow from it. Those, of course, will be public knowledge when the charges are laid.

Insofar as the detail of the evidence that was given at those hearings goes, I don't think that that will be made public, because there were certain spurious allegations made against individuals which were completely without foundation, and it would be very harmful to the reputations of those people involved.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider in

the future having all such hearings open to the press?

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, I would not consider that at this particular moment in time, Mr. Speaker. These hearings are held, I'm advised, in a very informal fashion, and there has been no clamour whatsoever from the people involved in the racing occupation that they be made public. There have been certain representations made to the ministry by the press. But when this type of hearing is conducted and facts are stated that perhaps do not amount to evidence, reputations can be permanently damaged and no advantage is made. If any criminal charges are laid, then those should be dealt with in the courts, which of course are completely open at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO RESERVOIR

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): I have a question of the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker.

Is the minister considering making a definitive statement, repudiating the idea put forward by the chairman of the select committee on land drainage for a 14,000 square mile reservoir in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't considered that it was necessary; I assume that the select committee will produce a report some time. As far as my ministry is concerned, we are concerned about water quality, but we are not involved in the creation or removal of any of the Great Lakes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a supplementary?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fears of the people in northwestern Ontario, which are very active because of the irresponsible statements of the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson), does this minister not consider those fears worth allaying at this time?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I can give this undertaking: I am sure that if there were such a proposal to be carried out, we would hold a public hearing and give an opportunity to speak to those who might be affected. I think the hon. member can allay the fears of anybody who has been in touch with him by saying that this would be a rather large undertaking and would not be done overnight.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): He has already done it for every newspaper in the country!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a further supplementary?

Mr. Foulds: Is the minister not concerned about the loss of revenue and the loss of water power to Ontario Hydro if such a scheme did take place?

Mr. Speaker: I think the minister gave a proper reply; the question is out of order.

The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

EGG QUOTAS

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

In view of the fact that the Ontario pullet growers are not receiving any protection under the egg commission quota system, would the minister undertake to make a presentation on behalf of the Ontario pullet growers to see that they do get some protection under this particular system, particularly in light of the fact that many egg producers are now constructing buildings to grow their own pullets?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, it has already been done. I don't know how it is going to work out, but I have made representations to the Ontario Egg and Fowl Producers Marketing Board and to the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board that the pullet growers be established in a marketing plan.

I am not sure what the ramifications are. Quite frankly I think they are entitled to that kind of protection, because when one recognizes the fact that the broiler growers, the roaster growers and the turkey producers are all under a marketing plan for quotas, or will be very shortly, and the egg producers are under quota marketing, then it leaves the pullet growers in an extremely vulnerable position because somebody else can say: "Well, I can't put broilers in for this particular lot; we will grow pullets instead." That to me destroys the responsible position that some of the pullet growers have taken in becoming full-time pullet growers. All their investment is in that particular field. They have their contracts, their outlets, their sources of chicks and their sources of food

built up. It could destroy them. I think they should be protected; and I have so advised the marketing board.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has almost expired. There are 30 seconds left for a supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask the minister if the egg commission has responded in an encouraging way? Have they indicated that this can possibly be done?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I haven't heard a word as yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Treasurer left the impression—in fact he did leave the impression—that Mr. Tom Smith had applied to the New Democratic Party caucus for employment and had been rejected. I want to make it clear to the House that the minister was mistaken; that in fact Mr. Smith did not at any time apply to the NDP caucus for employment—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They asked him, but he wouldn't accept!

Mr. Deans: Nor was he rejected by the caucus, since in fact he never did take part in any effort by us or by him to have him in our employ.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Does that mean he can still apply?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They would welcome him, though, if he did apply, I gather.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

ETHICS OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Ethics of Elected Representatives.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. J. M. Jessiman (Fort William): Starting with whom?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The member is right at home.

Mr. Shulman: This bill provides a code of ethics covering the use of influence and performance of services for gain and applies to the members of the legislative assembly and members of municipal councils and school boards and particularly to the cabinet.

Mr. Reid: Does it cover bribery?

Mr. Deans: I guess that is where it should be particularly directed.

BUSINESSES CONTROLLED BY ORGANIZED CRIME ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Businesses Controlled by Organized Crime.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: This bill provides a means of exposing businesses and corporations which are involved with organized crime and it allows for the cancelling of the letters patent of a corporation where it has been proved that the persons controlling that corporation are involved with organized crime.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for a system of registering motor vehicles based on the amount of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons which the vehicle emits, so that the amount of your licence will depend on the amount of pollution which you are putting in the air. This is a more equitable way of distributing the costs of motor licensing.

DENTISTRY ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Dentistry Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill repeals that section of the Act which puts a time limit on commencing an action under the Act. At the present time, if someone develops a difficulty or an illness as the result of malpractice, unless they begin their suit within an unreasonably short time they are not allowed to collect under the law.

Mr. W. Newman: How many more?

Mr. Shulman: One or two.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY ACT, 1973

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, the Occupational Safety Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Drea: Does the member for Sandwich-Riverside support all of these?

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): The member had better explain this one.

Mr. Drea: Does the member for Sandwich-Riverside know what he is signing? Has he read it yet?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill replaces a series of Acts dealing with safety matters and brings the whole field of occupational safety under one statute. The Ontario Safety Advisory Board replaces the present Labour Safety Council of Ontario and is given expanded powers.

CHILD WELFARE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment to the Act will in future allow unmarried persons or a person to adopt a child.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for disclosure to the consumer of the unit price in addition to the total price of consumer products.

CONTROL OF PROMOTIONAL GAMES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to control Promotional Games.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to control the operation of promotional games intended to attract customers or to advertise products sold at retail.

SECURITIES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Securities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in addition to the liability of an insider to compensate a person or company for direct loss suffered as the result of the use of confidential information in the manner specified, the bill makes it an offence to use such information under the law.

OPERATION OF AIRCRAFT ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to regulate the Operation of Aircraft over Ontario and to investigate the Effect and Consequences of Sonic Booms.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, there are two purposes of this Act. The first is to prohibit the creation of sonic booms by aircraft flying in Ontario airspace; and secondly to provide for a complete study and investigation by the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) into the effects of sonic booms on persons and property.

INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that on and after Jan. 1, 1975, the sale of automobile insurance in Ontario by any insurer other than the government of the Province of Ontario or a board, commission or agency thereof, is prohibited.

SECURITIES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Securities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this amendment puts into law the request by the Ontario Securities Commission that shareholders of public corporations be notified of material changes in the corporate affairs that affect

the value of their shares within a relatively short time, that is by the 10th day of the following month.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS LIABILITY ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to relieve Medical Practitioners, Registered Nurses and Others from Liability in respect of Voluntary Emergency First Aid and Medical Services.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to relieve medical practitioners, registered nurses and others from liability in respect of voluntary emergency first aid assistance or medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency. At the present time they are not so protected.

INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this amendment prevents binding settlements or releases from being entered into by accident victims in haste or while under the stress of recent injury. As you know, the insurance companies try to get recent accident victims to sign off immediately before the full extent of their damages may be known. This is to prevent this particular abuse.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in addition to carrying a warning label, this requires that cigarettes and cigarette advertisements include a statement of the tar and nicotine content of the cigarettes being sold or advertised.

PROVINCIAL COURTS ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to raise the upper age limit of persons who are to be dealt with as juvenile delinquents by the provincial courts from 16 years of age to 18 years of age.

OPHTHALMIC DISPENSERS ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ophthalmic Dispensers Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to prevent the sale of spectacles or eye glasses having frames made of cellulose nitrate, which are flammable.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Mental Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill requires that where a person charged with or convicted of an offence is ordered to attend a psychiatric facility for examination, he be examined by at least one psychiatrist. At the present time, persons remanded for a mental examination sometimes are seen only by practitioners.

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ministry of Correctional Services Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to set up a conjugal visiting programme for those prisoners who are not eligible or suitable for a temporary absence.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that bill as soon as you get me a quorum.

Mr. Speaker: It appears there is a quorum.

Mr. Shulman: Do we have new members?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How many has the NDP got left? Why doesn't the NDP come in?

Mr. Shulman: There are 18 in the House and the Leader of the Opposition makes it 19.

Mr. Speaker ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Now that we have a quorum perhaps the hon. member will continue.

Mr. Shulman: The purpose of this bill is to establish three classes of chauffeurs' licences related to the size and complexity of operation of the motor vehicle being driven. Provisions are to be made for chauffeurs' learning permits, and a test designed to reveal an applicant's driving ability is to be devised and administered. Existing chauffeurs' licences will expire when the Act comes into force and exchange of such licences for the ones with the new classes will be in accordance with the terms in the bill.

PLANNING ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Reid: Last night when we were doing something important, the member was not around.

Mr. Shulman: I am glad the member is here to see these.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to give municipalities discretionary power to issue or withhold permits for the removal or wrecking of buildings or structures. This has been requested before by various municipalities, including this city, but has not yet been granted.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to provide for the medical testing of motor vehicle drivers suspected of being under the influence of drugs. At the present time, of course, we have testing for those under the influence of alcohol, but there is no provision for the testing of those under the influence of drugs.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES EVALUATION ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish a Commission to Evaluate Government Programmes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill establishes a commission whose function is to study and evaluate provincial programmes and whose findings and recommendations thereon are to be submitted to the assembly on or before July 1, 1974.

GAME AND FISH ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Game and Fish Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill is being introduced at the request of the Trappers' Association of Ontario who are disturbed at the loss of raccoon and this will set out certain limits on the hunting of raccoon in various parts of Ontario.

Mr. Jessiman: And Toronto.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Don't wear that raccoon cap of yours, Frank.

CHILD WELFARE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill prevents children leaving the province for adoption unless adoption opportunities have been exhausted in Ontario and the adopting home meets Ontario standards. This bill was introduced because, as you are aware, certain children were sent to Peru for adoption a few years back.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill introduces the concept of strict liability for the manufacturing, selling or leasing of defective and/or dangerous consumer products.

ONTARIO SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1955.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this amendment delegates to the SPCA the licensing and regulating of dog kennels. Strangely enough, at the present time they are neither licensed nor regulated by anybody.

CEMETERIES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Cemeteries Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Act is to correct the abuse whereby at the present time, before cremation can take place, a coroner must sign a certificate even if a coroner has already examined the case and has already signed that certificate. This produces duplication and tremendous waste. We have brought the same bill in for five years now but they can't hear it over there.

REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: These amendments extend the prospectus requirements, which used to apply only to subdivision lots or units outside Ontario, so that they now apply to subdivision lots or units in the province as well. This is to correct the abuse whereby we have people buying scrub in northern Ontario and selling it as vacation land lots to people all over the United States.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Did the member get caught?

Mr. Shulman: Americans only.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF SNOWMOBILES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Control and Regulation of Snowmobiles.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill is an attempt to reduce the number of deaths and injuries resulting from the use of snowmobiles.

INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: The present government, two years ago, brought in regulations that prevent any person from giving advice to the public to get rid of their expensive insurance and buy cheap term insurance, which is to the detriment of everyone in this province. This amendment is to take care of the government's iniquities.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this amendment requires persons under 18 years of age to take an approved driver education course before being issued with a driver's licence.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill requires the installation of safety belts in all

motor buses and is particularly meant to cut down the number of fatalities among children when a children's bus has an accident.

ELECTION ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Election Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill requires the contributors to election campaigns to report contributions of more than $100 to the chief election officer.

The purpose of this bill is to remind the Premier of his promises, which he may or may not carry out.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill makes it an offence for a dealer to sell a motor vehicle knowing that its odometer has been altered.

CONTROL OF EAVESDROPPING ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Control of Eavesdropping.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to control wiretapping and all other forms of electronic overhearing of conversations.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill makes it an offence for the driver of a motor vehicle to fail to stop when given a clear signal to do so by a uniformed constable or police officer driving a plainly marked motor vehicle. Strangely enough, at the present time that is not an offence.

HEARING AID DISTRIBUTORS ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Certification of Dealers and Persons Engaged in the Fitting and Selling of Hearing Aids.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this particular bill has received the endorsement of persons in the hearing aid industry. There have been numerous recommendations made to the government that this bill be adopted. It is my hope that this particular bill will be passed this session.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Why that one more than the others?

Mr. Shulman: That one has a better chance.

Mr. Speaker: An hon. member had a bill. I guess he's left the chamber now.

Mr. Renwick: Before the orders of the day, I'd like to raise a procedural matter with the House, and with you Mr. Speaker, to ask for your guidance in connection with it.

I had expected the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson), might have raised the question. Minor changes in procedure in the House often have substantial consequences and it's for that reason that I'd like the clarification of the Speaker about the question.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Yes he can leave now.

Mr. Renwick: On the opening day of the session of the Legislature—

Mr. Eaton: The member for High Park takes up everybody else's time and then leaves.

Mr. Renwick: —at the time when the first bill is introduced, it has been the tradition simply to introduce a bill for the purpose of asserting the right of the assembly, as against the executive, to introduce legislation. Such a bill has, in the past, always been of an innocuous nature, correcting a typographical error or a grammatical construction in a statute. It has been so noted on the list of items of business as the traditional introduction of one bill. Indeed, on the slip of paper which was before us on the day the session opened it referred, in fact, to the matter as being the introduction of an innocuous bill or words to that effect.

The bill which was introduced this year, and in my memory this is the first time this has been done, was introduced by the Attorney General and was in substance, a government measure of substance. It was the Powers of Attorney Act, 1973; and reflected in it, I assume, are the considered conclusions with respect to government policy on the report of the Ontario Law Reform Commission.

I therefore would like to ask the Speaker whether or not that departure, as I believe it to be, from the previous tradition of the House is sanctioned by the usage of the House or if it is within the prerogative of the government to alter the procedure of the House by introducing a bill of substance on opening day rather than the traditional formal bill for the purpose simply of asserting the traditional authority of the assembly to introduce legislation.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, as far as I am concerned as Speaker, I am not in any way at any time going to attempt to determine whether such a bill is innocuous or of substance or what the bill might be. The bill was presented on the programme for the opening day as the traditional bill and, to the best of my knowledge at least, that's what it was.

As to whether or not the bill had substance, it is my understanding that from time to time there have been certain bills introduced on the opening day which, in fact, do have substance and which when passed do constitute a very important part of our legislation in the province. I did not take it upon myself to examine the purported traditional bill nor to determine just what was the nature of the content. I am informed that such bills have been introduced from time to time on the opening day.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Sock it to 'em, Margaret.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Turner), that a humble address be presented to the Honorable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario.

May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I would never come to the point when I would have the opportunity of telling you how very reassuring it is to have you with us on that great Speaker's dais, comfortably ensconced in that fine, historic old throne, conducting the business of this House with your usual wit and humour. I believe that I speak for all members of this House when I say that we have the utmost respect for the excellence and fairness of your rulings—even when we don't like them!

Mr. Drea: Even the member from Owen Sound.

Mrs. Scrivener: At this point I would also like to compliment several members upon their recent appointments to new positions of responsibility. I refer to the hon. Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. White), the hon. Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), and parliamentary assistant to the Premier with responsibility for energy resources (Mr. McKeough).

Mr. Speaker, as I sat listening to the Speech from the Throne on Tuesday, I could not help but think that a government capable of the imagination, flexibility and leadership as revealed in this address is a strong and skilful government, and one which is serving its people very well.

The comments contained in this speech, and the promises and indications for future legislation, are ample evidence that the government has clearly prepared itself wisely and efficiently, has anticipated the needs of its electorate with considerable skill, and once again has demonstrated its ability to be responsive to the people of Ontario.

Many progressive ideas are outlined in this address, ideas programmed to increase the amenities of life in this province. It is all very well for critics to say that the government has not gone far enough, but the realities of the times insist that the measures taken must be realistic and the objectives attainable.

It is interesting to note the very different approach to meeting the needs of people taken by this government, compared with the arrogance of the federal Liberal Party, for instance, or the high-tax syndrome and "government-do-everything" attitude preval-

ent among the NDP provincial governments in western Canada.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Shame, shame.

An hon. member: Truer words were never spoken.

Mrs. Scrivener: In Ontario we expect government to give leadership, and this is being done—through provincial action in connection with the book publishing industry, in the restructuring of the government administration and, as announced by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence), by the prompt action to save the endangered shorelines of our lower Great Lakes from high water levels.

However, the most important single item from my point of view is the fact that organized development as an expression of an emerging land-use policy is the recurrent theme. The speech is heavily laden with a number of matters associated with the environment. I am aware that these too are reflections of long-range programmes which have taken a considerable period of time to develop to their present position and which, when integrated into a major programme now developing, will become part of a total land-use policy which is soundly based on first principles.

Take, for instance, the subject of regional government east and west of Metropolitan Toronto. Much has been said and written about regional government and certainly I have been one of the contributors to the debate, associated as I was with Metropolitan Toronto's regional government over such a long period of time.

I would remind you that political scientists throughout the world consider that Metro Toronto has an eminently workable system and have come here from nearly every civilized country to study its structure and method of operation. And, Mr. Speaker, I would further remind you that the Metro form of government has been highly successful in its accomplishment, permitting as it does local municipalities to maintain their identity and autonomy while settling regional problems on a joint basis in the Metro partnership.

Therefore, consolidation of the regional government system in the more densely urbanized areas will certainly be a means of providing greater flexibility at the local government level, as well as a more effective means of planning, particularly as it applies to the control and use of land.

The speech indicates that the division of planning and administrative responsibilities as between the government and the municipalities has been more clearly defined than ever before. Furthermore, as the land-use policies emerge, it becomes obvious that implementation of those policies will be accomplished more effectively through the instrument of regional government.

Without a strong regional government system in southern Ontario, it would be very much more difficult to implement important planning proposals. Regional governments as the instrument of organization and administration for the urban areas and their surround, in combination with the existing "Baldwin" structure of local municipalities within their county system, should provide the elements of stability and harmony so necessary for the growth and development of tomorrow's Ontario.

The government's interest, as expressed in this Speech from the Throne, is clearly focussed on the major issues of provincial land use, on the designation of urban areas, the preservation of metropolitan greenbelts, the conservation of agricultural lands, recreational lands, wilderness areas and forests, and on ways and means of improving the urban environment.

These are mighty goals, Mr. Speaker, goals which can be achieved only through great foresight, great struggle, and great doses of that leavening agent, understanding. Yet, these goals are basic to Ontario's future development and any government which could ignore their importance in the general scheme of things would be unworthy of its electorate. This government knows and understands its role fully, Mr. Speaker. The Speech from the Throne is ample testimony.

It is my interpretation, Mr. Speaker, that the government's proposals will not only give direction but also provide a common framework for planning to the various ministries of government and to the new regional municipalities alike. This is a major step toward reconciling the conflicts which have existed between provincial and municipal planning goals in the changing scene.

By clarifying important components and the intent of Design for Development, and by declaring the provincial interest in major aspects of land use and environmental planning, I believe that the government is also indicating the planning competence of the municipalities to determine, within the broad and reasonable guidelines necessary and ap-

propriate to a large government, the quality and character of their own communities.

The speech also recognized the need, and promises public involvement in the planning process. In this regard I am sure there will be considerable applause for the decision to review the Planning Act and other Acts related to land development.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to interject a note about the concern I have for our present limited, computerized information resources. It is well known that one of the important elements of planning and land-use studies is adequate information, information which is usually acquired over a period of time and stored in a data bank.

I would like to see our facilities in this regard considerably broadened, Mr. Speaker. In addition, I would recommend that this government consider the incorporation in its next Throne Speech of an announcement that it will conduct a social census and will survey the province on a five-year basis.

Conservationists, hikers, skiers and many, many others will be pleased, as I was, to learn that protective legislation governing the Niagara Escarpment is to be introduced and that overall planning and administration for this great provincial natural resource will be the responsibility of a Niagara Escarpment commission.

Long years ago I sat as a director of the Conservation Council of Ontario and participated in discussions on how best the escarpment could be preserved for the future. Since then, many people and organizations have associated themselves with examinations and recommendations concerning the escarpment. Slowly the attitudes and interests have been formed to the point that now most people understand its importance and are willing to have the necessary money spent to acquire land crucial to its protection.

Those who have deplored the developmental pressures on choice farmland, such as that contained in our precious fruit belt, will certainly be heartened to discover that this government is seeking new means involving land-use controls where agricultural lands are concerned, so that good farmland may be retained for agricultural purposes. In this same connection, recommendations contained in the interim report of the select committee on land drainage will be implemented through new legislation.

The whole matter of energy resources is attracting considerable attention, not only in this province but throughout Canada. We know that at present Ontario's needs and resources are being carefully examined. Therefore, it is of some significance that we learn in the Speech from the Throne that "new policy initiatives establishing agencies for energy may be expected as well as changes in the role and place of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario."

This significance is further heightened by the information that new legislation will provide for the establishment of a permanent agency for environmental protection. This agency will fill a much needed role in today's society and will be responsible for the assessment and evaluation of the impact upon the environment of various governmental undertakings and comparable activities in the private sector. Since this is the government which created the Ontario Water Resources Commission and the conservation authority system, both of them unique concepts in advance of the times, it is refreshing to realize that this new agency will be another government first in its manner of dealing with threats to the environment.

Of special interest to large urban areas and especially Metro Toronto, will be the recommendation contained in the report of the task force on solid waste. The government has indicated its intention to introduce new legislation based on these recommendations. Also, it has declared its intention to clean up the Ontario landscape by providing for the removal of derelict motor vehicles, principally cars.

People who object to excessive noise and resent its intrusion upon their right to peaceful enjoyment of their homes will applaud the government decision to institute a noise abatement programme in connection with the municipalities. This is of particular interest to me, since hon. members will recall that during the closing session of the House last December I introduced private member's public bill No. 231 intituled, An Act to establish a Noise Research Bureau.

Since I have the honour to be the first chairman of the noise control group in the Institute of Environmental Sciences and Engineering at the University of Toronto, a group composed of many talented persons contributing their special knowledge and talent to the problem of noise abatement, it seems to me that it would be desirable to provide information and inform the public about methods of noise control.

This government has also expressed its intention to engage in such needed but

diverse activities as the introduction of a programme of forest management, the restoration and maintenance of buildings of historic significance—I think members of the Architectural Conservatory of Ontario will be pleased about that—and the improvement of airport and aviation facilities in northern Ontario.

The government has declared that it will develop an intermediate-capacity transit system. This is a subject which I'm sure will be of continuing interest and one which we will continue to hear discussed in future Throne Speeches as the programme develops in the years ahead. Again, this subject holds some special interest for me, Mr. Speaker, since you will doubtless recall that last June I debated with some hon. members second reading of my private member's public bill No. 35, An Act to Provide the Establishment of Regional Transportation Authorities in Ontario.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, it has been gratifying to hear the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis) refer to the need for transportation authorities during his policy statement on urban transportation needs in Ontario at the Science Centre late last November, and also to learn that the provincial government has commissioned a study entitled "Transportation Organizational Alternatives," to consider the feasibility of establishing a regional transportation authority for Metro Toronto.

I mention this bill and the events subsequent to its introduction, Mr. Speaker, in order to demonstrate to the hon. members of this House that we have a government which listens to its elected representatives and isn't afraid to endorse their ideas.

Not only is it a government which listens to people, it is also a government which is interested in opening up opportunities for people to do things themselves. Therefore, it is not surprising to learn from the Throne Speech of the importance it places upon the fact that next November the province will be host to the international conference being sponsored by the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers. Many citizens of Ontario are involved in preparation for this conference now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Not a single front bench member is listening.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Oh yes they are!

Mrs. Scrivener: Since I am a member of the Ontario Advisory Task Force on Housing Policy, I was interested in the comments contained in the speech—

Mr. Drea: Good party?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I was at a meeting.

Mrs. Scrivener: —concerning the structuring of new housing programmes. A number of worthwhile proposals have been presented to the task force during its public hearings, and I haven't a doubt that some of these will be incorporated into the task force report when it is prepared.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne reveals that community health centres are being considered by the Ontario Council of Health in conjunction with other health services, in order to "provide a strong blueprint for future policy."

As the member for St. David and the representative of a constituency which is considerably underserviced in terms of its medical needs in the downtown area, I am pleased to learn of this intention. The government of Ontario has agreed to finance the establishment of the Regent Park health centre in St. David, which will be operated and used by local residents; and it is expected that this project will open its doors later this year.

However, since populations adjacent to Dixon Hall on Sumach St. and in the Carlton-Parliament area have a considerable requirement, designation of another centre is imperative. Further, it would help reduce the present high death rate, which is 1½ times greater than the average across the whole of the city.

I believe the community health centre concept is a practical means of taking medical services into the community, and I hope that ultimately funds may be made available for many more units throughout the province.

On a more personal note, Mr. Speaker, there is a small comment I would like to add concerning the Throne Speech as it relates to my riding of St. David. The speech places a heavy emphasis on matters relating to the environment, transportation and housing—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Housing?

Mrs. Scrivener: —and future governmental studies and decisions—

Mr. Deans: The member has the nerve to say that after the minister's statement today?

Mrs. Scrivener: —concerned with these matters will also have a considerable impact upon problems of a similar nature affecting the people of the riding.

As you may know, St. David stretches from the lakefront and the harbour headland north to Davisville Ave., and it straddles the Don River for more than half that distance. Pollution of this river has had a negative impact upon the riding for a very long time. However, now that the Metro Toronto Conservation Authority is creating a lake on the west branch of the Don, perhaps "downstream" residents located in St. David can hope for some improvement in the quality of the lower river.

The riding features some very attractive, historic buildings such as Little Trinity Church, the Enoch Turner school and the Gooderham & Worts' distillery. It is reassuring to know that funds may be made available for the restoration and maintenance of such important and historic buildings.

Canada's oldest public housing project was mentioned earlier today during the question period in the House, and I refer to Regent Park. It is located in the southerly portion of the riding, and I am confident that the leadership which has been displayed by its residents through the preparation and presentation of the Regent Park tenants' brief to the housing task force will lead the way for new thought in connection with this vital area.

Cabbagetown, and the remnants of the old town of York, which nestled around the marshy mouth of the Don River, have a number of dwellings which provide housing for a substantial population of roomers. A report prepared and written by area residents Mary McMaster and Norma Browne, who is editor of the ward 7 newspaper "Seven News," presents a very clear picture of the plight of roomers in downtown Toronto and has also been submitted to the housing task force.

Throughout the riding, residents will herald the municipal noise abatement programme with joy. Major thoroughfares such as the Gardiner Expressway, the Don Valley Parkway, Eastern Ave., and Parliament, Yonge and Bloor Sts. all generate very heavy traffic; the noise is excessive at any time, and on a warm evening when bedroom windows are open, noise is a very considerable disturbance.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is stimulating and exciting, and an excellent portent for the future. I predict that the coming session will be very interesting, and I am certainly proud to be a member of a government capable of providing the calibre of leadership so obviously demonstrated in this address.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They like it in St. David but they didn't like it in St. George.

Mrs. Scrivener: To conclude, Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I am honoured and pleased to move the adoption of the Speech from the Throne, and I would say to all hon. members that those who vote against this speech are in a very real way voting against the best interests of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Drea: Come on, let it rip.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): This is enough to keep Walter from coming back.

Mr. Turner: Who? Walter who?

Mr. Deans: Yes, who?

Mr. Turner: I am very deeply aware of the honour and privilege that has been extended to me in this opportunity to second the motion of my hon. colleague, the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener), for the adoption of the Speech from the Throne presented by the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

The people of this province are indeed fortunate that His Honour continues to display his deep concern and abiding interest in their future well-being.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this particular speech from the Throne was probably one of the most inspiring and most imaginative and most visionary that this House has been privileged to hear.

Mr. Deans: This is most repetitive.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who wrote that? There's no way that these compliments will get the member into the cabinet.

Mr. Turner: I need hardly say that I heartily disagree with the occasional vapid editorializing over its meaning and direction.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought the Globe editorialized.

Mr. Turner: To me, its meaning is clear to anyone who can see and hear, and its direction is new, exciting and challenging.

Mr. Deans: Is the member not embarrassed to say that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Turner: Give me time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Turner: Not really.

An hon. member: You will learn something.

Mr. Turner: We are just gathering steam.

New, because to my mind it signals a shifting of overall responsibilities and priorities; exciting and challenging because of all that that entails. A good many years ago this government properly anticipated the burgeoning demand for educational facilities brought about by the postwar population explosion. In the intervening years we have built the broadest and best educational system in the world, from the elementary to the post-secondary and post-graduate levels. A few years ago this government embarked on a programme of universal health care which is the envy of people everywhere.

Mr. Deans: He will confess that there was a degree of reluctance?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Doesn't he feel any shame at all?

Mr. Turner: These were the major priorities of the Fifties and Sixties, Mr. Speaker. They will continue to involve the most earnest attention of this government in the future, but the basic challenges have been met and successfully overcome. It is time now to turn our creative talents and abilities to other pressing problems faced by our society. This Speech from the Throne heralds our willingness to meet and resolve these problems.

Further evidence of this government's ability to provide effective solutions to the staggering complexities of modern living is contained in the early paragraphs of His Honour's speech. The remarkable success of the province's measures to combat the economic malaise of the past years demonstrates statistically the futility of the federal government's solution to the same problem.

The simple fact that Ontario is the only region in Canada to experience a decline in unemployment in the past year in spite of a rapidly growing labour force demonstrates clearly that Ottawa's determination to spend its way out of crises just will not work. Moreover, they do it by using expanding revenues which should more properly and equitably be distributed to the provinces rather than squandered on ill-conceived short-term schemes.

Mr. Speaker, we told them it wouldn't work and it hasn't worked.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This government found $300 million it didn't even know it had.

Mr. Turner: Ontario's budgetary deficits are the price we pay for Ottawa's fiscal mismanagement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Stanfield is going to support them though.

Mr. Deans: How about the corporate ripoff?

Mr. Turner: The member can tell me.

Mr. Deans: Let him tell us about his position on that.

Mr. Turner: I think it is fair, Mr. Speaker, to say that the major thrust of the Throne Speech is our government's determination to come to grips with the issues of ecological and environmental protection in the general public interest. While measures designed to preserve the historic and ecological integrity of the Niagara Escarpment and the establishment of the parkway belt system do not directly affect my constituents, the concept of land-use control is vital to the residents of Peterborough, both county and city.

As most of the members are aware, Mr. Speaker, Peterborough riding is made up of a rural and an urban area, consisting of a northern portion which is divided from the southern portion by the Canadian Shield, or part of the Canadian Shield. The northern part probably has some of the finest recreational and tourist areas not only in Ontario but possibly in Canada. The southern part of this riding of Peterborough is made up of rolling agricultural farm land in the midst of which is situated the city of Peterborough. The rugged northern natural vacation land is designated in the Toronto-centred region plan as a recreational area and serves, as I said before, all of Ontario as a tourist area.

These three distinct areas have unique planning priorities and considerations, and

each must have a high proportion of local participation in the planning process. I am heartened therefore, as is my colleague from St. David, that the major review of the Planning Act and related statutes will encourage and facilitate this local initiative. The protection of prime agricultural land from ill-considered development through land-use controls is an ideal to which everyone will subscribe in principle.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): That is not what the Tories are saying in British Columbia right now.

Mr. Turner: However, because of the delicate balance between the common good and individual rights, its successful realization demands the fullest citizen consultation and co-operation in the farm community. I single out the farm community particularly because in the rural areas of Ontario land-use planning is of major importance and of major concern. As is well known to you, Mr. Speaker, people operating farms look on the sale of that farm land as being their future retirement fund and this government must be very careful not to trample on the rights of individual citizens over the disposal of their land.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I hope they listen to that as well as all those compliments.

Mr. Young: They can have it both ways, eh?

Mr. Turner: I hope so. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duty and responsibility to my constituents if, given this opportunity, I did not urge this government to act as quickly as possible on the recommendations of the Canada-Ontario-Rideau-Trent-Severn study. The Trent canal system, a significant portion of which lies within my riding, is an invaluable recreational water route from Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario. It is a unique resource of great potential which must be preserved. I am not speaking here only of the lakes and rivers that form this Trent canal system but, more importantly perhaps, of the land abutting the system. There is a clear and imminent possibility that within a short time much of this land, if indeed not all of it, will be controlled by the private sector. If public access to the water is to be secured and controlled, action must be taken now.

I endorse the concept of strengthened local governments and welcome the proposal to transfer broader authority and responsibility to them. The restructuring of local government in Peterborough, and I speak here of both the city and the county, can and should be initiated at the local level. There is indeed plenty of time during which this process can be encouraged and developed, since this government is not at this particular time considering any plan for the introduction of any form of regional government in the Peterborough area.

I am gratified to learn of the government's initiatives in the field of noise abatement. It is a matter of vital concern to everyone, if perhaps more directly to the urban residents. Of particular concern to me, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to emphasize this, is the effect of the high decibel levels on workers inside manufacturing and industrial buildings. The increasing incidence of industrial deafness is an alarming public health problem. While present solutions, involving ear muffs and plugs, in the short term perhaps are effective, I think they should be regarded as a strictly temporary measure. We require more efficient methods of muffling and silencing industrial machinery.

I would just like, if I may, to take a minute to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that 80 decibels apparently are what is regarded as a noise factor. Also, this magic number of 80 decibels is the beginning of permanent hearing damage. I think that we in this government must take cognizance of this fact and take the steps required to bring about more efficient and quieter-operating machinery.

As a member of the select committee on the Ontario Municipal Board I am encouraged by the undertaking to make the institu? tion a more effective vehicle. I would hope that this government would adopt those recommendations of the committee, the aim of which is to return more authority to the municipal level. I know that it is a matter of great concern to municipal officials and to do so would not seem to be inconsistent with the present policy.

Another area of concern to me, Mr. Speaker, is the proposed Livestock Medicines Act which will be awaited with considerable anxiety and anticipation by the farmers, not only in my riding but in the whole of the province. Very real concern has been expressed to me during meetings I have attended in the farm communities in my area.

The hon. member for St. David has quite properly hailed the urban transportation policy announced last November and for which plans are now proceeding. I, too, commend the principle and envision its considerable impact on the problems of urban congestion. Although there is still a dinosaur ele-

ment in this House which does not yet see the light, the automobile is not a reasonable or rational solution to the movement of people within cities. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, for many of the same reasons it is becoming a less credible mode of intercity movement. In my view, we must consider fast and alternative means of interurban transit of goods and services as well as people.

I congratulate the government for proposing adjustments of benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Act. There is no doubt that this is an area of great concern to many people in this province, and I hope that the changes will occur without undue delay.

I would also congratulate the government in general, and the Ontario Housing Corp. in particular, for its excellent building and development programme, not only in Peterborough but throughout the province, and we look forward to a continuing spirit of co-operation. I hear so much criticism of this agency, of the minister and of the ministry, Mr. Speaker, that I feel it is incumbent on me to extend to them my heartiest thanks. During 1972 construction was commenced on 221 units in the city of Peterborough.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was that land bought from the member's predecessor?

Mr. Turner: From Walter?

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning of this speech that the Speech from the Throne was visionary. The courageous initiatives in the field of environmental protection, land-use control, alleviation of urban congestion and strengthening of local institutions; in short, measures to improve and protect the quality of life in our province are designed to benefit not only our generation but many generations yet to come. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:25 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 23, 1973

Court ruling on land acquisition, statement by Mr. Bales 131

Status of OPC officer, statement by Mr. Yaremko 131

Status of OPC officer, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Renwick 132

Investigation of OHIP payments, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Shulman 134

Mississippi River contamination threat, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon 135

Metro Centre plan, question of Mr. White: Mr. Deans 135

Provincial Auditor's report, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Deans 135

Metro housing shortage, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Deans, Mr. R. F. Nixon 136

Dial-a-bus system for Toronto, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Givens 138

New community of North Pickering, question of Mr. White: Mr. W. Newman 139

Oil spill in Kelly Lake, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Germa 139

Assessment of churches, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Gaunt 140

Testing of medical students, questions of Mr. McNie: Mr. Shulman 140

Great Lakes flood damage, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Haggerty 140

Mississippi River contamination threat, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon 141

Old Sandwich public library, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Burr, Mr. Bounsall 141

Windsor Raceway, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. B. Newman 141

Northwestern Ontario reservoir, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Foulds 142

Egg quotas, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Gaunt 142

Ethics of Elected Representatives, bill respecting, Mr. Shulman, first reading 143

Businesses Controlled by Organized Crime, bill respecting, Mr. Shulman, first reading 143

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 143

Dentistry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 143

Occupational Safety Act, 1973, bill intituled, Mr. Shulman, first reading 144

Child Welfare Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 144

Consumer Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 144

Promotional Games, bill to control, Mr. Shulman, first reading 144

Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 144

Operation of aircraft over Ontario and investigation of sonic booms, bill to regulate, Mr. Shulman, first reading 144

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 144

Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 144

Medical practitioners, registered nurses and others from liability re emergency services, bill to relieve, Mr. Shulman, first reading 145

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 145

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 145

Provincial Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 145

Ophthalmic Dispensers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 145

Mental Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 145

Ministry of Correctional Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 145

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 145

Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 146

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 146

Commission to evaluate government programmes, bill to establish, Mr. Shulman, first reading 146

Game and Fish Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 146

Child Welfare Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 146

Consumer Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 147

Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 147

Cemeteries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 147

Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 147

Control and regulation of snowmobiles, bill to provide for, Mr. Shulman, first reading 147

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 147

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 147

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 147

Election Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 148

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 148

Control of eavesdropping, bill to provide for, Mr. Shulman, first reading 148

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 148

Certification of dealers and persons engaged in the fitting and selling of hearing aids, bill to provide for, Mr. Shulman, first reading 148

Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mrs. Scrivener, Mr. Turner 149

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. R. F. Nixon, agreed to 156

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 156

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 6



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 26, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors with us today: In the east gallery, students from T. R. McEwen Public School of Oshawa, and from St. Vincent de Paul Separate School of Toronto; in the west gallery there are students from St. Martin's Separate School of Mississauga.

A little later in the afternoon, in the Speaker's gallery and in the east and west galleries, we will have members of the Huron Liberal Association and St. George's Liberal Association.

Statements by the ministry.

SOLANDT COMMISSION

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that the duties of Dr. O. M. Solandt, chairman of the commission which was established by the government of Ontario in June, 1972, to inquire into the routing of transmission lines from Nanticoke to Pickering, have been extended by order in council to include inquiry in like manner into the routing of transmission lines between Ontario Hydro's Lennox generating station and the proposed Oshawa area transformer station. The study will include consideration of transmission line connections to the proposed power plants at Wesleyville and Bowmanville, and so will cover the entire area from Napanee to Oshawa.

The terms of reference note that particular attention will be given to social, environmental and economic factors.

As with the proposed transmission of power from Nanticoke to Pickering, the Lennox to Oshawa connection involves the siting of the 500 kv transmission lines that will supply the increasing growth of electrical power requirements in the southern areas of the province over the next decades.

In an interim report of Oct. 31, 1972, following on the commission's public inquiry into the proposed routings for the Nanticoke to Pickering transmission line, Dr. Solandt recommended that a full environmental study involving public participation was necessary to determine the best routing for this line. This study is being undertaken by Mr. Bruce Howlett, environmental consultant, through his Toronto company, BHI Ltd. Area inventories are under way and the second series of regional open meetings to encourage area public participation are being held for four outlying regions this week.

In the spirit of these recommendations, Ontario Hydro independently retained the environmental consulting firm of Commonwealth Associates Inc. in October, 1972, to do a similar detailed siting study of the proposed 500 kv line from the Napanee area to Oshawa. This line will convey power to the Toronto area load centre from the existing Lennox generating station and the proposed stations at Wesleyville and Bowmanville.

This study is being undertaken with the assistance of Ontario Hydro and every effort is being made to include the citizens of the area in each phase of the study, so that local plans and priorities may be given full consideration. Initial public meetings have already been held with a number of municipal officials and citizens.

Ontario Hydro proposes to have a report ready by the late summer of this year based on these studies. This report will then be submitted publicly to the Solandt commission. At that time Dr. Solandt will invite submissions on the report and hold public hearings under the terms of the Public Inquiries Act, so that full opportunity may be given to all interested individuals and organizations to make their views known to the commission.

Mr. Speaker, I warmly endorse the study being undertaken by Ontario Hydro and Commonwealth Associates Inc., and particularly the opportunities for public contribution. The open, full and continuing co-operation of all parties throughout the course of the study is to be highly commended.

It is to be hoped and expected that the main discussion concerning details of choosing the best route will take place at the informal sessions being held locally during the study by Ontario Hydro and Commonwealth Associates, so that only unresolved difficulties need be raised at the formal commission hearings.

PUBLIC HOUSING RENTS

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, a number of questions were asked by hon. members in regard to the recent increase in the combined old age security and maximum guaranteed income supplement payments and how this may affect recipients living in Ontario Housing Corp. senior citizen dwellings.

Because of the confusion surrounding this matter, created essentially I must say by the unclear observations made at the federal level, I would like to make the following statement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That will clear it up.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes sir, clear it now!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: By way of background, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that on May 19, 1972, Ontario Housing Corp. wrote to Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. pointing out that a task force within OHC had been discussing rental scales with tenants and housing authority members. The letter requested a meeting to consider some of the points that arose during the task force discussions. Again, on July 8, 1972, OHC requested a meeting, but to date no meeting has been held.

In February, 1973, the federal minister responsible for housing made certain public statements in regard to senior citizen rentals as a result of which Ontario Housing Corp. wrote on March 1, this year, asking for clarification of these remarks so that our housing authorities could be informed.

Mr. Speaker, under our agreement with CMHC all increases in income, apart from those exemptions under the rent scale, must be included for the purpose of calculating rent. On March 15, I sent a telegram to the hon. Ron Basford, Minister of State for Urban Affairs which said, in part:

DURING THE RECENT FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL-CONFERENCE ON HOUSING, I MADE THE POINT THERE SHOULD BE NO UNILATERAL CHANGES IN THE NATIONAL RENT-GEARED-TO-INCOME SCALE WITHOUT PRIOR CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PROVINCES AND THEIR MUNICIPALITIES WHO PAY HALF OF THE SUBSIDIES. THERE WERE RECENT ANNOUNCEMENTS ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN MADE BY YOU TO THE EFFECT THERE WOULD BE NO INCREASES IN SENIOR CITIZEN RENTS IN LIGHT OF RECENT PENSION INCREASES IN ACCOMMODATION WHERE THERE WAS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT. OHC, FOR WHICH I AM RESPONSIBLE, WROTE YOUR STAFF ON MARCH 1, 1973, FOR CLARIFICATION AND HAVE NOT RECEIVED AN ANSWER IN THIS REGARD. METRO TORONTO HOUSING CORPORATION TODAY ANNOUNCED IT WILL INCREASE RENTS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS. IN LIGHT OF THE CONFUSION CREATED BY YOUR STATEMENT, IT MAKES IT DIFFICULT FOR OHC TO NOTIFY OUR HOUSING AUTHORITIES AND DISTRICT MANAGERS THROUGHOUT THE PROVINCE AS TO WHAT ACTION THEY SHOULD BE TAKING IN REGARD TO THE RENEWAL OF ONGOING LEASES WITH SENIOR CITIZENS.

I AM QUITE SURE YOU ARE AWARE THE RENTAL SCALE BEING USED FOR SENIOR CITIZENS IS THE SCALE ORIGINALLY DESIGNED FOR FAMILIES. IN FACT THERE HAS NEVER BEEN A SPECIFIC RENTAL SCALE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS.

THEREFORE, I WOULD STRONGLY URGE A DELAY IN APPLYING THE PRESENT SCALE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS DURING WHICH TIME A SPECIAL NATIONAL SCALE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS CAN BE DEVISED. THIS SHOULD BE DONE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PROVINCES.

On March 19 I received a letter from Mr. Basford which called upon the provinces to do what, in effect, Ontario had already decided to do; that is not consider the pension increases for the purpose of rent.

He suggested further that this should apply "until March 1, 1974, or an earlier date if our respective staffs have by then completed a study of the rent scale as it relates to senior citizens and the recommendations are acceptable to both of us."

On March 22 I again wrote Mr. Basford confirming Ontario's decision and suggesting a speedy resolution of the new scale. I suggested September or October of this year would be a more reasonable target date for this task than would March 1, 1974.

NON-PAYMENT OF TRAFFIC FINES

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton), and myself, that Bill 212, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, will come into force on Monday, April 2, 1973, by proclamation.

This amending Act adds a new section to the Highway Traffice Act providing for the possible suspension of the drivers' licences

of motorists who are in default of payment of fines incurred as a result of convictions under the Highway Traffic Act, the Public Vehicles Act and the Public Commercial Vehicles Act or any regulations coming under these Acts. The Act does not apply to parking violations covered by municipal bylaws.

The present method of assuring payment of outstanding fines has become increasingly less effective in recent years. Unpaid fines levied by the provincial courts are today approximately $13 million, compared with $3.4 million in 1968, and the bulk of this relates to fines levied under the above Acts.

It is our estimate that there are now some 100,000 Ontario motorists who have avoided payment of fines levied under these Acts. To leave this situation uncorrected would be a disservice to Ontario's 3.6 million motorists.

Motorists convicted of violations on or after April 2 will be given or sent a notice showing the amount of the fine to be paid, the court to which the remittance must be made and the deadline for payment. Motorists convicted prior to April 2 who have failed to pay their fines will be sent a reminder notice containing the same information. These notices will go by first-class mail to the motorist's address as listed in the drivers' file at the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. Failure to pay the fine may result in a court order to suspend the driver's licence.

A driver's licence, once suspended, will remain suspended and will not be renewed until full payment is made and a court order for reinstatement has been issued.

It is imperative that details of this legislation and regulations become public knowledge as quickly as possible. To do this, advertisements will be appearing in newspapers in Ontario.

It must be understood that these arrears, having accumulated over a number of years, will take some time to eliminate. This legislation will assist us in eliminating the large amount of arrears which has accumulated over the last few years and hopefully will prevent a similar situation from recurring in the future.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

PUBLIC HOUSING RENTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, for further clarification of the Minister of Revenue's statement, are we to understand from this that it was the federal government that raised the payments to the senior citizens by way of their pension fund? Secondly, even if the minister at the provincial level were going to make use of those funds—which he said on Friday he had not been able to use—to provide housing on a rent-geared-to-income basis in the province, it will be possible that they will not have their rents raised; the increase in pension would be nullified under those circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has unfortunately added to the confusion by talking about unused funds again. He made the statement the other day in the House, and talked about $80 million or $100 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was 15.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was puzzled where he got that figure. There is no such figure. I'll be making a statement, probably tomorrow, to clarify that situation which has been confused by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Between the two of them, the members will keep each other busy all the time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say anything about unused funds. It was the Leader of the Opposition and we will clarify that tomorrow.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All I can do is again assure him that, insofar as the senior citizens are concerned, we have not increased the rents at this time; as we did not indeed the last time there was a pension increase.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: For further clarification: It is the federal government that gives them the extra money and it is the provincial government that decides, with its usual generosity, that it will not raise the rents.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out to the hon. member that we have agreements with the federal government in which there is rent geared to income, as soon as the income of a person goes up a portion of that is generally required to be taken in an increase in rent. It doesn't make any difference where the money comes from. The point is that this is the agreement with the federal

government and we have been trying now for over a year to get a review of that scale—

Mr. MacDonald: It's the fault of the federal government!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and to date it has been impossible to do that. As I pointed out in my statement, the federal minister has now agreed that we should have such a meeting.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Finally!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has talked about a year from today and we are trying to encourage him to make it a lot sooner than that so that there won't be the kind of confusion which apparently exists in the opposition ranks.

Interjections by hon. members.

SUNDAY OPENING OF RETAIL STORES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Is he prepared to make a policy statement with regard to the Sunday opening of commercial enterprises—which apparently is becoming a matter of some concern—since one chain of supermarkets remained open in Toronto this past Sunday by way, it appears, of a test of whether the province is prepared to enforce the legislation or whether there is some new policy in the offing?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the government isn't prepared at this point to make a statement.

There are two matters related, I think. One is the pause day as it is referred to in Mr. McRuer's report; the other is the question of store hours. They are not directly the same, but they are interrelated.

The justice policy field, if memory serves me correctly, met with some representation from a group, I think from the industry itself, from the Federation of Labour and others not too many weeks ago. It is a very complex matter and one on which we hope to come up with some policy suggestion. I would expect, Mr. Speaker, we will be in a position to do this, hopefully, in two or three weeks.

As I pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition, I think it probably relates both to Sunday observance and to the question of store closing hours. As I say, it is complex. We would like to find some better solutions to it and hopefully within that period of time we shall have some policy suggestions to make.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In the meantime, what instructions are being given to the various police forces as far as the enforcement of the present law is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I personally haven't instructed the police forces. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition might like to redirect that to the Solicitor General or the Attorney General.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would do so.

I would ask the Solicitor General what instructions are being given to the police forces?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): No specific instructions, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of any specific instructions one way or the other. It is just that the law is there to be enforced.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question, then, of the Attorney General: What steps would he see necessary in order to enforce the legislation since a large number of stores are staying open, apparently in contravention of the law of Ontario?

An hon. member: Of the Lord's Day Act.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this comes under the provisions of the Lord's Day Act. The charges are laid; they come to me for consent to prosecute for violations on Sundays. I have been consenting to those requests for prosecution.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: The request must come from the police or citizen in that case, and no initiative is taken by the Attorney General through the police to control this matter which is beginning, apparently, to mushroom in contravention of the law?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It's done through the police. Sometimes complaints are made to police. Sometimes police lay charges themselves. When it is a matter of a prosecution for an offence on a Sunday, they must come to me for consent. I have been consenting to those matters. For example, in relation to driving trucks on the highways on Sundays, store openings, et cetera, they have been submitted to me regularly and I've dealt with them in that way.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the Attorney General advise us if the incidence of requests to him for consent to prosecute has increased materially in the last three months? Perhaps he has some figures that would indicate it.

Secondly, can the Attorney General advise us whether or not he is consenting to all requests to prosecute or is his consent a selective process?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I don't have any figures before me at the present time. I'd be glad to get them for the member.

It isn't an automatic consent, but a very large percentage of applications or requests to me is consented to. I can think of very few that have not been consented to of late, but I go over each one independently.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): By way of a supplementary question, doesn't the minister think that when there's a deliberate plan to violate a statute in force in the Province of Ontario that the minister is obligated to take some initiative in connection with those violations?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the initiative is really taken through the police forces. I agree with the member on that, and I'm attempting to assist them in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY RIOTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further question of the Attorney General: Now that the official report on the riots in the Kingston Penitentiary has been made available, does the Attorney General contemplate any further changes based on the findings of the report?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, that involved the federal government as well as ourselves. The matter is being studied.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: In the case of the original charges laid against certain prison guards, if my memory serves me correctly the Attorney General acted alone in laying those charges, and it was considered at that time his sole responsibility so to do. Would not the same application be correct now?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Maybe, but I think there should be co-operation between the federal government and ourselves on these things by way of consultation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

METRO HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Revenue: Would he be kind enough to name for the Legislature those ratepayers' groups and those specific projects, which he referred to both inside and outside of the House on Friday, which had managed to prevent the construction of between 1,000 and 1,500 units of geared-to-income housing in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The area residents, whether they are in organized groups or otherwise, sir, will be named. I will name the projects which have had to be postponed or cancelled, as the hon member opposite has asked. We've been asked, as a matter of fact, by some other outside group and by the press. I think I gave them a statement this afternoon. They're asking for the list, so I'm just hoping I'll be able to get them to the House before they're published. We haven't finalized them yet. I'll be glad to give that information.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister have any instances which come readily to mind, so we're not pre-empted by press stories of projects which were stopped either at the council level, or by citizen obstruction as he called it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A number of them come to mind, Mr. Speaker, but I don't see that any purpose is served. I will give a complete statement in the House and members will have the whole picture.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, when does the minister intend to do that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, perhaps tomorrow, Wednesday or Thursday—sometime this week.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister tell the House if those 1,500 units which were not built had, in fact, been funded previously by vote of the Legislature or by funds made available to the housing corporation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, indeed they have.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Were they unused funds?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They were—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —funds which were not used for those particular allocations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They're not used yet?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They were not used for public housing.

Mr. Bullbrook: Unused funds; right?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The hon. minister is attempting to answer a question which was an interjection and was not proper.

Mr. Bullbrook: Certainly!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): I'd like to ask a supplementary question: Would the minister also table the projects and the number of units which were offered by builders under the proposal call system and which were rejected by OHC, in order that we can put this into perspective?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought that was the original question of his leader and I offered to do that. Is that any different from the question that he asked?

Mr. Cassidy: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I'm seeking the proposals which were rejected by OHC and not turned down by ratepayer groups. Would the minister also table those with the number of units involved?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What I am concerned with, Mr. Speaker, is if there is a difference between the information which the hon. member has asked for and the information which his leader has asked for. I can't distinguish any. If there is, I'd like to know, so I'm not misleading the House. It seems as if he's asking for the same thing.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, there is a difference, which may have escaped the minister, between those houses the building of which is prevented by ratepayers' groups and the building of which is prevented by OHC. We are now asking for different pieces of information: First, the proposals which were prevented from completion by the intervention of ratepayers' groups and city councils; second, those proposals from builders which were rejected by the Ontario Housing Corp. itself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know that that's important, Mr. Speaker. There is a tremendous number of proposals made, which for various reasons aren't satisfactory. They may not be in conformity with the requirements of OHC; they may indeed not be in conformity with the requirements of the municipality, they may be a proposition which the municipality hasn't asked for. I'll look at that and find out how practical that is.

Mr. Cassidy: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is it correct that the minister seems to be saying that perhaps 10,000 or 15,000 or 20,000 units have been turned down by the OHC, however he is turning on ratepayer groups and blaming them for turning down thousands?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Good point, though. No wonder the members opposite howl.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

INTEGRATED COMMUNITY HOUSING PROJECT

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Revenue: Can he tell us how much money he expects to spend in the extraordinary contribution which he is making to the developers of Ontario in what he calls his integrated community housing project, that one-third of the plan by which the ministry will provide up to 95 per cent by way of mortgage financing? How much does he anticipate spending?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we anticipate spending a portion of whatever we have within the budget of OHC for public housing. Wherever this kind of housing is made available to us, we will spend those funds.

The money in our budget for public housing does not, as far as I can recall from the top of my head, stipulate the kind of housing within the public housing funding that these funds are to go to. So if the hon. member really is asking what we have in the budget

for public housing, because within that budget I think—and I stand to be corrected if it is not so—we have the ability to move about from one programme to another so long as it is public housing, if the hon. member is asking what we anticipate, I hope it is a lot more than it appears at the moment.

Mr. Cassidy: That's a pretty confusing answer.

Mr. Lewis: So do the developers. They hope it's a lot more, too.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, good!

Mr. Lewis: It's outrageous! It's a gift to the developers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am very glad to hear that they are interested, because the more they are interested the more housing we will be able to put up.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister realize, by way of supplementary, that what in effect he is saying is that no developer who participates in the plan need place any consequential equity of his own or his company's into the building of housing? Why was it not, therefore, possible to say that 25 per cent of the units will be provided for geared-to-income housing which the Province of Ontario will underwrite, rather than giving all this additional money to the developers? Why was it necessary to do it that way?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that it would be an attraction to a builder to accept from us merely a proposition that we will underwrite the rents for 25 per cent of their houses?

Mr. Lewis: If the minister would guarantee 25 per cent of occupancy, of course it would.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course not! As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had done his research into the housing programme, he would know that's precisely what we're doing under our rent supplement programme, and we cannot get sufficient of them. I think the last year we had about 1,100 which we were able to get across this province, in which we have practically an open-ended invitation to owners to provide us with accommodation where we could place our tenants. They would be integrated with other people in the rest of the building, so that hopefully people wouldn't recognize those who were subsidized and those who were not. Under our rent supplement programme, we would pay the difference between the required rent, provided it is a reasonable one of course, and what the proposed tenant is able to pay under the rent-geared-to-income programme. That is in existence now, but we haven't had sufficient response because it isn't attractive enough to a builder. He wants to have a certain amount—

Mr. Lewis: He wants to have everything paid by the public purse, and that's what this government is doing!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That may very well be, but what we want to do is to provide as much housing as we can in practically any way we can do it.

Mr. Lewis: By selling out to the developers!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! This has developed into argumentative debate.

Mr. Singer: No, I'm not debating. I just want to ask a simple supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions? If not, the hon. member—

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: No further supplementaries! It is an argumentative debate at this point. We are finished with that topic. There will be no further questions on that topic.

Mr. Lewis: I apologize for introducing argument into the debate, Mr. Speaker. May I ask a question of the Minister of Health—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The purpose of this period is to elicit information from the ministry, not to debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well because the former is impossible, the latter is desirable.

Mr. Speaker: Don't get out of order!

STUDY OF PAYMENTS FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. Lewis: May I direct a question to the Minister of Health? The committee of the Ontario Council of Health, which was

referred to in the Throne Speech to look into questions of medical care insurance, is composed entirely of doctors. Am I not right in that?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): There was a committee established in the Ontario Council of Health—

Mr. Singer: Oh yes, that one!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He has so many!

Mr. Singer: I remember—a committee to investigate committees!

Hon. Mr. Potter: A task force of the Ontario Council of Health was established of doctors from all over the province and from all the various fields of medicine to recommend changes to us. Their report was submitted to the Ontario Council of Health, which, as the hon. members know, has very few doctors itself. The council, in turn, has submitted its recommendations to me from that report.

Mr. Singer: And that is going to be investigated by another committee!

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, no. But we did have—

Mr. Lewis: He'll just give it to his civil servants to mutilate.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, no. We did have an internal task force at the same time—

Mr. Singer: A task force?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —which the hon. member is very well aware of, and I know the Leader of the Opposition is very well aware of it too. We have now had these reports submitted and we are in the process of reviewing them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the public clamour and the political reality for the minister, does he not think that it's a very great distortion to have solely doctors commenting on the medical care insurance plan and the recommendations for its revision, and should he not have opened that to the public?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, we have many other people besides doctors commenting on this. This is just one aspect of the study that's going on.

Mr. Lewis: But the minister is acting on those recommendations!

Hon. Mr. Potter: We are acting on all of them.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister say he is acting on none of them? Was that what he blurted out?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I said we were acting on all of them.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary question, where is the report from the Ontario Council of Health? It is, after all, a public body.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I have it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: I'm glad to hear that! When does the minister intend to release it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I will release it just as soon as I have an opportunity to do the proper studies and make a presentation to this House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I wouldn't applaud. We didn't win them, but you lost them.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The hon. member should have been here!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Is that why he went away?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, *plus ça change.* One last question of the Minister of Health and then, feeling good that everything is the same, I will take my seat.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The man from Wentworth has a lean and hungry look!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

$55 MILLION ERROR

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister aware that the gentleman who headed the Ontario Hospital Services Commission at the time of the $55 million error, which the Treasurer aptly described as grossly deficient, is now the minister's deputy minister, and how does he feel about it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think I have a very efficient deputy minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh he does!

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in that my remarks have been quoted I think perhaps I owe it to the Legislature to provide—

Mr. Singer: Order!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may rise on a point of order or privilege.

Mr. Singer: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since my name has been mentioned by the leader of the NDP, I would like him to know that my off-the-cuff reply prompted certain information to come to me—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. Call the minister to order. Surely he is not going to get away with that?

Hon. Mr. White: —and I have today initiated an investigation and will be making a statement to the House this week concerning that very substantial sum of money.

Mr. Singer: Ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If not, the hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mine is a question designed to elicit information from the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member must have taken several weeks preparing it!

PRE-CLEARANCE OF CUSTOMS

Mr. Givens: Does the Premier intend to make representations on behalf of the people of Ontario to the government of Canada and to Air Canada with respect to the vexing question of the imminent cancellation of preclearance of customs and immigration, which is a matter of federal jurisdiction which will inconvenience and affect hundreds of thousands of Ontario travellers and will affect our tourist industry?

Mr. Lewis: A burning issue!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will be very frank and very specific with the hon. member. I hadn't really thought of this, but it might be a very good idea. I shall certainly consider it.

Mr. Lewis: That was a shining jewel in the otherwise cluttered heap.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

LCBO MARKUP ON WINE

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister consider breaking one of the traditions of the Liquor Control Board by reducing their punitive markup on wines so as to prevent next week's forecast price rise of up to 125 per cent on certain wines?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I wish I did have the power to set the price of all alcoholic beverages within this province. I conferred with my people. They advise me that the international money markets right now have required certain studies.

The other matters referred to by the member might all be within the ambit of the Treasurer of this province when it comes to the time of the budget. I read an article in the paper this morning dealing with certain problems relating to increased costs being requested by exporters from foreign markets into this area. I don't think we can turn a blind eye to those increased costs, and it may well require some additional consideration.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister agree with me that the 109 per cent markup he is now charging is somewhat excessive? And would the minister furthermore agree that he will continue to make the same profit because of the higher prices if he reduces his percentage markup?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Yakabuski: Buy Canadian, buy Canadian!

Hon. Mr. Clement: I am sorry, I couldn't hear the member's question.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The minister didn't miss anything.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister's own colleagues are so noisy.

Mr. Shulman: They have been imbibing too much of it, Mr. Speaker.

Would the minister agree with me that a 109 per cent markup is excessive? Secondly, would he not also agree that he would make exactly the same profit by reducing his percentage, because of the increased price of the wines? If he is buying a wine for $5 that he bought before for $2 and he has a 50 per cent mark up he will get the same profit.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I do not agree with the hon. member that it is excessive. I agree to this extent that I think it is high. I am also not blind to the fact that we have domestic wines made within this province and we cannot lose sight of that industry either, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

HOSPITAL CUTBACKS

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): I have a question of the Minister of Health. Is the minister aware that the cutback in hospital beds and the limiting of the budget to a five per cent increase this year is affecting the smaller hospitals in a much more severe way than the larger hospitals. Is the minister going to do anything that will assist these smaller hospitals so that they may continue to operate efficiently?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, the information we have back so far from the hospitals is that the vast majority of them are finding it very easy to live within the constraints. There are one or two isolated cases where we have asked the hospitals to get in touch with us and if the member knows of any specific cases we would be delighted to deal with them.

Mr. Cassidy: Hear no problems, see no problems!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

LAYOFFS AT RYERSON INSTITUTE

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): A question of the Minister of Labour: Will the Minister of Labour order his director of employment standards to launch an immediate investigation under section 10, subsection (f) of the Employment Standards Act to determine if the proposed layoffs by Ryerson Institute are merely a scheme to defeat the true purpose of the Act?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to ask our director of the employment standards branch to look into this case and report to me.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I direct a supplementary to the Minister of Colleges and Universities in connection with that question?

Will he give an undertaking to this House that he will, tomorrow, make himself available to the delegation coming to the Parliament buildings to meet with him and others in connection with these proposed layoffs?

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, if I can change an appointment I have tomorrow noon I will be very happy to.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

STRIKE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING STUDENTS

Mr. Cassidy: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) and the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells):

In view of the government's repeated commitment to the principle that French-speaking students have a right to receive education in their native language, and in view of the Premier's own commitment as Minister of Education to students in Cornwall that they would have a French-language high school, what steps is the government prepared to take to resolve the impasse that now exists in Cornwall which has driven French-speaking students out on strike?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult matter in Cornwall. I think the member for that area and also the Minister of Labour met with representatives of the people interested on two occasions over the weekend. I intend communicating, in a formal sense, through the Minister of Labour to the people concerned, the government's commitment, that was stated in the Throne Speech, with respect to the establishment of the commission, the function of at least a part of which will be to deal with matters of this kind.

I am hopeful that we can get the legislation into the House and discussed here some time within the next six to seven weeks. It is relatively complicated legislation.

I am, as head of the government, making this commitment to them in hopes that this might resolve the situation, because this is really what the Symons commission report envisaged as being one of the functions of the commission they suggested and that the Throne Speech says this government will introduce.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this will help resolve the problem.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that legislation would come too late to allow students to choose a fully French-language high school in 1973 and for it to be created by September of this year, is the government prepared to intervene in Cornwall in order to ensure there is a commitment to have a full French-language high school at St. Lawrence School in September of this year, rather than having yet another delay until 1974?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure, really, that the time involved in introducing the legislation and establishing the commission would preclude this being assessed by the commission in time for the fall of 1973. Of course, at this stage I don't want to preclude the assessment by the commission of this particular matter, so that to give a commitment of this kind would, I think, be premature. I say that in the spirit of the discussions that are presently going on.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Isn't the situation serious enough that the government could at least find taxi fare to send Tom Symons down from Peterborough to look into the situation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, now that I have been asked this I am sure that Mr. Symons might be available, although I have to be very frank—and this may take me a little longer to answer, but I was asked the question. It may be somewhat difficult to prevail on Mr. Symons to become involved in matters of this kind again—

Mr. Lewis: Which would be a great pity!

Hon. Mr. Davis: And the leader of the New Democratic Party has said it—and I hope the record shows it. He himself says it would be a great pity—

Mr. Lewis: Yes it would. He did a first-rate job.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I think it would be a great pity.

I take no issue with the Provincial Auditor's report, nor with the way the press has reported what was in the report, but I think it is important for the integrity of Professor Symons that there be a greater degree of understanding by members of this House of the facts in this matter. I say, Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me. We can argue amongst ourselves—we're here to defend ourselves—but it is sometimes difficult when people outside the House are referred to in this manner. Professor Symons is releasing a statement today, and I think the facts will show, Mr. Speaker, that the term taxi fares, and the amounts of money involved, really do not reflect the situation that existed.

So in answer to the member for Ottawa Centre, may I just describe for him the circumstances—

An hon. member: He asked a question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —whereby we requested Professor Symons to act, in a matter that I think could be agreed as being of some very real urgency as it related to the Franco-Ontarian community in that particular riding; and I would be very surprised if the member for that riding didn't echo those sentiments.

Mr. Lewis: Except the Premier should have done this before the orders of the day. The Premier should have defended him days ago, not today.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Where was the leader of the NDP last week?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to get back to the question that was asked—

Mr. Speaker: Please; order please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! With respect to the hon. Premier, I must point out to him that the rules do forbid a ministerial statement during the question period. If it's of a lengthy content, then it would be out of order, sir.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I agree with you completely, but I am only referring to that part of the question that related to taxicabs, because the actual arrangement did not relate to taxicabs in the traditional sense of the word. Professor Symons did not use a taxicab with a meter to travel from place to place. He had a rental arrangement with car and driver that amounted to $3,100 or $3,200 for six months' work—

Mr. Cassidy: The Premier is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —which, if you calculated it on the basis of any other sort of arrangement—

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier is out of order. Why does he make a bad situation more embarrassing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —for the calibre of work that was done and the importance of the work related to the total involvement of the commission, then I say, with respect, the terminology that has been used and the feeling that has been generated in the public related to taxicabs, is not a true reflection of the situation.

So if we were to prevail upon Professor Symons to assist in Cornwall, I would say with respect to the member for Ottawa Centre, the word taxicab would really not be appropriate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Some hon. members: Sit down! Sit down!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, obviously we would be pleased to have Dr. Symons or the Minister of Education intervene, but—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Cassidy: —my question though is, if the commission of linguistic rights is set up by June or July of this year, does the Premier believe that is sufficient time in order to ensure that French-Canadian students do not suffer yet another year of second-class schooling, in shifts, starting in September of 1973?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't give a firm commitment as to whether this would be the case or not. I can only say I would hope they would have an answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

ELIZABETH GARDENS PROJECT

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Revenue.

Will the minister undertake an investigation into the alleged poor quality of construction and the many complaints of all of the 25 occupants of the 28-unit first development in Elizabeth Gardens in Windsor, as outlined in a two-page article of the Windsor Star this last Saturday, Mar. 24?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will take a look at that, Mr. Speaker; and of course if it warrants an investigation, it will get one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale—a supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, on the same topic: May I ask of the minister responsible for the inspection of Ontario Housing projects: Is that a municipal responsibility or Ontario Housing responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not too sure, Mr. Speaker, as to what particular project the hon. member is referring. I don't know whether it is an OHC project. Is it a HOME programme, a lot lease programme?

Mr. B. Newman: It is the Elizabeth Gardens project.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are quite a few projects under way at the moment so I don't know whether we have a responsibility in the field of inspection there or not. If it is a lot lease one, or course, we don't.

I'll have to find that out. I'll get whatever information is necessary. I'll take a look at it, and of course advise the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Burr: In this condominium project, is it not the minister's intention to have any inspection whatsoever on behalf of the people who buy these houses?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member already asked me that question.

Mr. Speaker: Surely, the previous answer was sufficient to answer that.

The hon. member for Riverdale.

INSURANCE RATES

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Having regard to the preliminary figures of the general insurance business, including the

automobile business, concerning the substantial losses which they are reporting for last year, will the minister take whatever steps—legislatively or otherwise, or by proclamation—to make certain that any anticipated increases in automobile insurance rates or in fire insurance rates will be the subject of a public hearing and will be subject to the agreement of the minister?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I received a memo today from the Superintendent of Insurance who advises me that any increases in rates are to be submitted to him. He will study them and make recommendations to me as minister. I, in turn, will advise the House, once I have received his recommendations and have a chance to consider them.

Mr. Renwick: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the minister give a clear indication to the House as to whether or not he will have public hearings with respect to those anticipated rate increases?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I don't know what the recommendations will be. I'll have to wait and see whether there would be any advantage at all. If the recommendations of the superintendent were to the effect there would be no increase there would be no point, sir, in my undertaking to have public hearings as to no increases; so I'll just have to wait and see. I see by the member's smile that he does agree with that answer.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Renwick: If there are to be no increases, there will be no need to have public hearings.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes.

Mr. Singer: —in the superintendent's investigation of the rate, is he, for the first time, going to get his own actuarial advice or is he blindly going to accept the actuarial advice submitted to him by the insurance companies?

Mr. MacDonald: Passively, not blindly. He always does it with his eyes open.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I don't know. I have always been under the impression that he did obtain his own actuarial advice. I presume that will continue in the future. I would hope that no one in my ministry would accept blindly the advice or recommendation of any industry reporting to the ministry.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, could the minister tell us what was the first year when the superintendent sought independent actuarial advice?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I can't tell the member offhand because—

Mr. Singer: No.

Mr. Shulman: He never has. That's the problem.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I can go back six months, and I am under the impression and advice that he has been getting it for that period of time.

Mr. Singer: We have been trying to get him to do that since 1965.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Get them to review lawyers' fees at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Downsview have a new question?

COMPLAINT ABOUT OMB

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General advise us if he has received a letter from a Mr. Don Weitz who was complaining about the kind of treatment he got before the Ontario Municipal Board; whether the minister has had a chance to review the complaint of Mr. Weitz; and whether or not he has as yet replied or is prepared to inform the House as a result of his investigations?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I think that letter from a gentleman named Weiss—W-e-i-s-s—

Mr. Singer: W-e-i-t-z.

Hon. Mr. Bales: There was a letter from a gentleman whose name was spelled the way I referred to a minute ago, but I'll look into that matter. I don't recall that particular spelling.

Mr. Singer: The letter is dated Mar. 13.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I'll look into it and see what the situation is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

INTEGRATED COMMUNITY HOUSING PROJECT

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Revenue:

In establishing the 95 per cent of the value of projects referred to a little while ago this afternoon, in respect to the land portion of that value, is that land value established on the original purchase price plus reasonable interest, or the present inflated value of the land?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I presume that when we are dealing with financing of a project, one would have to take into consideration present value of land and buildings.

Mr. Lewis: Present value—oh boy!

Mr. Young: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware, then, that 95 per cent assistance may well mean more than 100 per cent of the actual cost to the person doing the project?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would presume if I were going to get a mortgage on my house today, I would probably get a mortgage well in excess of what I paid for the whole house—probably twice as much, because I've had the house long enough.

Mr. Cassidy: It's speculation the minister's government is encouraging.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Elementary economics!

Mr. Lewis: This is land speculation that the minister is funding from public money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members on the one hand decry what they claim is the lack of success of this government in providing sufficient housing—

Mr. Lewis: The government legislates in other areas.

Mr. Young: Let's be fair.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and they do everything possible to make sure it is more difficult to provide that housing.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What the hon. members opposite really want us to do, is to say that if some developer or some builder is going to make a fast buck out of a development, and even if it is going to provide us with good, legitimate housing at reasonable cost having regard for today's market, we shouldn't do it because—

Mr. Lewis: How does the minister know? The minister doesn't have to give him a fast buck. The minister doesn't have to pay the housing—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —the man is making money on it.

Mr. Lewis: The minister doesn't have to pay for that. He can say he wants 25 per cent for geared-to-income housing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And we are not paying it all. The hon. member—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member—

Mr. Lewis: The minister can do it by regulation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member knows perfectly well that at the present time builders have 90 per cent mortgages on their buildings from CMHC. Now they get 90 per cent, that means they are investing 10 per cent. What we are doing is holding out a carrot so that they will accept this housing programme; hopefully when they do, it is providing an additional five per cent of mortgage money.

Mr. Cassidy: And they don't put a nickel of cash into it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't care how much a man makes on his land, provided it's a good proposition—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —for the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Lewis: It's a lousy proposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It is money thrown away.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Rainy River.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Will he table in the Legislature the logbooks of the government aircraft which have been used by cabinet ministers to transport themselves and their families both within and without the province? Could he perhaps today explain to the Legislature what kind of trips a cabinet minister would take outside the province and take his family with him, pleasure or business?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: This doesn't fall within the purview of my responsibilities, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that the question be addressed to the Minister of Natural Resources or to the Premier.

Mr. Lewis: It certainly is within this minister's expertise.

Mr. Reid: We thought the minister was the expert.

Mr. Singer: The member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) asked for this four months ago and never got it.

Mr. Reid: By way of supplementary, if I may: Does the minister not feel, because the Ministry of Natural Resources comes under his policy field, that this is a matter of government policy particularly within his field, and that he should be aware of it and should be able to report to the Legislature on this?

Mr. Singer: I think it's a good question.

Mr. Bullbrook: Answer it!

An hon. member: What does the minister do?

Mr. Bullbrook: Answer it!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister cannot absolve himself of that policy responsibility.

Mr. Singer: The Premier undertook to answer that question some months ago, to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Singer: Yes, he did.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

ALBERTA NATURAL GAS

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Prime Minister, or any other representative on behalf of the Ontario government, planning to meet again with the Premier of Alberta with regard to gas prices? If so, when, where and on what specific phase of the subject?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I intend to be in Alberta next Tuesday, a week tomorrow I believe. Whether I will be meeting with the Premier of that province I can't inform the hon. member at this point. If I were to, of course, I would expect there might be some informal discussions related to matters of energy policy.

I will check to see if any other members or ministers have discussed this with officials of the government of Alberta. I think perhaps there have been some informal discussions, but the next date that I know of when some discussion might take place is a week tomorrow. I cannot tell the hon. member whether or not I shall be discussing it with the Premier of Alberta.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Does the member for York South want to go along too?

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: In view of the fact that Premier Peter Lougheed has informed the Legislature that he would be meeting the Premier of Ontario in Edmonton next week, is it possible to answer my question? Is the Premier going to be discussing the gas price issue; and if so what phase of it? Will he be taking his parliamentary assistant and adviser on gas along with him?

Mr. Reid: They are all experts in gas!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I could have some observations as to the contributors of gas, but I shan't make them! I shall only observe this, that quite obviously if I do meet with the Premier of Alberta next Tuesday we will be informally discussing that among other problems. I can't inform the hon. member whether the parliamentary assistant to the Premier will be going next Tuesday. I don't know at this point.

Mr. Reid: They haven't forgotten about him!

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has now expired.

Mr. MacDonald: This trip sounds as well planned as that one to Cuba last year!

Mr. Lewis: What is this love for Alberta?

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves, seconded by Mr. R. F. Nixon, that Mr. Rowe, member for the electoral district of Northumberland, Mr. Hodgson, member for the electoral district of North York, be appointed chairman and deputy chairman respectively of committees of the whole House for the present session.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves, seconded by Hon. Mr. Winkler, that a select committee of 13 members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient dispatch a list of members to compose the standing committees ordered by the House. Such committee to be composed as follows: Messrs. Henderson, chairman; Allan, Deans, Gilbertson, Hamilton, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Leluk, Nuttall, Smith (Nipissing), Smith (Simcoe East), Stokes, Worton and Yakabuski.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lewis: That gives the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) two select committees simultaneously. I'm not sure he's up to it.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves, seconded by Hon. Mr. Winkler, that standing committees of the House for the present session be appointed as follows:

1. Procedural affairs committee.
2. Administration of justice committee.

Committees 1 and 2, combined under the chairmanship of the chairman of the administration of justice committee, will function as the private bills committee.

3. Social development committee.
4. Resources development committee.
5. Estimates committee.
6. Public accounts committee.
7. Regulations committee.

Which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, provided that all boards and commissions are hereby referred to committees Nos. 1 to 4 in accordance with the policy areas indicated by the titles of the said committees.

Public accounts for the last fiscal year are hereby referred to the public accounts committee and all regulations to the regulations committee.

All standing committees shall report from time to time their observations and opinions on the matters referred to them with power to send for persons, papers and records.

That there be no duplication of membership among any committees No. 1 to 4 inclusive, or between committees No. 5 to 7 inclusive.

That substitution be permitted on any committee while considering estimates referred to it, provided that notice of the substitution is given to the chairman of the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There are one or two matters that I would like to refer to on this motion. I'm sure we all agree that the work of the committee system in some sense has improved over the last two years when specific matters from this House have been referred to it. We have the precedent established by the Premier in the matter of the Workmen's Compensation Board that certain committees under certain circumstances can have the addition of specific and expert advice having to do with legal affairs, economic affairs and so on.

I want to bring to your attention, sir, a matter that might not be of concern in all parts of the House but certainly concerns me. We hope in the next few minutes to bring in two new members to join our caucus and, if the Speaker will recall, I believe that because of the complex mathematical arrangement last year our party was left with approximately 19—I am not sure of the number, but I believe it was 19—committee appointments.

I would hope that the select committee that was struck by the previous motion recommending membership for these committees will see to it that every member of the House has access to at least one committee for service associated with an area of special expertise or interest. This may require a small bending of the mathematical appropriation but it does occur to me that, on behalf of the very large group of Progressive Conservatives present, my experience is that the whips used to have some difficulty in getting sufficient numbers of those worthies to attend committee meetings. I think the whips might even jump at the chance to reduce their membership by perhaps one or two in certain com-

mittees so that the opposition can have a larger role to play.

I simply mention this to you, sir, so that all members of the striking committee will know my views in this regard, and I hope they will give them at least some earnest attention.

I would also like to say to you, sir, that as far as the striking of these committees is concerned, I hope that the attitude of the Premier in going over the names of those on the committees will not be unduly restrictive. He knows that I and others in the House have felt that the standing committees could very well perform a special function, if not in the control of certain costs and prices, at least by close observation and by providing pressure for changes.

It is not my intention to launch into an argument in this regard. Again, sir, I know you have heard my views that a standing committee of this Legislature should have a special responsibility to have referred to it those matters pertaining to changes in costs, whether they be for services or products that come to the attention of this House and certainly to the people of the province from time to time.

There is no suggestion that the committee itself would have the power to roll back these prices, but simply to hold open hearings whereby the justification for the price change could be attempted on the part of those who were putting it forward; and a defence against the price change, usually on behalf of the consumer, could also be put forward. The recommendation of such an all-party standing committee would then be made to this House, and more specifically to the government, which could then take the appropriate action under our system of responsible government.

I simply raise this matter briefly at this time, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that it has been of importance and will be of growing importance, particularly as we see the cost of living moving upward with even new pressures in particularly sensitive fields.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to only one aspect of this motion, and I am renewing an old plea. I want to raise with the Premier the question of whether or not he will extend that right to substitution on all four of the omnibus committees, the first four committees, whether or not they are sitting to consider estimates.

The brief history, Mr. Speaker, for your consideration and more particularly perhaps for the Premier's consideration, is that this was the original recommendation of a committee of this Legislature which was chaired by the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson). Quite frankly I have never yet been able to find out why, but somewhere along the way there was a monkey wrench thrown into the works so to speak.

The Premier's argument is that he wants continuity and therefore we can't have substitution except in the instance of when we are considering estimates. Well, I remind the Premier that last year's experience reinforced that of previous years—that we don't get continuity; we get absenteeism and the whips hounding members to come to a committee where they don't happen to have a topic of interest.

Surely it is just plain common sense that we place upon the person who has permanent membership in that committee the obligation that if he is not interested in the topic on any given day, to find one of his colleagues who is perhaps not only interested but who is clamouring to get on the committee because he is so interested in that topic. And you would get a real kind of continuity, namely a continuity with presence and participation.

I don't see why the Premier is being so stubborn; and I am going to use that word and not any other kind of word on this particular piont. But would he reconsider it? And what would his response be now, rather than six months from now, so that we might have it effective for this session.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to one phrase in the motion: "That the committee will pay attention to those matters referred to them by the House." Unfortunately, those of us who have served on these committees in the past recognize that to a greater and greater extent every year that matters that might be of very substantial interest to the members very seldom get referred to the committee. The committee on the administration of justice often gets bills referred to it, but never gets referred to it the problem of organization within the office of the Attorney General.

What is currently of great public interest is the problem of the difficulties in the Ontario Police Commission. There is no ability, as I understand it, within these committees to determine by themselves that they could examine the chaos that exists in the health ministry. I believe the government intends and wants to keep these committees under wraps and that the role of a private member

is very limited because of the inclusion in this motion of the phrase, "those matters referred to them by the House."

This plea has been made many times before and in view of the contents of the Auditor's Report, I suggest there is going to be a strong move—the initiative was put forward the other day by the Minister of Health—that the public accounts committee could examine health costs. But surely it is also the duty and responsibility of the committee on natural resources to look into various matters relating to the functioning and expenditure of money by the Ministry of Health; as it is the responsibility, or should be, of the committee on the administration of justice to look into police matters and reorganization matters within the Attorney General's department.

We have mentioned this time and again and the minister gets up and repeats almost by rote the same kind of motion that "private members be damned." We have got the Camp commission that is investigating the role of the private members, but when the Premier gets up year after year—as did his predecessors—and introduces a motion almost in exactly the same words, it shows that he really is doing nothing more than to pay lip service to the role of the private member and his ability to really inquire into what is going on in government.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Premier to withdraw those words from the motion and let the committees themselves decide what kind of investigations and what kind of studies they are going to embark on. Otherwise, again, we go through the facade of creating committees which really by and large are not going to do the job that the members want them to do and that the public wants them to do.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth was attempting to gain the floor previously.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What I want to say about the committees is a very personal thought. When I first got elected to the House some 5½ years ago, the committee structure didn't work at all. Over the last 5½ years, it has hardly improved. The only time that I can recall when a committee has worked effectively was in fact the investigation into the Workmen's Compensation Board. As far as the other committees that I have been a member of, they have been extremely remiss—perhaps not through any fault of their own—but they have not had the opportunity to look at matters which were of concern to members of the House. It was virtually impossible to have matters of general public concern brought before the committees.

I want to suggest to the Premier there are two reasons for this problem. One is that the work load of the House during the time that it is in session is sufficiently onerous that to have the committees sitting concurrent with the House means that there are fewer people involved in any particular aspect of the work of the Legislature and therefore you don't get as much done.

I think frankly that the committees ought to be sitting—since the Premier chooses not to have the Legislature sitting very long during the year—that the committees ought to be sitting while the House is not in session; that the standing committees of the House should be given the power to look into matters of public concern when they are not in fact required to be in the Legislature dealing with matters here; with bills and the like.

It is impossible for a member of this Legislature to be in the House dealing with bills if the committee that he is a member of is sitting, dealing with estimates.

I find it extremely difficult as I have an interest in a number of different topics. I am sure every member of the House has the same problem. I have to be here in the Legislature much of the time in order to do my job properly. But the fact is that I also want to be in the committee asking all kinds of questions about the estimates that are going through the committee and the expenditures of the government, and it is absolutely impossible to do this.

I frankly feel that we are going to have to take a look at the problems. I didn't hear the minister say it, but I assume we are going to be using Wednesdays again as a committee day. Further, I think we should set aside mornings for committees and that committees ought not to sit concurrently with the House, other than under special conditions where there is perhaps legislation to be considered that requires public scrutiny outside of the Legislature. I think we have got to try to apportion the time more equitably in order to ensure that every single member is able to fulfil the functions that he is sent here to fulfil, and that is to take part in every single thing that goes on in the Legislature in order that we can properly understand the effect it will have on our constituents.

For those reasons, I frankly feel that we are drifting backwards. The exercise we went through in dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Board matter was an important one, and it ought to have set a precedent in the Legislature. It ought to have set a precedent that would allow us to continue to deal with those kinds of matters in that way.

When I was a member of what I think was called the government commission committee, or a committee that investigated government commissions, we used to call those commissions before us and we used to hear them explain what they had been doing during the year and question them in depth. I would love to get my hands on Ontario Hydro right now, for example; but recognizing that the private bills committee will be sitting for the first half of that session, and recognizing that the other committees will be dealing, hopefully, with legislation, the chances of coming to grips with what I consider to be problems in the area of Hydro are pretty difficult and pretty hard to imagine.

So I really do feel that if we are going to make this place worthwhile, the Prime Minister should consider allowing committees to sit all year and providing the kind of expenses that will enable them to hire the staff they need to investigate matters of public concern. Let's do away with select committees altogether. Let's deal with all of those matters through standing committees.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, through you, whether the wording of the motion means that most, if not all, the regulations which are drawn up in the various departments will be vetted by the regulations committee prior to gazetting; otherwise the committee has no function.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that this is the practice. To have them vetted by the committee prior to gazetting, I think would be impossible; certainly in those times of the year when the House isn't sitting.

I think the function of the regulations committee is for members opposite to assess the impact. If a member has any observations to make, nothing prevents one doing this. But I think to have them assessed by the regulations committee prior to being gazetted is not really a practical approach.

Mr. Young: It is useless after.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, just to deal with the two or three matters that have been raised, firstly I want to make it quite clear—and I appreciate the observations of the Leader of the Opposition that we have made some progress—I am not saying here that we have reached perfection in the functioning of standing committees. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared at this time in an ad hoc fashion substantially to alter the present functioning of the standing committees, because this is really why this House voted—and I think with some degree of unanimity—to appoint Mr. Camp, Mr. Oliver and Mr. Fisher to assess, amongst other matters, the involvement of the private members, and their functioning within the Legislature.

Mr. Singer: We never voted to appoint them. They were appointed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the House voted, I think on a resolution or a motion, as I recall. I think that that was the procedure that was used, Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly. So the hon. member for Downsview may be technically correct, but I think really I have indicated what, in fact, happened.

I think in light of that, and hopefully of the report being forthcoming in the not too far distant future, to start making variations at this precise moment would not serve a useful purpose.

To answer the question about the functioning, say of standing committees or the form of standing committees when the House isn't functioning, Mr. Speaker, I will express a personal point of view. This idea has some appeal. I think there is some merit in this.

I would also say to the hon. member that if he is concerned about the length of the time that the House is sitting, really he should disabuse himself of this. I think when we are finished this spring and start relatively early this fall, and who knows just how soon before Christmas we will finish, he may find that in actual sitting days or length of time we are not too dissimilar to legislative assemblies dealing with the same size of programme and budget, and related to other years. I am not saying just when we are going to finish—I don't know. But I think he will find that the length of time involved is not dissimilar.

I will be very frank about it, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that perhaps out of Mr. Camp's observations, or some consideration we are giving, that we could come up with, not a

precise day, but perhaps a rather traditional day for the opening of the House—whether it be in the latter part of February or the early part of March—with some understanding that we would sit till the latter part of the end of June, and we would start again for a precise period in the fall, so that all of us could plan our activities, the government included.

Some of this relates, Mr. Speaker, to the complexities of government operation—the need, I think, really to give meaningful work to the members of the House, the need to have budgets here fairly soon after the House starts, because this is part of our responsibility.

As I mentioned to the press on the day the Throne Speech was read, the Treasurer has been considering—and there may be some very real practical reasons why we can't do this—the development of the budget with a fiscal year similar to that of the municipalities and others, which I think might expedite the date that we could have a budget presentation to the Legislature. To me it is somewhat incongruous that we are going to deal with a budget on April 11 or 12, when some of the municipalities have already set their mill rates and some their expenditure programmes. This is something that, as a government, we want to avoid. Yet it is a very substantial departure for us to move to a calendar year rather than the traditional fiscal year that we have been experiencing.

But these are things that are presently being considered by the government.

I would just say on the one other point, Mr. Speaker—the suggestion the member for York South made again this year somewhat related to what he suggested last year—I don't say it is completely illogical. I can't agree with him here this afternoon, but I say this quite seriously, I shall give it consideration, but I really want to think it out very carefully, and I cannot see my way clear to altering the motion here this afternoon.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the Premier—I didn't see that as a windup.

Mr. Speaker: I regret very much that there cannot be further debate on the motion, and that no member may speak twice. The reply has been given.

Mr. Lewis: Well, just by way of a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I hardly think there is a point of order, but I will stretch the point and listen to the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I appreciate that, sir.

The Premier rose in response to what I thought was a question from a member. In the process of answering the question he said "while I am speaking", and then went on to deal with other matters. I didn't know that the debate had been terminated; I didn't hear the Speaker ask, "Are there other speakers?"

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is quite right. I didn't call for any further speakers, so I will permit the hon. member to go on.

Mr. Lewis: I want to add a footnote, not to pre-empt the Premier's right to reply. He can speak last on anything and everything inside or outside the House, as he unfailingly does.

I wanted to make the point that the Premier has taken a very long time to come to some resolution of the obvious. There is no point whatsoever, other than the mounting frustration of all members in the House—government and opposition—in removing from us the right of substitution in the various standing committees. It is an appropriate, intelligent, useful thing for members of the House to have. The Premier's refusal to bend on this issue is very bewildering, frankly.

Mr. Speaker, further, I appreciate that the Premier can always have reference to the Camp commission; alas, some of us have feared that. Some of us—with the Premier himself—who know the workings of the Camp commission know that the first report is still a little time off, that it deals with matters rather unrelated to committee structures, and that what the Premier is in fact saying to the House is that we will operate through this entire year on the rules that applied before.

This means that the investigative powers of the committees will be negligible. It means that we will not be able to look, for instance, at a way of establishing more appropriate payments than those of fee-for-service to bail out the Ontario Health Insurance Plan because it will never be referred from the House; it is a contentious issue. It means that all the standing committees will do, other than that of public accounts, is the old matter of looking at legislation and examining estimates, rather than giving members of the House some sense that they are moving toward an investigation and resourceful function.

Why we have to wait yet another year, when it is clear in the mind of every backbencher in this House, of whatever party, that it makes sense to give the committees some investigative power, is beyond me. I really don't understand the inflexibility, the rigidity, with which the House is viewed by the Premier, which forces us to again have this straitjacket.

It would serve you nothing, sir, no problem, no anxieties, no difficulties to withdraw this motion and make it tomorrow; take out the clause that was referred to which is the cause of so much difficulty; give committees investigative power on their own capacity to move to inquire into matters.

The Tories suffered grievously at the hands of the electorate recently, but the government still has a majority under the committee system. It can still run them if it wants to. So, I hardly think that the Premier has anything to worry about other than this refusal to grant the private members the rights which they wish. So we wait another year; and in the process there will be angry and anxious moments which can be removed.

I guess I'm getting nowhere, but I want the Premier to know that this is one of the ways in which his personal intractability is resulting in disservice to the government as a whole, this is one of the very minute ways in which the public gets a sense of a government that is removed from issues which are real. I think that's a very critical mistake which the Premier is making. Others of us make other mistakes—he is making that one.

Mr. Speaker: Any response?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to very briefly reply, I would just observe to the leader of the New Democratic Party that this government is just as anxious as he is to have a meaningful involvement of the private members. I will be very frank about it—it's easier to say than to bring about. I think we did have—and it wasn't always easy for the government—relative, positive response from the standing committee dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to some moves in this direction, but I think that really —and I'm not hanging my hat on the Camp commission—but I would say to the leader of the New Democratic Party that I don't think we will go through a full year. I would anticipate that we will have some indication prior to that—perhaps for introduction by the fall session. But I think to move into sort of ad hoc decisions when this matter is being assessed is not the wisest course to pursue. But I would say to the hon. member really, we're not that inflexible. We would like to see some alterations ourselves, but I still feel there is great merit in waiting for the report of the Camp commission, because after all this is one of the responsibilities given to them.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to remove from the protection of the Labour Relations Act any union that sends dues, or other moneys to the United States.

Mr. Lewis: Do we have to go over all that again?

Mr. Drea: The member got it once; he can have it again!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The red Tories ride again —and in the wrong direction!

Mr. Drea: The member wouldn't even show up the other day.

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSIONER ACT

Mr. Singer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Appointment of a Commissioner to Investigate Administrative Decisions and Acts of Officials of the Government of Ontario and its Agencies and to Define the Commissioners Powers and Duties.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: There's a new idea!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That's a little late!

Mr. Lewis: In this House, there's an idea whose time will never come.

Mr. Singer: Oh, no! It nearly came before the former Attorney General left. He had it on his desk. Now he's got to convert the new

Attorney General, if he's still going to be there for a while.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No fear of that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth successive introduction of the bill to create an ombudsman in the Province of Ontario. Perhaps this time the idea's time has come and perhaps this time the government will see fit to enact this kind of legislation at the present session of this Legislature.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk had received from the chief election officer, and laid upon the table, certificates of by-elections held since the last session of the House:

The electoral district of St. George: Mrs. Margaret Campbell.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that, in view of a writ of election dated Jan. 29, 1973, issued by the Honourable Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario, and addressed to Mrs. Theda Burton, returning officer for the electoral district of St. George, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of St. George, in the legislative assembly of this province in the room of Allan F. Lawrence, Esq., who since his election as representative of the said electoral district of St. George, has resigned his seat, Mrs. Margaret Campbell has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated March 21, 1973, which is now lodged of record in my office.

Chief Election Officer.
(*Signed*)
RODERICK LEWIS

Toronto, March 26, 1973.

The electoral district of Huron: Jock Riddell.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that, in view of a writ of election dated Jan. 29, 1973, issued by the Honourable Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario, and addressed to Russell Bolton, Esq., returning officer for the electoral district of Huron, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Huron in the legislative assembly of this province in the room of Charles S. MacNaughton, Esq., who, since his election as representative of the said electoral district of Huron, his seat, Jack Riddell, Esq., has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated March 20, 1973, which is now lodged of record in my office.

(*Signed*)
RODERICK LEWIS,
Chief Election Officer.

Toronto, March 26, 1973 .

Mrs. Margaret Campbell, member-elect for the electoral district of St. George, having taken the oaths and subscribed the roll, took her seat.

Jack Riddell, Esq., member-elect for the electoral district of Huron, having taken the oaths and subscribed the roll, took his seat.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you Mrs. Margaret Campbell, member-elect for the electoral district of St. George, and Mr. Jack Riddell, member-elect for the electoral district of Huron , who have taken the oaths and signed the roll and now claim the right to take their seats.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. members take their seats.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the rules provide for, but if I could presume upon the good-natured feeling in the House, on behalf of the government—I won't say with some regrets—I would like to extend on behalf of the government and personally our very sincere congratulations to the new member for St. George, the new member for Huron. There are some of us who might have wished it had been another way, but the by-elections are over; the people in those constituencies have made their determination.

I would like to make it very clear to both of the new members that we appreciate the contribution that they will make. We recognize the degree of sacrifice that is required in public life. We respect the positions that they have taken; and we certainly welcome them here as members of this House.

I might casually observe, and not facetiously, that I expect they will become very involved over the next few weeks. I even sense the member for St. George in the past few days was almost unable to restrain herself under the gallery, anxious to ask certain questions; and I would only say to her that some of us have really been preparing the answers in advance, and we look forward to them.

But once again, a welcome to both the new members.

Mr. Lewis: Knowing, Mr. Speaker, that in the protocol the Leader of the Opposition would wish to make the final word of welcome, may I say, in the spirit of effusive generosity, that we are pleased to have both the new members in the House. I have no doubt of their contributions. They will make the government profoundly uncomfortable, that is obvious. Why cannot we thereby share in that discomfort at least, Mrs. Speaker, and wish them well in their tenure in the Legislature.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to speak on behalf of my party, as well as on behalf of the two new members, in extending not only a welcome to the new members but our appreciation for the very thoughtful and broadminded compliments paid by the leader of the government and the leader of the NDP, then I would now do so.

I would like, of course, to associate myself personally and directly with both those victories, but I must point out to you, sir, that the outstanding quality of both the new members has been apparent on all sides, and I don't think it needs reiteration. I can simply assure you, sir, that having already worked with both of these outstanding Canadians on a number of projects recently, I can assure you and other members of the House that they will give a good account of themselves here and in the province in the years to come.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, may I add my personal congratulations to the new members. I have a long acquaintance with the member for St. George, and I am sure my colleague, the Minister without Portfolio (Mrs. Birch), would wish to join me in extending our welcome to her in this House.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to her that the member for Scarborough East and I can assure her there is a very rich, masculine environment here and that she won't find the proceedings dull.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it must be apparent—

Mr. Lewis: A little sexist, perhaps!

Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I believe it must be apparent to all members that, apart from the obvious we three members share one special thing, and that is our Christian name.

Mr. Ruston: It is a hat trick.

Mrs. Scrivener: However, there the similarities cease, inasmuch as alphabetically our surnames appear to sandwich that of the new member, and politically of course we outnumber her. However, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would say that I can assure the hon. member for St. George of the best possible representation in this House, since after all she is a constituent in the riding of St. David. As her member, I wish to welcome her.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh time that I've had the responsibility to reply on behalf of the official opposition since I took over the responsibility of the leadership of this party. I can't recall an occasion when I was more enthused and full of optimism, political and otherwise, than today. You have just met our two new members, and while we certainly appreciate the welcome extended on all sides of the House, I think it might be appropriate, sir, if you would allow me to take just a moment to say a bit more about them.

The new member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) is well acquainted with elected responsibility in that she has served in many important capacities in the government of the municipality of the city of Toronto, and is well accepted in her own community as a philosophical leader as well in all things democratic—those things that would lead the community to a more active participation in control of its own affairs.

The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Riddell) has a record that is interesting as well, having been elected just a few months ago to the Huron County Board of Education. I'm sure that this part of his background will serve him well when we are discussing matters pertaining to education here in the House. He comes from a family well associated with the agricultural industry of Ontario, and many people from the western part of the province would have known his father who was agricultural representative in Middlesex county for many years.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, you must realize that the election results in Huron county place you, sir, in a particularly vulnerable situation. Representing a part of Waterloo, as you do, and with Liberal representation now in Huron, Huron-Bruce, Perth, Waterloo North and Kitchener, the red tide is moving toward you, sir. And with your undoubted abilities here, I would suggest that you had better concentrate on the old concept of a permanent Speaker if you are going to withstand this tide that is moving in your direction.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Not to mention Brant and Wellington!

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): I thought the Leader of the Opposition was going to suggest himself for that position!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, perhaps before I finish my remarks, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's interjection might have some more force when he considers me as becoming a permanent Speaker, because I do have a good many items that I want to bring to your attention, and specifically items that I felt had some application and implication in the results of the by-elections on March 15.

The Premier, in his comments on the resolution establishing the committees, made much of the thoughtfulness he had given to the fact that there should be some date, perhaps late in March, when the Legislature would meet almost by tradition. The indications were that this was as a result of careful consideration on his part but, from the subjective point of view of those of us involved in partisan politics, his off-the-top-of-the-head comment to a representative of the Globe and Mail, I believe—it was reported in that newspaper—that he didn't want the Legislature in session to interfere with the by-election campaigns is a bit closer to the truth.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, indeed it is!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Somehow or other the Premier has the idea that politics should not be discussed in this chamber—

Mr. Singer: Just the Premier!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I never do!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —that nothing that might affect the opinions of the electorate of any by-election area should be brought to the fore. He knows, and it's regrettable that it's true, that when this chamber is not in session there are special difficulties to private members—leaders of opposition parties and even backbenchers—in getting views expressed to the community at large.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): The hon. member can be sued if he doesn't tell the truth!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: When the chamber is not in session it is not possible, through questions and other devices, to prod the ministry to take certain courses of action.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the protraction of the elevator strike, which was brought to an end just last week, was specifically caused by the Premier's decision that he didn't want any waves emanating from this chamber that might rock the placid waters—or what he thought were the placid waters—of the communities in Huron county and St. George in the heart of Metropolitan Toronto. As a matter of fact, he was prepared to go to great lengths indeed to protect his two hand-picked candidates in those particular areas.

He even had his new Treasurer (Mr. White) announce that because of the important matters brought down by the Minister of Finance for Canada, it wouldn't be possible to have our budget available until April 12, many weeks after the federal budget was made available and read to the members of Parliament. This, too, was a matter of some concern for him, which I will deal with more specifically in a moment, because he realized that his Treasurer had already made the threat that Ontario might well raise the level of our personal income taxes so that our budget be brought more nearly into balance. This threat had been made publicly and he realized that there was a political connotation there which would not serve him well in the by-elections. Certainly, he was proved to be correct in that particular fear.

These two by-elections, of course, were hot contests indeed. The Premier abandoned the role of the leader of the government in the past, when perhaps one official visit to the by-election situation was all that was permitted. I don't think Mr. Frost took part at all. John Robarts from time to time would make some appearance although, having been elected in a by-election myself during Mr. Robarts' time, I don't believe he showed up in the Brant constituency at all. He sent a number of his ministers to take pot-shots at us!

The present Premier in these two by-election situations threw himself into the fray completely. I mean, he was there flipping pancakes in Goderich at 7 o'clock in the morning, and he was carrying a tin tray—

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of order, I was eating them, not flipping them.

Mr. Nixon: He was carrying a tin tray, Mr. Speaker, in the lineup down at the Toronto General Hospital. He wanted to associate himself with the nurses in training because he felt that they would forget he had raised their tuition by something like 300 per cent, or had raised it to over $300, and that his hand-picked candidate, Roy McMurtry, would have an overpowering influence on those young girls and they would all turn out and vote for him.

You know, they are a lot brighter than either the Premier or his candidate gave them credit for because they turned out en masse to protest recent policies of this government.

It is interesting to note that the polls of the University of Toronto went completely against the government as well. There is one lesson for the Premier and his Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. McNie) in that connection. The students in those areas feel they have not been dealt with adequately or fairly.

Mr. Speaker, there is a matter that does concern me and that is that the Premier tried to indicate that there were no valid issues; that anything which was raised in the by-election campaign was somehow misleading or unfair or the typical exaggeration that he, with his urbanity, would have to set right. It was the concept that by-elections are somehow a passing on of the mantle from good old Charlie to good old what's-his-name —who is now evidently looking for some further employment; we may see him under the gallery as a matter of fact before too many days go by because he used to be under there serving good old Charlie and he may in fact come back to serve some other good old boy who needs help here!

The situation in St. George was a bit different because Roy McMurtry was accepted on all sides as a person who was needed by the government. The Globe and Mail, in a small editorial hedged away at the bottom of the editorial remarks, decided to support both the Conservative candidates. The paper said that the government needed them on the front bench. Well, frankly, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be closer to the truth, because you see the Premier has absolutely no support on the front bench except for the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) down there.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): With friends like that, he doesn't need any enemies over here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I recall on Friday when the hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener), sitting as she does in the back row in all her charm, got up to move the motion for a humble address to His Honour, she kept talking about the government that listens. And as she was speaking, every one of those seats was empty—there was a mass of blue emptiness—and I thought it was a good indication of how carefully the government listens. They don't listen at all.

Now as far as the issues in the by-elections are concerned, there is one that I thought raised the point of sensitivity, as far as the Premier is concerned. Frankly, I appreciate the fact that he, practically alone in the whole ministry, has seen fit to stay and listen to my remarks. I appreciate that. I feel that that's probably one of the things he is paid for, and I hope that in my remarks that I can put forward some alternatives as well as criticisms that will assist him in making some of the decisions that will be pressing on him in the immediate future, and one of them has to do with the famous deficit.

The Premier, in one of those meetings that he had—I think they had them in telephone booths mostly—was indicating that there was something wrong with my arithmetic when I said that under his leadership the government of Ontario was going to have an $800 million deficit. He said, "There is something the matter with Bob's arithmetic."

I want to comment on that because his own Treasurer announced in this House just about a year ago that we were going to go into debt by about $600 million—I think maybe $5 million less than that—and he was concerned that this high expenditure was necessary in order, let's say, to correct some of the federal policies which he said were leading us to doom and ruin. The indication was that while he regretted such a large deficit it was federal policies that were forcing this decision upon the reluctant Treasurer of Ontario. Six hundred million dollars.

But it was December, just a few months ago, when the House reconvened briefly and we were informed that another $205 million would be necessary, basically because of the serious underestimation of the costs of our Medicare programme, $50 million specifically for that purpose, so that the doctors, who had not been provided with enough money —we had voted only $540 million—would have an extra $50 million so that the Minister of Health could see us through the year.

There were other programmes as well, but an additional $205 million was voted—albeit reluctantly on this side—by the Legislature and no new programmes were announced which by any stretch of the imagination could possibly improve the revenue side of the accounts of this province. So for my part, the arithmetic came from the specific figures provided by the Premier's minions, particularly the Treasurer, who seems to have a lot of figures up his sleeve these days. So it was $600 million to begin with, then another $205 million. I didn't want to exaggerate so I just said that it appeared the deficit

would be $800 million—and what could be simpler than that arithmetic?

As a matter of fact, if one is to examine the actual cash deficit that was predicted for the province—because the members understand we are also investing huge sums of money in capital projects which, over the next 40, 50, 60 years, will return some of this investment—one will see that we would in fact go behind by $1,055,000,000 on the basis of the government's figures that come from the budgetary predictions.

Well, members will remember that Mr. MacNaughton—and we have been talking about him a bit because he was the member for Huron up until his resignation just a few weeks ago—was plunged into the thick of this morass by the sudden departure of his predecessor, the member for Chatham-Kent, Mr. McKeough, if you will permit me to identify him by name, Mr. Speaker. The new Treasurer, Mr. MacNaughton, a very worthy gentleman indeed, had to accept the responsibility for the administration of the largest budget Ontario had ever seen. It was even larger than our budget a year ago, which was close to $550 million.

And, Mr. Speaker, just to bring it home to you, who from time to time wears that button in your lapel that shows that you are a friend and supporter of the present Premier, the next largest budget before the present Premier took over the management of our affairs two years ago was back in 1968, when John Robarts put us behind by a paltry $119 million. So the worst—or perhaps the best—that John Robarts could do was the $119 million. But when the present Premier took over, the first year it was $550 million; the second, a prediction of $800 million.

Those were the predictions that the new Treasurer grasped and waved like a red flag on his first official duty as Treasurer, and that was to go to Ottawa to convince the government of Canada, particularly the Minister of Finance, how desperately we needed special funds, voted by the Parliament of Canada to assist Ontario in keeping away from increasing deficit positions.

The new Treasurer is not in his place, and I regret that because he carries a very heavy responsibility indeed. With the House leader on one side of the Premier, with the kind of advice he can give, the Treasurer on the Premier's left in fact assumes the role, whatever the order of precedence on the official list, of chief spokesman for the government in the absence of the Premier—and he is often absent as we all know.

So the Treasurer, talking about his deficit position—a gloom and doom predictor, to go back to the phrases that were often used in the early sixties—went to Ottawa and declared that unless special assistance was forthcoming for Ontario, he would have to recommend the revenues for our province would be expanded by increasing the income tax base and the income tax rate. This was a threat that was made in his position as Treasurer.

He thought, I suppose, that by crying poor mouth, and going up to that conference, banging on the table, and being as vociferous as only he can, that somehow or other the government of Canada would be convinced that this province, with more than a third of Canada's population and more than half of Canada's wealth, should have some special assistance beyond what is already forthcoming.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that we already share the income tax pie with the government of Canada. This year we are going to get $1.2 billion from them, with no strings attached, to pay for our provincial programmes.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that this money is our right by agreement. But we also must not forget that it is collected by the government of Canada, with all of the political ramifications that that involves.

You've heard Mr. Stanfield, and even Mr. Diefenbaker, getting up and complaining about how difficult it is for the poor little man on the street to pay his income tax, and they are right in this connection, there is no doubt. But the hugest share of that money, the largest single individual source of income for Ontario, is sent down from Ottawa for our purposes with no strings attached.

In addition to that, as you know there is well over $1.3 billion that comes into Ontario to support the shared cost programmes that have become so much a part of the fabric of life in Ontario and the other provinces. It bears half the cost of post-secondary education, close to half the cost of Medicare and hospitalization, and a very, very large share of the costs of social and family services.

These matters have often been forgotten by our Treasurer. Certainly they were forgotten by the Treasurer when he went up to Ottawa, pounded the desk and waved in the air the tremendous deficit position.

You know, in a sense he reminds me of an iron butterfly. He was flapping and clanking but he couldn't get off the ground, be-

cause while he was listened to, I presume, with careful interest by the Minister of Finance, when the budget was brought down there was no additional money for this province.

Whether or not there was, that is a shame. We have been told once again that, if we cannot keep our fiscal house in order, then it is the responsibility of the government of the province to raise the taxes. The Premier knows we have every right, and in fact duty, to do so if our fiscal affairs cannot be adequately managed, to keep them within the bounds of proper balance, with a deficit which can certainly be accepted if it is needed in order to stimulate our economy.

Then the by-elections came along, Mr. Speaker, and, all of a sudden, while that deficit didn't quite disappear like the melting snow up in Huron before the hot sun, it did recede considerably. As a matter of fact, two press conferences were called. A special publication was brought out, which the Treasurer said he was going to make a quarterly publication, but which appeared just three weeks before the by-election, in which the Treasurer found in the pocket of his other pants $290 million. That is a conservative estimate, because he now found that our deficit was going to be less than $500 million. If you accept the fact that it might well have been in excess of $800 million, then well over $300 million had been found unexpectedly by the advisers to the Treasury.

So the Premier was able to go up to Huron and say, "Things are not as bad as good old Bob is telling you. We have found a lot more money. As a matter of fact, our economy is booming."

How different from their predictions when they were trying to help Bob Stanfield last fall. They found $160 million extra from corporate taxes alone that they didn't know had been funnelling into the Treasury during the year. They found that $45 million extra, that would be paid by the government of Canada through our tax-sharing programme and which they weren't aware of, were being channelled into the Treasury on a regular basis.

Mr. Speaker, you know that we have several acres of experts in the Treasury building—the Frost building—and that we have the finest computers that money can buy. As a matter of fact, they may even be finer than that; I don't know. Surely there should have been the capability of predicting, on a quarterly basis or perhaps even a monthly basis, the revenues and the changes in those revenues over that period of time. In my opinion, the results of the special press conferences called by the Treasurer were intended to mislead either the electorate in St. George and Huron or to mislead the officials of the finance ministry in Ottawa, and more probably both. It is a serious criticism surely that the staff advising the Treasurer—or more properly a criticism of the Treasurer himself—were so off the mark in their predictions that, in fact, the budget and its forecasts are practically meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, I said before the by-elections that because of the confusion on these important figures, at least in the minds of the government, the Treasurer should state specifically whether the situation had improved to the extent that we no longer need fear the imposition of special and extra provincial income taxes as had been predicted by the Treasurer. I felt that it was his duty to the electorate to indicate clearly whether or not it was now necessary for the Province of Ontario to cancel out the reductions in personal income taxes and the proposed reductions in corporation income taxes which were designed on a federal initiative to stimulate the economy of the whole of Canada. Because of that stimulation and the fact that we in Ontario are fortunate in having the largest share of the economic activity, those initiatives are bound to benefit us more than any other province, and I felt that the Treasurer should have made a statement in that connection. Failing that, the Speech from the Throne would have been an appropriate time, many weeks after the federal budget had been brought down, for the government to clarify its mystifyingly opaque position on the budget and the ramifications that the budget predictions would have for the tax situation in our own province.

Mr. Speaker, the second point that I felt was an important issue, at least in the Huron by-election, had to do with regional government. At the nomination in Hensall, when my colleague, the member for Huron, won the nomination over four opponents—and an excellent meeting it was—I made the statement to the assembled gathering—and I think there were 600 or 700 there—that the Conservative government would be looking very carefully at the vote in Huron because if a Conservative were returned we might be sure that it would be construed by the government as a support for the regionalization policies.

Now, I believe that to be true. The Premier said there is no plan for regionalization in

Huron. As a matter of fact, you can be darn sure there wasn't Mr. Speaker, because Mr. MacNaughton was not going to let regional government come close to the place, in the same way that the present parliamentary assistant to the Premier was not going to let regional government come close to Chatham.

The concept set out by the former Premier in his Design for Development, and the thrust of the member for Chatham-Kent's policy as far as regional government was concerned, was that before 1975 the areas of Ontario between Kingston, at least, and right through to Windsor would be subject to the advantages, as they called them, of regional government.

It is interesting that the Conservative candidate in Huron said, "Even if there is regionalization, I am going to try to get the government to restrict it to Huron county." He had forgotten, of course, that the guidelines for regionalization insist that a minimum of 150,000 people be involved in a region. The Premier is shaking his head but when I asked specifically in this House whether or not those guidelines still applied, I was informed that they did. They must certainly have forgotten that Huron county has a population of only 65,000–52,000 I am informed by my trusty adviser from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt).

Mr. Speaker, it was an issue because while there were no concrete proposals put forward for the regionalization of Huron, the good citizens of that area felt very much like a man marooned in a flood on a small island. The man could see the water advancing upon him and, according to the Premier, he should not call out until it was up around his neck.

The citizens of Huron were much too sensible for that. By electing a Liberal to this House they showed that among other things they disapproved of the policy of the imposition of regional government that has been experimented with by this administration during the present Premier's term of office and for a number of years before.

I want to say something quite specific about this because we are told in the Speech from the Throne that we are going to have legislation concerning probably three areas, if not four, presented to us this session.

The first one will undoubtedly have to do with a large area east of Toronto, that we used to call the Oshawa-Whitby study. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will recall that the former Treasurer, Mr. MacNaughton, went down to that area to present the government's programme and plan. Out of the blue he indicated to the citizens who had been invited to the meeting that the regional government that he was going to enact—and this policy has apparently not been changed—was going to be extended considerably beyond the original boundaries of the study to include Cobourg and Port Hope. I would draw to your attention, sir, that no study nor recommendation had been made which would have included these two large communities with the surrounding rural areas and many smaller towns, with Oshawa-Whitby.

Mr. MacNaughton at the time was questioned about the extension of the purview or the boundaries of the proposed regional government and had indicated that it had simply become a matter of policy. They would hear objections, if objections there were, but there was every indication that the government was going to proceed with the enlarged concept for regional government.

As a matter of fact, one of the strongest and earliest objections was made public by the federal member for the area, a friend of us all, Al Lawrence, MP, who evidently was sitting in the front row while Mr. MacNaughton was presenting his programme for regional government and, as soon as the meeting was concluded, he got up and rushed over to the reporters with their tape recorders and said that he was going to fight this nefarious scheme with all of the power and influence at his disposal.

Mr. Singer: That's typical.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Actually, I think it was a fairly safe thing to say because, I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that Al Lawrence probably has no power nor influence up here. I think that was even indicated before he made the decision to leave this chamber and go to another.

Mr. Singer: That was one of the reasons he left.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I sometimes feel a bit sorry for Bob Stanfield with John Diefenbaker on one side and Al Lawrence on the other, because while Al may have expressed his concern for the extension of regional government, I have the feeling that like so many of his pronouncements lately, it was voiced simply for the political impact it might have in consolidating his home base, because he envisages being rather busy on several other bases in the next few months and years.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the government brings forward the bill encompassing Cobourg and Port Hope it will be making a very serious mistake indeed. The Premier is surely aware of the local feelings toward that extension to the east and that, if they are lumped in with Oshawa and Whitby, it will be an error indeed. It will, in fact, snuff out the local participation—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The member will want first chance to oppose it too, won't he?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —in our reform of local government that can be brought forward, if the government does not enter into this programme without reviewing the statements put forward by the former Treasurer.

As far as regional government is concerned, I want to turn just briefly to a meeting that the Premier and I both attended. I'm not sure he knew I was there but certainly we all know that he was there, because the whole thing—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I knew the member was there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —had been staged, Mr. Speaker, by one of those small little $100,000 public relations contracts in the large auditorium of Mohawk College on the hill at Hamilton. Once again, the festivities were by invitation only. I appreciated receiving one as a member in the immediate area and decided to attend just to see what went on at these little clambakes, these shindigs.

You know what it's like, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that you have participated in these things yourself, with all the tension and excitement of spotlights and the television cameras, people scurrying around, shaking hands with their political cronies, and looking for the best possible seat, if possible within range of the television camera.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the member find one?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But, you know, there's a hush that falls upon the gathering and the Premier himself comes out and allows as how he doesn't usually attend these functions, he usually leaves it for his ministers to explain to the assembled municipal gathering, but since this particular meeting did involve Peel he himself was there so that his own good people would realize his immediate concern.

I shouldn't be paraphrasing in this way, because you know how excellent he is when he shifts that monotone into operation. He can pacify any kind of querulous group, except maybe the ones in this House, by simply expressing with his usual urbanity that there's nothing to fear except, maybe, fear itself.

It's interesting, because I sometimes feel it myself. When the Premier floats on to the stage with the spotlights upon him—

Mr. Worton: Like another Emmy Awards show!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —there's something very awesome about it. But one of the healthy things about municipal government is that the reeves and the councillors and the mayors are not so easily overawed perhaps, as some of us who've seen the manifestations of power that have come from this particular gentleman, because his remarks were punctuated with some very—well, let us say—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Rude!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —rude interjections, hisses, boos, suggestions that he take himself off the platform—and, as a matter of fact, he eventually did, but not until he had presented to the gathering his new Treasurer.

And the Treasurer, who as is well known is shy and self-effacing—ingratiating, everybody's friend—had a smile painted on his face. It was very much like the one I had on my face the night of the by-elections.

Mr. Lewis: No doubt.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I just couldn't get it off. He indicated that he was a new Treasurer, that in fact he was not an expert in these businesses of regional government, but they had somebody who was and that was his colleague, the member for York East (Mr. Meen). And the member came out and—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is what you call passing the buck.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —the mantle of responsibility was passed down to this gentle chap whom we all know so well and who is not in the House today. He came out and took his place behind the podium and described in great detail the programme for regional government that was going to be presented to Peel county, Halton county and Wentworth-Hamilton.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It's like the Marx Brothers.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's interesting that the member for York East has an entirely different philosophy to this matter than—well in a sense his predecessor, the member for Chatham-Kent. We always thought the latter was ready to wield the axe at any moment and that he was prepared—as I believe was Mr. MacNaughton—to simply present it to the people and say: "It's okay, you can complain about it for one month but that is the way it's going to be."

In other words, he had the axe there and was ready with one strong blow to settle the arguments—and that was it. And I have even heard him express these views. He was much more prepared to take the arguments all at once than to be picked to pieces over a long period of time. He may very well have been right in this particular area, because with the member for York East it's more like slow death.

He is prepared to go to every meeting that is called—perhaps now with a few exceptions—in order to answer every possible question on regional government. He is so convinced at the rightness of the Conservative cause that he simply believes that through the sheer force of his own good spirit and reason he will carry the day.

I've been present at at least one of those meetings and it sounded to me like a former Minister of Finance trying to convince people through sheer good feeling and rationality that his white paper proposals should be accepted—the more he explains them the more they are rejected. But one thing the member for York East has said and that is, that if he feels that there is, let's say, an atmosphere of non-acceptance in any one of these programmes that it will not go forward.

Well, the first question that came from the audience was: "How are you going to determine that? Are you going to have some kind of a referendum?" Of course not! "We can't have a referendum because we are elected to govern." We have heard that phrase before.

How then are you going to determine whether your approach to regional government is acceptable?

Mr. Breithaupt: Cheese and wine parties!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: My hon. friend interjects something that may be the new procedure for the Conservative Party to determine whether or not it's acceptable, because they don't like votes—that's plain. The whole approach toward determining acceptability is one that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting that it should be done by vote?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —I believe that there should be a statement on it from the Premier himself; because the people in Ontario are not satisfied even though two proposals have been put forward. We have to look at Peel, Halton, Wentworth-Hamilton as a package; and for all the talk about consultation we know what there were just two meaningful consultations.

The first were the Tory bigwigs in Peel, because there is no doubt they have to be satisfied. The warden of Peel county said: "You know, it was just as if I had written this regional government proposal myself." I thought that that was an interesting reaction for him to make. But the other consultation—and I don't know how this one became so important—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the hon. member know the one-time Liberal candidate supported it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The only other consultation that was of any effect at all was the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr) and the golf club mafia in Burlington. And there was no doubt Burlington had to be included with Halton. That was just one of the "givens"—pardon me—that the member for York East said was not negotiable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that I feel it would be a tragic error indeed if the disposition of Burlington in the regional government programme were not carefully reviewed. Every authoritative study and commission that was anything other than crassly political has come to the conclusion that Burlington should be included with the city of Hamilton.

Many, if not most of the people—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Bluntly denied.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Many, if not most of the people living in Burlington work in Hamilton, and there is no doubt in my mind that the decision to exclude Burlington from that regional government is a serious mistake that the government must not be permitted to make. Does the Premier want to say something about that?

An hon. member: Give him a hand.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just as a matter of information, Mr. Speaker, this matter goes back certainly in the era I know best—well before

the proposal. It goes back some six or seven years when, with the initiative of Peel County Council and I think with some involvement of Halton, probably the first report on regional government in that whole area was the Plunkett report. I am sure the hon. member for Downsview recalls this. With respect, as I recall, that report did not recommend the inclusion of Burlington and Hamilton. That was, shall we say, one of the very early reports on regional government in that area, including Peel and Halton.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right. The Premier is correct, except that the basic recommendation of Plunkett was to draw a line separating the lakefront communities, so that there would be one urban area, and leaving the top parts of the counties in a rural organization. Since that particular concept has been rejected, then surely the Plunkett recommendations cannot be referred to as having any meaning whatsoever, since the government is not even considering making an urban region along the lakefront.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that there are so many errors creeping into the imposition of regional government, as has been expressed by these plans, that the government should certainly consider a moratorium on further regionalization until we see the effects of our experiments up to the present time. Certainly I don't intend to take time to review the regional governments that have been previously imposed and the problems that they have experienced—the high costs of those governments, the remoteness from the people who have to be served, and so on.

I am aware that the Treasury is examining the effects of regional government, but it seems to me that we in this House should not be asked to proceed with further regionalization until we can have a careful reassessment, with public hearings in those areas that have already been affected.

To tell the truth, I feel that the commitment to the old Design for Development and the member for Chatham-Kent's regionalization concept is already seriously out of date. The Premier must surely be aware that we can achieve the kind of reforms which he has frequently said we are looking for, without simply disrupting what has been working very well in many areas.

I would suggest to him that if he pursues the policy of paying an ever larger share of the costs of education—we are now up to 60 per cent and approaching the goal of 80 per cent, which has been our policy for many years—we can, through this mechanism alone, reduce the pressure on smaller municipalities to grab at any kind of assessment that comes along, whether it's a glue factory or Archie McCoy's foundry—it doesn't make any difference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where's that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's right in Beverly township. You almost gave it to him, don't you remember?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He switched.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about this as one alternative to relieve the local taxpayers of a much larger share of the costs of education.

Mr. Worton: That's the real McCoy!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And while the Premier is shaking his head, he knows full well—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, I'm sorry; I thought he was shaking his head. But he knows full well that in fact, this is going to come about in the next five years.

The second thing that does form a part of the Speech from the Throne, but I sense it is going to be inadequate, is the true transference of authority for the implementation of official plans back to the municipalities—counties in some areas, regions in other areas—which have established official plans.

I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that even in the Niagara region, where so much money has been spent on reorganization, the mayor of Niagara Falls is still waiting for the community planning branch and the Ontario Municipal Board to recommend, and in fact to decide for it, where a certain new shopping centre will be located. In other words, no matter whether or not we have reorganized government on a regional basis, the decisions still are made here at Queen's Park.

I will admit that the present speech indicates that the government is at least recognizing that the municipalities, the local people, deserve the right to make those decisions. But we have been talking about this new partnership ever since John Robarts convened that provincial-municipal conference up at the Science Centre. We have heard this repeatedly from Premiers, Ministers of Municipal Affairs, latterly Treasurers, but still nothing has come to pass that would indicate the government means business when

it says it is going to relinquish its authority to decide on severances and the establishment of the decisions to bring about the implementation of official plans.

Frankly, there is the feeling—and I have to express this to you, Mr. Speaker—that, like the school boards established on the county basis, there is a terrible error when we talk about efficiency and even a more general application of a fair and equal approach to the good things that the government can put forward through its grant programme. If, even now, you go into the various counties you will find the feeling in many communities that under the present county board system, for all of the good intentions of the people elected and working hard in the county boards, there is still a remoteness to the needs of the people in the communities rather than in the counties. People regret to lose this sense of community need and do not want to lose it in other aspects of their municipal government. So I would say again that the Speech from the Throne is lacking in that it does not anounce a moratorium on further regionalization until there is a full review of the fiscal and democratic implications in the experiments that we have already undertaken.

The next subject that I want to discuss, Mr. Speaker—and I'm afraid it's not going to be a brief one—has to do with the announcement in the Speech from the Throne that great new initiatives are going to be taken in land-use planning. This, in fact, could be the most important announcement that we have had from the government for a long time. There has been some editorial comment about, "Is Bill Davis serious about this? Are we heading for the kind of confrontation that Barrett is having in BC?" and that sort of thing.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that among every aspect of the community there is a new acceptance of the need for planning with teeth in it. That has been the fear of almost everybody in the province up until now. I can tell you that for the last 10 years, going back to Wilf Spooner's day, there has been the feeling that the government has been afraid to take planning decisions itself, that it has left the decisions to the municipalities where the reeve and his council have to fight through some kind of zoning provisions, if not an official plan, and take the political flak that goes with it.

There has been many a reeve and councillor who has lost his seat, Mr. Speaker, because he simply responded to the threat, from the former minister largely that, "If you don't do the planning, we will do it for you." Frankly, this has been nothing but a threat up until recently. As a matter of fact, it still is nothing but a threat. The government has left the responsibility up to the local people to implement a plan which the province might or might not support.

The reference to the Niagara Escarpment is very acceptable indeed. Editorialists and columnists have pointed out that this has been referred to specifically in the last four years—if not in the Speech from the Throne itself, at least in government pronouncements. John Robarts, as far back as 1967, was talking about this. I can well remember suggesting and putting to the government—I believe it was in 1968 in my reply to the Speech from the Throne—that the responsibilities of the Niagara Parks Commission could very well be expanded to include the escarpment. I would still suggest to the Premier, rather than establishing another commission, that the Niagara Parks Commission's responsibility could go along the north shore of Lake Erie and up the escarpment, and that could be the body that could implement many of the policies that are at least hinted at in the Speech from the Throne.

The parkway belt is once again an old story, extending from Dundas around to Pickering, or something like that. I remember that was a part of the MTART study, which was presented, once again with fanfare and a $100,000 public relation programme out at the Queen Elizabeth building, where Mr. Robarts occupied the centre stage and, as the lights darkened and the pink spotlights picked him out, he carried the MTARTS proposal and later the Toronto-centred region plan to the assembled group of municipal officials.

Land-use planning then, in my opinion can be supported by almost every group within the province. There have been fears expressed that the farmers are not going to support any concept of land-use planning. I think the hon. member for Peterborough who seconded the address in reply made an excellent point—and I want to commend him for it—when he said that the farmers are quite prepared not only to accede to but to support concepts of firm planning decisions which, in fact, will put arable land out of the development ambit. They are prepared to support that only if it is part of the policy that they do not have to pay for the programme themselves.

If the province or any other level of government says to a farmer, let use say in the Niagara Peninsula, "We consider your land

to be of a special value and that from here to eternity it will do nothing but grow fruit trees or grape vines," the farmer is prepared to accept that as long as he does not personally have to pay the specific costs of putting the use of that land on ice in perpetuity. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of alternatives available.

There can be tax concessions or, as has been put forward by the Federation of Agriculture, the development rights in those specific areas can be separated from the land itself—just like mining rights have in the past been separated—and bought and paid for. The alternative is to have the farmers carry the financial responsibility and I will say to you now, Mr. Speaker, that that is not an acceptable alternative.

I want to say to you that when I talk about the inadequacies of planning in the past there is one specific case that I want to bring to your attention. Perhaps before I do so, I should say that because of the business which went on in the Legislature before I began my remarks, it will not be possible for me to complete them by 5 o'clock. I don't know whether you wish to continue with private members' hour at that time or have me proceed with my remarks and finish this afternoon rather than go ahead tomorrow? I mention it so that those people who might be concerned with ordering the business will think about it.

I have been talking about land-use planning and I have a specific case which I want to bring to your attention.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, on that point if we could get the agreement of the members? As far as the government is concerned, in fairness, we would suspend the private members' hour so the Leader of the Opposition could finish, or at least go into the private members' hour. Certainly from the government's standpoint, we would have no objection to that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is agreeable with us.

Mr. Lewis: Does the member want that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Fine.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I appreciate the agreement as I would like to finish my remarks at this time.

I am referring to a situation that occurred in Chatham township and many people may be aware of this situation. The reason it is significant is that it is at the back door of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs who used to trumpet, "If you don't do your planning, we will do it for you." Chatham township has always been without an official plan for land use and even zoning bylaws have been effectively absent from any control of development in the area.

The township is well known for having some of the best arable land anywhere in Ontario and the land value for agricultural purposes is as high as it is anywhere, with the exception of some areas here in the Toronto area and in the Niagara Peninsula. Even under the shadow of the member for Chatham-Kent's political statements over the last many years and his willingness to impose the decisions of Queen's Park on huge areas such as the whole of the Niagara region, the township of Chatham was held up in the establishment of an official plan.

Its original proposals came forward in 1968 but the ministry, then under the operation of the member for Chatham-Kent himself, delayed in its acceptance particularly because of its concern that the official plan still allowed certain developments to use septic tanks for waste disposal. The plan was aimed at maintaining the largely agricultural nature of the township and would have specifically prohibited the developments which attract large numbers of people, such as highrise apartments, shopping plazas and so on.

As a matter of fact, during that period of time any farmer who wanted a severance under any circumstances was and still is delayed up to 18 months while the community planning branch in Toronto gives its consideration. Approvals from the medical officer of health and the delays in soil testing by the Ministry of the Environment often add many months to the final approval.

Yet this is what is happening in Chatham township at this very time: An organization known as Multi-Malls Developments Ltd. has purchased land a short distance outside the city of Chatham, in the township, and is undertaking to build a $7.25 million shopping plaza with a complex of offices, apartment buildings and townhouses, the whole concept of which is a negation of even the most elementary planning principles that are accepted across the province.

Without an official plan and zoning bylaws the township is powerless to stop the development, except by not issuing a building permit or by holding up the approval of the medical officer.

The facts in this particular case are incredible. The building permit was issued apparently without the knowledge of the reeve or the approval of council, and the approval through the Health Department—which in other circumstances always requires a lengthy delay for soil sample—was attained within three days of the original application. This is how efficient the provincial Ministry of the Environment can be under special circumstances. The earth movers were busy on the land and observed from the highway before any of the residents of the largely farming community had any inkling of what was to be built.

Multi-Malls intends to provide water for this large complex by drilling wells, and experience in the area would already indicate that such a huge draw of water would lower the water table to such an extent that the water supply of the area's farmers would be seriously endangered. Most ironic of all, the sewage from the whole complex is to be treated by septic tanks with the approval of the Ministry of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker, the matter is of grave concern when you see what a large corporation can do when it goes down into an area like that and gets that sort of approval. The Premier, I know, winces when we talk about Fidinam, but he does not answer when we ask about certain corporations which contribute to his campaign fund. All we can do is look at the facts. The farmers in the area have no way of getting these approvals and yet within three days a large corporation in this province can go in and get the approvals necessary to move into an agricultural area and build a $7.25 million complex and service it with wells and septic tanks.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Unbelievable. Absolutely unbelievable.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The total environmental effect of the complex is clearly disastrous, and with its official plan still held up after five years by the government at Queen's Park, and apparently with the co-operation of the Ministry of the Environment and other provincial authorities, the township is powerless to prevent it. As a matter of fact, under the circumstances there is not even a means whereby a public hearing can be called under the auspices of the local municipality, the Municipal Board or any other group, so that residents who are watching this situation are without power to affect it in any way.

Many of the farmers in the community have appealed through every political resource available to them for help, and as a matter of fact it was Charlie MacNaughton on the very day of his resignation who announced a freeze on the development in Chatham township. But of course it was too late. The orders, signed by the then Treasurer, prohibit commercial or industrial use of land in the township or the construction of multiple dwellings. Although this was a good move, it was unfortunately ineffectual. The project has received prior approval and is now under way. Although work has apparently been discontinued because of weather circumstances—it may in fact be under water with the flooding problems they are experiencing — the Treasurer's order cannot legally stop nor obstruct the building.

I only bring this to your attention, sir, to indicate the inadequate muddle that planning in this province has been subjected to up until now. As a matter of fact, there are very few students in the field who would believe such a chaotic condition to exist anywhere, let alone in Chatham township which is one of the areas of the best arable land in Ontario and, as I say, under the direct scrutiny of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs himself.

Our profligate and wasteful concepts over the past many years have destroyed for all time some of the best agricultural land in Ontario. While in many areas of food production we have surpluses, still when we look at the problems of the future in our own country and the world, it is obvious that only fools would permit the continued destruction and loss of our agricultural land resources by the kind of unplanned development that has gone on for the last 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, when I say that we are prepared to support the concept of planning laws with teeth in them, I must of course refer again to the unquestioned needs of the farmers to have the assurance as a matter of government policy that they are not going to have to pay the whole bill, and that we must also have as a part of that statement of policy one associated with a plan on the provincial level.

For all of the urging that has gone forward from the province to the municipalities, there has never been a concept, other than the Toronto-centred region—which is amorphous at best—as to the role the province itself should play in deciding the goals for the large areas and regions in Ontario. It is my firm conviction that the decision to abandon the 10 provincial planning areas that had been set up following the war, replacing them

with five planning districts, can only be effective if in fact a plan for the province is based on that regionalization.

My opinion is that the development of industry from henceforward should, by government initiative, be fostered around those areas where there are plentiful supplies of power. I specifically refer to Nanticoke, Lambton, Bruce, Lennox and the Ottawa Valley, where we have various power sources. The northern part of the province can as well be included specifically in this regard.

I feel that as a part of an Ontario plan we should be prepared, in the establishment of our power projects on the Great Lakes, to oversize the water intake and the sewage disposal systems so that we can by government planning provide areas for heavy industry properly serviced at public expense, which then can be recouped from those industries moving into the area. Through these five regions we can obviously take ourselves out of the day-to-day oversight of planning decisions made by local municipalities, counties and regions. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that without that kind of alternative the comments in the Speech from the Throne are absolutely meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, in moving forward I want to refer briefly to the educational situation in the province. I do not intend to spend a long time on this, but simply to bring to your attention, sir, and to the attention of the former minister, an area of growing concern. Our approach from the Ministry of Education is setting up a cafeteria of curriculum pablum in the various schools of this province, so that we are in fact doing a serious disservice to the young people in the province who may opt for courses which are not preparing them, even to a minimum level, for the kind of responsibilities that they are going to be asked to accept as citizens, breadwinners, taxpayers and residents here in Ontario.

In my view and the view that our party holds, we must return to the concept of a core curriculum—the Premier may recall the phrase being used some years in the past—which can in fact establish, once and for all, that in the schools that we support we will insist that our young people have an opportunity to study English, conversational French, and Canadian history, and that they will not have an opportunity to opt out of that core curriculum unless, for reasons having to do with their personal abilities, it would be a waste of time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At what levels?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The levels, in my view, should be from one end to the other, particularly for conversational French. I notice, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You'd have to include math.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne refers to the concern of the government to provide French language as the language of instruction in various areas of the province. I am convinced that that battle—if battle there was—has, through this announcement and the report of the Symons commission that was discussed previously this afternoon, been fought and won. We believe that French as a language of instruction has got to be accepted in French communities, but where this government is still dramatically falling down in its responsibility is providing French as a second language in English communities.

The Premier is saying we are going to have to include math. I would think obviously that most young people ought to be urged to take math and science. But once you start moving out of what is in my view the skeleton, the real core of the curriculum, you are soon dictating a whole spectrum of compulsory subjects—for example, phys-ed. There is a good argument there that no student should be allowed to go through without taking phys-ed.

Well, I am not prepared to enter into that argument, but I am prepared to tell you that in my opinion no student from grade 1—or whatever you call it these days—up to at least level three in high school should be permitted to opt for the list that my esteemed number two son brought home for my approval the other day: consumer education, bookkeeping, man and society, instrumental music. All of these are excellent subjects, broadening subjects, but what if the decision were left to him—because all of the fellows are taking this, and nobody wants to take French, nobody likes history, math is too tough. Okay, the decision is left to me, and I can say, "All right Harry"—his name is Harry—"this is what you are going to take." We fixed it all up.

Mr. Drea: Will the hon. member tell us what he took?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Now, perhaps that might be just a little authoritarian, maybe a bit too paternalistic; but I will suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a responsibility that I am prepared to take on his behalf—and I

will predict to you, sir, that he will thank me for it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He didn't want to take that tripe anyway.

Mr. Drea: Come on, will the member tell us what he picked!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So, just to get back to this business of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just to get back to this business of history. I can well remember the Premier, before he ascended these vaunted heights, establishing a committee to look into the teaching of history in the province. He had a very competent group of two or three people gathering submissions from teachers and others all across the province in order to advise them on this. And there were a lot of kudos and credit accruing to him.

Mr. Drea: What did the hon. member take?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the member really wants to know, I took English, French, physics, chemistry, Latin; I took it all, I took it all.

Mr. Drea: No, no. What did the member pick this time?

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the member leave the House and discuss it afterwards.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to satisfy the member because it is very difficult to continue with him there.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What difference does it make? It is kind of a stupid question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Anyway, certainly in the teaching of history there can be no question that if we are going to reduce the core to the basic minimum, there is not a young person who should go through our system without an appreciation of Canadian history.

If he wants to opt for American history, Mexican history, British history, there are all sorts of arguments that could be made for their relative importance—particularly British history. But surely we must insist that they have an understanding of the development of our governmental institutions—responsible government particularly—and for us to say, "You can study that if you want to," is just ridiculous. I don't have to comment on English; but if a person cannot adequately use English, then his usefulness to himself and to the community is reduced.

And let's just spend a moment on French. I notice the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) is nodding and looking at me when I talk about it, but I am sure almost everybody would agree with me on this. We have a tremendous advantage in living in Canada where we are multi-cultural and we are bilingual. And for our young people to go through the schools without having an opportunity—and something more than an opportunity—to have a good grasp of the conversational language is just simply an abdication of our responsibilities right here. But it should begin at a very early stage indeed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Now if you want to look at it as money in their pockets, obviously it is. There is no other country in the world that I am aware of, except perhaps the United States, which discredits and discounts language education the way we do in Canada. And there is no reason we should have that attitude. We are a bilingual country, except in fact in the educational system here in Ontario and in a few other provinces. I put this to you most sincerely.

I credit the government for mentioning in the Speech from the Throne some initiatives in Indian education; not just for the Indians of course, but for the whole of the school community, so that we can involve ourselves in the lessons of Indian culture.

I would like to spend some time talking about religious education in the schools, because the government has never yet come to grips with the recommendations of the MacKay report and it appears that it never will. It is going to pussyfoot through that particular patch of willows because of the problems that it has in coming to grips with the old-fashioned approach to religious education no longer is what our young people or even their parents are looking for. Obviously we can assist them through the school system in establishing a basis of morals and ethics, but the approach to religious education that was first established by George Drew in 1943 is out of date. I do believe that we can do much better than we have during recent years when the government simply has not come to grips with it either on the basis of

George Drew's approach or, more latterly, that of the Keiller Mackay.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue in the by-elections, and I do want to refer to it at some length. It has to do with our problems of financing Medicare, which have been discussed so frequently in this House and in the community.

As you are aware—I hope that you are aware—a former high official of the Ministry of Health in one of his last acts before moving to the Province of Quebec with a similarly high responsibility with the Department of Health and Welfare there, came to me and the leader of the NDP and gave us a good deal of information about the operation of the Ministry of Health, particularly associated with the escalating costs of Medicare.

Dr. David Kinloch is the person I am referring to, and I want to deal for a period of time specifically with the matters that he brought to my attention, because I believe it is my responsibility to pass them on to the House and to the interested citizens of Ontario at this time.

I want to begin by quoting from a letter that was addressed to me and which was the covering letter for the information he made available. It was dated March 9 and was signed by D. R. Kinloch, MD, director of the medical services branch of the Ministry of Health. It reads in part as follows:

> Dear Mr. Nixon:
>
> I am writing not so much to offer a defence against what appear to me to be absurd charges by the Hon. Dr. Potter, but to suggest that the Ministry of Health is deteriorating as an effective vehicle for the administration of $2 billion of public funds.
>
> The combination of a well-intentioned but poorly informed and impetuous minister, of an entrenched senior bureaucracy resistant to change, and of an environment within the ministry that is hostile to integrity, imagination and initiative, does not augur well for intelligent administration.
>
> My public humiliation was only the most clumsily handled of manoeuvres to purge or to sequester those who asked, or wished to respond to, embarrassing questions.

I continue from a later paragraph in the letter:

> OHIP data do not support the hypothesis of significant patient abuse; indeed, they point to physician-generated overservicing for misrepresentation as the basis for the overwhelming proportion of "excess costs".

Mr. Speaker, I simply refer to the covering letter because we are aware that in a statement in this Legislature, in response to a question from me in December, 1972, the Minister of Health indicated that Mr. Kinloch was being removed from that particular responsibility—not being fired, but being given other responsibilities because of certain inadequacies in Dr. Kinloch's service.

In order to defend himself against that charge, Dr. Kinloch has provided me with certain manuscripts and documents which I feel it my duty to put before you and which I will read to you. I quote from a speech that Dr. Kinloch prepared for the then Minister of Health (Mr. Lawrence) in April, 1971. Dr. Kinloch came on the staff in February and was considered an important acquisition by the ministry at the time. This was in response to a request for an assessment of the problems that OMSIP, as it was then, was experiencing in meeting its financial commitments to the provision of medical services. I quote from his paper dated April 9, 1971:

> Physicians' incomes are . . . undeniably rising and this should elicit an inquiry into the manner in which OHSIP incomes are derived to ascertain what we are getting for our $400 million annual expenditure for medical care.

I would like to bring to your attention, sir, that while this was in April, 1971, now in March, 1973, we are not talking about $400 million but close to $600 million commitment for the same programme. That is a commentary on just how ineffectual the controls have been since that time. I continue to quote from his paper:

> In setting out the statutory basis for OHSIP, the medical profession was accepted, on trust, to provide a payment schedule for a public programme that would provide reasonable income for the physician while protecting the public programme from unwarranted or excessive billing. For its part, the government withheld intensive scrutiny of physicians' practices during the early phases of OHSIP; instead concentrating on the efficient processing of claims. It appears that this trust was misplaced for not just a few but many physicians had been regularly and increasingly

> exploiting their own fee schedule to wring maximal payments from the programme.

Those are very tough allegations made two years ago when most of us were still concerned that OMSIP payments would be paid on time. You remember, we used to be phoning Dr. Aldis' office regularly to speed up the mailing of those particular cheques. At least the department was aware that the real problem was not so much getting the cheques written but to put some control on the cheque-writers so that the payment for the medical services under OMSIP would not escalate at the rate at which, unfortunately, it has risen in recent years.

Dr. Kinloch then provided a list of areas of billing abuses, none of them themselves corrupt, but all leading to over-servicing on the part of the doctors. I intend to table these papers and any member of the Legislature would then have access to reading this material in detail. He sets it out in detail listing the areas which, in his experience, the doctors were using, not in any way to defraud the fund, but simply to maximize their participation in it. A further quote from his statement:

> Undoubtedly, government must bear some responsibility for these excesses for in not exerting tight control we have encouraged a few to set bad examples which have, unfortunately, been followed by the many.

A very significant statement indeed. Most doctors undoubtedly were prepared to bill for services rendered but only for those services fairly rendered. Over the last two years, as they have talked with their colleagues in the staff rooms and read the reports in the newspapers, it's become abundantly clear that they would be fools if they did not follow the habits—bad habits we would call them—of many members of the profession in billing for services which actually should not have been billed for. We have really allowed a bad example on the part of only a few doctors to creep through a large proportion of the billing procedures of the medical profession.

I now quote, Mr. Speaker, from a memo written by Dr. Kinloch to Dr. Aldis, who was in charge of the OMSIP procedures and the OMSIP programme at the time, following a discussion which established a constraint package. The government of the day—Mr. A. F. Lawrence was the minister—had decided that it could not continue with the escalation rate which was then apparent.

They were instructed, as officials of the Ministry of Health, to prepare a constraint package which was designed to reduce the expenditures by about 15 per cent or $50 million. The constraint package was approved by the Policy and Priorities Board of cabinet and then the ministry found that it was having serious difficulties in implementing that package. In quoting from this memo dated May 31 you will see the problems were well understood by Dr. Kinloch:

> In order to set out our current position in relation to the proposed constraint package, I have, in the accompanying draft material, commented on each of the 36 major items within the constraint package, sometimes not kindly. It's clear from reviewing our progress that there has not been much and that the prospect of achieving the $50-million savings is a fantasy. I hope, however, that we may be able to salvage some of the potential gains by aggressively pursuing the recommended policies.

So on May 31 the man in charge said that the $50 million savings prospect was a fantasy. This was less than two months after the budget was presented on March 28 of that year, in which the savings of $50 million had been predicted.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to read too much of the writings of Dr. Kinloch but some of them simply must be put before you because of their importance, particularly in the situation we now find ourselves in, with our Medicare payments still completely out of control and no programme designed to constrain them. I quote now from a statement made by Dr. Kinloch to Mr. Stan Martin, then Deputy Minister of Health, dated May 23, 1972, and entitled, Our Five-Year Financial and Programme Forecast. It goes as follows:

> The administration of our health insurance programme has shown a lamentable lack to date of any meaningful planning or evaluation activities and has exercised a level of administrative control that would have bankrupted any other enterprise. No organizational goals have been articulated, no priorities have been established. The only measures of success have been the rapidity with which cheques have been processed and the relative absence of complaints about payments. In its short life the medical insurance programme has misled the public and seduced the profession into patterns of behaviour that are as expensive as they are generally non-productive in terms of ultimate benefit to health.
>
> I have suggested in previous papers the urgent necessity for a thorough evaluation

of the services included in the programme and of the methods of financing such services. The non- or counter-productive elements within the programme must be purged and any new service added only after consideration of our ordered priorities and of our administrative and financial capabilities. If there is any feeling within the ministry that by prodding the college into belated action there is a lessened need for control mechanisms within the plan, I should like to note that the college can only be as effective as our capability is to support them, and that our ability to support them is just about zero. It will take a massive sustained effort to develop our planning, evaluation and control mechanisms to the level that should have been maintained since the inception of the plan. The incredible myopia of starving these areas, of providing a free hand to the cheque writers, while stifling those who hope to bring relative order to the programme, borders on criminal malfeasance.

Very strong words indeed, I'm sure you will agree. These come from a top official in the department to his deputy and undoubtedly were forwarded to the minister. Yet, although the constraint package had come from the department and had been approved by the policy and priorities board, still on June 18 in a submission to the management board of cabinet, the following was imparted:

Last year the policy and priorities board approved a $50 million constraint package for health insurance in order to lower the rise in health costs. The constraints were approved for implementation in 1972-1973. [In parenthesis, I indicate to you, sir, the very year in which we are now paying for these bills.] Instructions have been received from the minister's office not to proceed with implementations of the constraints. In addition, longer lead times are necessary than were available. Consequently the programme will require a reinstatement of the $50 million for the 1972-1973 fiscal year.

The ministry requires the reinstatement of $50 million to the medical plan budget in order to meet the expected costs. Specific direction to proceed with implementation would yield the savings for 1973-1974.

I simply bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no announcement of such constraints, only a further statement in the Speech from the Throne that various committees, task forces, and other groups responsible to the ministry are going to make further recommendations.

Still the drain on our resources continues and it has been publicly announced that the doctors are billing for the months that are now available on the computer printouts at an astounding rate. Many of them are billing more than $10,000 a month, the average billing for pathologists being in excess of $13,000 a month, the outflow of funds from the OHIP treasury being well in excess of $40 million a month.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is of grave concern to us all, because it is up to us not only to provide quality medical service and to see that the doctors are appropriately and fairly paid, but also to see that the public interest is served. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, that in recent days, the auditor of this province has brought to our attention that $55 million in premiums was lost and, just last December, that because of the ineffectual leadership in the Ministry of Health, an additional $50 million had to be voted to keep the plan afloat—a $105 million discrepancy, rather than the one cancelling the other, as was indicated by the secretary of the Ontario Medical association in his release over the weekend. The $55 million lost by the former Hospital Services Commission had nothing whatsoever to do with the need for an additional $50 million simply to pay the doctors the fees that they demand under that ridiculous fee schedule that we are tied to in our statute for their services.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks in this regard by quoting from a letter from Dr. Kinloch addressed to Premier Davis and dated Dec. 21, 1972.

I quote in part only those parts that I feel are significant to our particular concerns here this afternoon, although the letter, in my opinion, is a public letter. I quote:

I feel constrained to document events from the two years I have spent in the service of the government of Ontario that bear upon hon. Dr. Potter's recent public comments regarding my performance and competence and, by implication, that of colleagues.

In October, 1971, plan officials were directed on short notice to prepare proposals that would achieve savings over estimated expenditures of 15 per cent. The specific proposals arising from the analysis of options were reviewed and accepted by the policy and priorities board and the projected savings incorporated in budget

forecasts. But implementation floundered through belated, time-consuming, and essentially non-productive discussions with the OMA executive, and action on critical elements of the constraint package was suspended by newly appointed Health Minister Potter. Budget overrun thus became inevitable.

The request for additional staff was approved on Nov. 8—

Perhaps I should interject here out of the quote that there are those who have indicated that Dr. Kinloch more or less talked a good game but was not giving the kind of statistical advice that was necessary to the minister or his chief advisers. The papers that he made available show without doubt that there was a freeze imposed on the acquisition of new professional staff and that, in fact, he was not given the staff that was needed in order to supervise, using the computer data, the escalation of these costs.

I quote once more from his letter to the Premier:

The request for additional staff was approved on Nov. 8; the first qualified analyst for the branch was recruited Nov. 20; on Nov. 22 I was informed by Mr. Martin that I was to be relieved of my responsibilities. Mr. Martin indicated that the council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Ontario Medical Association executive had made their "continued co-operation with the ministry" contingent upon my dismissal and that the minister had acceded.

An hon. member: Shame. Shame.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Who runs the government?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I further quote:

Dr. Potter has stated that morale in his ministry is at a low ebb. But unless he is prepared to consider and act upon the possibility that the current malaise is related to his own actions, including public disparagement of his own officials and undue sensitivity to the interests of the professions rather than to those of the public, I suggest that worse is yet to come.

We are not here, Mr. Speaker, to decide upon the worth of Dr. Kinloch, but we are here to consider the charges that he has made, borne out by the additional $50 million voted by this Legislature to maintain the payments to the doctors and the loss of $55 million in premiums under OHSC. These matters are of grave concern to us all. I have suggested and will continue to suggest that the only decent and appropriate way to deal with these charges, particularly the loss of confidence in the ministry by the public related to the $105 million deficits that we have had to deal with, is to refer the matter to the standing committee on human resources so that the members of that committee, with representatives of all parties, can examine into the charges, can call before them Dr. Kinloch, the Ministers of Health who served during that period and the representatives of the OMA and the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Surely this would not set a precedent in this House?

The charges are not those of corruption, but simply the inadequacies of the controls that have been imposed on this particular programme, inadequate though they may be, by the present Minister of Health and his predecessors. There is no nice way to call for the resignation of a minister. There is no nice way to point out publicly that a man who, in a position of criticism to the then policies, has himself failed when he has the responsibility to implement those policies.

In my considered opinion the usefulness of the present Minister of Health is at an end and I believe that the Speech from the Throne should not only have announced his successor, but also a referral of this whole matter to the careful investigation of the standing committee that I have already mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, the whole matter pertaining to the responsibilities of the Ministry of Health does not, unfortunately, end there. I recall, in the present minister's freer days, before he was encumbered by the responsibility of cabinet office, that he called for the elimination of premiums, that we should pay for our medical programmes on our tax bill—an excellent concept. As a matter of fact, his predecessor advocated the same thing at one time.

Mr. Deans: In January and February of that year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a private member Mr. Potter spoke about amalgamating the functions of the Ministry of Health and the then Department of Social and Family Services—an excellent concept that would do away with a great deal of overlapping. He called for the establishment of district and regional health councils—a concept that would be and must be supported on all sides, particularly if, in the minister's words then, these regional

councils and district councils would in fact have some powers to decide the goals and the achievement of goals for the provision of medical services in their own communities.

Yet when the present Minister of Health, the same man who was talking about the regions and the districts, decided to cut back on active treatment beds he didn't consult with either the regions or the districts that were established. He simply did it by authority of his own office and simply did it from the centralized approach without any use of the community involvement that might have been a part of it.

The Minister of Health as a private member called for the use of community health clinics, which is supported on all sides. The very idea that the communities could establish such a health service, hire doctors and pay salaries and have the Ministry of Health meet that cost and escape at least in part from the disastrous fee-for-service basis that is ruining the finances of our plan, was a good one.

Yet in Ottawa itself—and I believe it was instituted by the former Minister of Health, himself a member from Ottawa—a community health centre was established, or at least the planning part was established. Many thousands of dollars were voted to assist in the planning, and it was moving forward, but then the present minister unilaterally cancelled it. There is no doubt in my mind he did so because of the insipid objections of two or three medical practitioners in the area who thought it might be the beginning of some kind of an undercutting of their ability to earn what they consider a living wage, which in those days averaged $30,000 net and these days probably averages $45,000 net.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the minister has shown that he has abandoned the principles we supported when he was a private member and himself very critical of the attitudes and policies of the government.

One other area that I must mention is the programme to establish the training of nurse practitioners who can go out into the field as something between a fully trained medical practitioner and a nurse; in other words, to use their special skills to expand the ability of a medical doctor to serve a community that might otherwise be underserved. I feel that this is an excellent concept. The medical school at McMaster has proceeded with that, and actually has nurse practitioners available to go into the field; and they would have been used in the Ottawa medical centre if it had proceeded.

But once again the minister has drawn back from those policies that he supported in his own day as a critic of the government. And he has not fully utilized, nor even partly utilized, what was a good concept when it was implemented by his predecessors.

It is a shame, I feel, that the present minister has let us all down. We felt that this was a fresh approach and that the good doctor from Belleville was going to move into a position of authority and confidence and make the changes that so many of us could see were obviously necessary if we were going to have a Medicare programme that we could support and finance, as well as new initiatives that would improve the whole situation here.

He has not been able to achieve success in any of those areas. That is why it is with regret, but firmly, we must demand that he be replaced; and the ministry must be shaken up from top to bottom, because I do not feel that the minister or even his predecessors have been well served by the senior officials.

I would also point the finger of criticism at those members of the front bench, almost entirely absent except the previous minister, who have not gone out of their way to support the present minister in the problems he has faced.

The policy minister turns away from him when he needs his help, and the Premier's contribution is simply to say in response to questions from myself that he has full confidence in the minister. That is not sufficient defence when obviously this is an area where the whole cabinet must join forces, enunciate a new and powerful policy which might in fact offend a few medical practitioners, see that it is implemented fairly and evenly so that the doctors will be properly paid, either on a fee-for-service basis or in some other way, for their services, and see that Ontario once again gets into the mainstream of some of the initiatives that have been lacking in this regard.

In closing this section of my remarks, I believe that not only do we need a new Minister of Health, we also need a reference to the standing committee and an examination into what happened to that $105 million specifically. We also need a new Medicare financing policy which will establish a salary basis for those specialists who are presently billing in excess of $10,000 a month and whose services must be made available to the communities across Ontario. I believe we could do this in fairness to the practitioners involved and in fulfilling our responsibilities

to see that we do get value for the hundreds of millions of dollars we are expending.

I further believe that we can continue with the fee-for-service basis for most of the practitioners who choose to stay in that category but that, in order to put some control on the outflow of dollars, we as a Legislature—and with the leadership of the government—approve a lump sum that should be sufficient to cover these services and that that sum be prorated among the doctors who are going to call on the sum for payment for their services. In my opinion, there would be nothing unfair about this. It would be eminently fair.

We could administer it without undue difficulty and in fact it would not undermine the initiatives of the doctors to carry out their duties to the limit of their own desires and to the limit of their own efficiency. There have been those who say, "Let's pay all the doctors $45,000 a year. Surely, they would be satisfied with that?" I am quite sure that there would be some practitioners who with the present fee-for-service basis, could make that much money in three months and spend the rest of the time out of the country, in fact, living on their earnings from a very short period of time.

I suppose that doctors have every right, as have we all, to work as hard or to take it as easy as they choose.

It seems to me that if we had a rational fund that could be set after consultation with any medical group or any other group and approved by the Legislature, we could prorate it in a fair and effective way and finally bring some order out of the chaos that has resulted from the decision taken by John Robarts some years ago that, in fact, Medicare was not a Mechiavellian fraud; that in fact, it was a programme that was essential to the continuation of the development of the social fabric of this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter pertaining to health that I want to bring to your attention. It has to do with the situation in a number of our public hospitals which, in fact, have constituted themselves as closed shops. For the sake of convenience, I refer specifically to the North York General Hospital, a class A teaching hospital, one of the finest hospitals in Ontario.

The board of that hospital has the power to admit specialists to the staff of that hospital or reject them as it sees fit. It takes that decision only on the recommendation of the medical advisory committee of that hospital. I have been told that doctors applying for staff status at that hospital—and I am sure it is the same at many other hospitals—are informed by the medical advisory committee of the success or failure of their application before the board of the hospital even knows what the recommendation in fact is!

It seems to me that under various amendments to the Public Hospitals Act in recent years these medical advisory committees have usurped most of the authority for operating our public hospitals. In this one case the result, as I have already said, has been a closed shop to the benefit of a small number of very competent doctors, particularly specialists, who practice therein.

One case in particular that I want to bring to your attention concerns that of Dr. Jack Sheriton, who for eight years has been put off by the board of North York Hospital in a variety of applications to be given staff and admitting privileges. I consider it completely unconscionable that after that lengthy time, including a government inquiry and an amendment to the Public Hospitals Act, Dr. Sheriton, who is an obstetrician living in North York, has not yet had a hearing to get hospital privileges at the North York General Hospital.

Despite the fact that each obstetrician on the staff of that hospital earns approximately $71,000 annually from hospital work alone, the hospital claims that there's no room for another obstetrician on staff. The hospital medical advisory committee challenged the right of the newly established Ontario Hospital Appeal Board to hear Dr. Sheriton's appeal, which had been scheduled for Feb. 20. Its reason is that section 48 of the Public Hospitals Act limits appeal to physicians who have had privileges, but lost them or had them altered, but does not apply to physicians seeking privileges for the first time. For those reasons the hearing into Dr. Sheriton's case was postponed and I have already submitted an amendment to the Act to set that matter straight, sir, and I hope it will be accepted by the government.

The Act was amended as a result of the report of the Grange committee of inquiry into hospital privileges in Ontario, which recommended that the appeal board hear appeals from the decisions of boards of trustees "of rejected applicants for first appointments."

I would like to point out to you, sir, whether it concerns you or not specifically, that to have a baby delivered by an obstet-

rician at North York General a woman has a choice of only eight specialists named by the hospital. These eight men are thus assured of an almost guaranteed number of patients in the area surrounding the hospital.

Because of their monopoly, their charges for a delivery vary from $225 to $300, well above the OMA fee schedule of $175 for specialist services. It is apparently impossible to have the service of a specialist for the recommended OMA fee and I know, sir, that concerns you as much as it does me.

Not only patients are being penalized for the closed-shop policies of the hospital. Local obstetricians like Dr. Sheriton, whose patients live in the vicinity of the hospital, are being denied the right to earn a living in their own community.

I would like to point out to you, sir, that the same charge applies to anaesthetists in a number of hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto and elsewhere and in that particular case the patient obviously often does not have even the right of choice. The North York Mirror, having done a great deal of research into this matter, recently published an article that indicated that these particular specialists simply do their work on a roster and that none of them accept the OMA charge—that in fact they have their own fee schedule.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is a serious matter that public hospitals are thus restricted in the Province of Ontario, that the OHIP contribution is made at 90 per cent of the OMA schedule, and that every one of the patients in those hospitals is presented with an additional bill up to the level that these doctors think the traffic can bear. I believe that we have stood this long enough and that we must take legislative action if necessary to open up these public hospitals so that people can get the services of specialists without paying some special premium based upon the restricted attitude toward the admission of more specialists.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt at length on the problems that are experienced in the Ministry of Health, and by the minister involved. It used to be regrettable as far as I was concerned to have to specifically attack an individual with such high responsibilities. No one questions the man's motives, but we simply cannot afford to allow the ministry to be subjected to the disability of the kind of leadership that it has had in recent months. I know that the government must make immediate consideration for his replacement.

There is one last matter that I want to bring to your attention, sir, which involves the auditor's report. I think the time will come when we in opposition will be spending a good deal of time in complimenting Mr. Spence on the contents of his last report. I have a feeling that the new auditor, Mr. Groom, had a large part to play in the inclusion of specific paragraphs—I think there were about 80 of them in number—where criticisms of the manner in which public business was conducted by various Crown agencies has come to public attention.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that last year's report had no more than two pages of specific indications of where the government programme had not been adequately ordered in the expenditure of public funds. This year's book contains many specific criticisms where public funds have been spent incorrectly with inadequate authorization, or perhaps with the loss of public funds because the decisions made were not in the best public interest. There is an area, however, not specifically covered in the auditor's report that I want to talk about. It has to do with the high cost of the provision of certain public buildings on what has come to be known as the proposal procedure.

I want to refer specifically to the new head office for Ontario Hydro, which is presently under construction at the corner of University Ave. and College St. I know that my good friend and colleague, the member for St. George, knows, or at least some of her supporters know, about that place, because her charming picture was stapled up around that corner and to great effect. Every morning when I drove past coming in to work it used to cheer me up to see her picture there.

This building is presently under construction. It is going to be well in excess of a $40-million building. The decision was made, apparently with the approval of cabinet, that Ontario Hydro would use that land and would build a new head office in the heart of downtown Toronto. Personally, I believe that that decision was wrong; that we have all sorts of problems of the transportation of the working force into the centre of downtown Toronto and that there were many other sites that could have been utilized for a new headquarters for Hydro. Nevertheless, that is not what I am concerned with specifically. The contract was let on the basis, not of competitive bids, but on the basis of proposals.

There were, as a matter of fact, five companies invited to make proposals. The successful proposal was made by a company called Canada Square Corp. Its chief executive

officer, or at least moving force, is Mr. G. W. Moog, who, I am told, used to be a real estate salesman in Sarnia—is that not so?—and has come a great distance since then and is now one of our more successful entrepreneurs and is known to be a close and personal friend to the Premier himself. I think we should recall that among Mr. Moog's other business activities is a company called Swiss Granada Ltd., which had the contract to build the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education headquarters on Bloor St., also a leaseback corporation. The rent from that particular building is, I believe, $2.1 million a year for 30 years.

An hon. member: With caretaking services.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He also owns something called Transortium Realty, which is the company that got the leaseback contract to build the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, otherwise known as TransAmerica building. I am not just specifically aware what the rental is in that connection. So Mr. Moog through his various companies has built and now rents to the government of Ontario the OISE building, which is probably the most imposing public edifice in Toronto, except for the John Robarts Library, and he now leases to the Ontario government the TransAmerica building and is presently building the $40-million plus new headquarters for Ontario Hydro.

I emphasize to you, sir, that no tenders were called, only proposals. Proposals were requested from five developers for the new Ontario Hydro building and four were received. Canada Square got the contract, apparently because it met the criteria laid down by Ontario Hydro. This list of requirements includes previous experience in lease purchase arrangements, the capability to handle the complexity of the project, minimum other commitments, willingness to retain an outside consultant firm, and ability to maintain a good working relationship between the parties.

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am not quite sure whether Mr. Moog's friendship with the Premier is noted on all applications, but I have no doubt that he has the ability to maintain a good working relationship with at least one side of the party. Incredibly, cost was not a criterion.

If these rather subjective evaluations were to be the criteria then one would expect that the government could do a screening in advance to ensure that all asked to make a proposal met those criteria. Under the tendering process all criteria would be spelled out in advance and all firms who met those criteria could then be judged solely on cost.

I must also point out that Canada Square's previous experience in lease-purchase arrangements includes the OISE building and the educational television building. If this keeps up, only one developer in the whole province will have the experience to deal with the Ontario government.

The agreement signed between Canada Square and Ontario Hydro is an extremely complex leaseback arrangement involving four separate leases. The simplest is the ground lease—and Ontario Hydro, I guess, owns the ground—whereby Ontario Hydro leases land valued at $7 million to Canada Square for 30 years at $1 a year. Of course, it is pointed out that this is taken into account in establishing the rent, but even at that it appears that Mr. Moog has quite a deal.

During the construction period of three years, Canada Square will invest by way of interest on construction loans a total of about $6 million. In return, Canada Square is rewarded by a rental income of $6.1 million every year for 30 years. That is almost $183 million in total income over the term of the lease.

In terms of profit Canada Square will recover its original $6 million investment in less than two years, double its money in less than four years and continue to pile up profits over the 30-year life of the lease. Now, of course, a condition of the lease is that they are going to provide janitor service and paint it at least once during the 30-year period.

I saw a picture of this building in a recent Ontario Hydro News and I don't know where they are going to paint it, because it looks as if it is all made of mirrors; it may be that the people up in this part of the government complex will be able to look down at this shining jewel that has been built for them by Mr. Moog for that lengthy period of time.

I have asked the Premier, using the order paper of the legislature, if Mr. Moog or any of his companies had made any contribution to the Conservative Party, but the Premier was unable to answer. I recall that the Premier was unable to tell me if Mr. Saunderson, president of Fidinam, had been a fund raiser for, or a contributor to, the Conservative Party when I asked that ques-

tion last March, just a year ago. It was six months later that the Fidinam scandal became public.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in my remarks there are the kinds of allegations and innuendoes that the people in government don't like. But, of course, there is no possible way for us to get at the facts unless the Globe and Mail finds a Telex communication somewhere hooking up the Moog enterprises with the Conservative Party fund-raising project. It is impossible for us to know what the connection is.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, when this province is going forward with the establishment of tremendously expensive new buildings — and members are aware that the decision has been announced to make a large new public project on a whole block of land to the east of Bay St.—we simply cannot countenance a further use of this kind of building and financing procedure.

Just as Medicare is heading us toward bankruptcy if we don't do something about bringing it under public control, the same is true of the proposal method for buidling these great edifices of government.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Try a tender once in a while!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is obviously in the best interests of the province and the taxpayers therein that we examine more fully the method of proposal building and find an alternative, based on competitive tenders, which will be in the best interests of the taxpayers.

At the time, the people from Hydro said they couldn't possibly get office space this cheap if they went out in any other way to rent it. Well, I think that is ridiculous. As a matter of fact, I think it is ridiculous that the Ministry of Labour is paying $11 a foot, or something like that, for the use of that beautiful new building farther down University Ave. If we are compelled to pay those high prices we should be building our own buildings or locating them elsewhere. I just don't believe that the public purse can continue to sustain this sort of incompetence in the administration of our public responsibility.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the government is riddled with incompetency. Its fiscal controls are non-existent. Our deficit and the auditor's report confirm that. The planning function is confused, unfair and lacking direction from the top. The formulation of policy has become a fiasco as the so-called policy ministers seem to consider their jobs equivalent to some kind of provincial Senate. The Premier seems to be overcome with his own bland urbanity and finds himself leading a cabinet of no talent while the people of Ontario, the taxpayers, suffer.

The Globe and Mail was entirely right when it said or implied that the front benches needed new talent. The House leader (Mr. Winkler) is looking at me with his upside-down smile. Believe me, there has never been a time in the last 11 years when the administration of this province was so vulnerable to the accusation that it lacks people of top talent planning and administering our affairs. The by-elections are not just localized disaffection with the Conservatives. The results show clearly a deep-seated disillusionment with Conservative policy and the Premier's leadership.

I want to say something more about that because I can remember when the Premier was gloating over the great victory of October, 1971. He said "It wasn't money that did it. It wasn't any of those things that you, in opposition, are talking about. It was just good Conservative hustle." Frankly, I don't like the word but I hope that right now, when he is looking at these by-elections, he will remember that he was hustling. I've already made some references to the pancake parties and all the rest of the involvement that he himself undertook. And still the people rejected him. They rejected the Premier. They rejected his candidates and they rejected the Conservative Party.

I am not here to say they voted for the Liberal Party because of Bob Nixon's leadership. I recognize the outstanding capabilities and qualities of our candidates. But at least the people, the electorate in those constituencies, turned to us, the Liberal Party, as having the viable alternative that Ontario is seeking as it becomes disillusioned with the Conservatives.

It's been 30 long years—it will be exactly 30 years on Aug. 4 this summer—since the Conservatives came to power. There is a famous philosopher in political affairs who has said, "There is a turning in every long road." It seems to me that March 15 was the turning in the political road in Ontario. For 30 years the Conservative Party through its patronage structure, has been establishing its bonds and connections in every community through this province and the people are getting sick of it!

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Like an octopus.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: An interjection here refers to it as an octopus. Well, the tentacles are being cut off one by one. If any of the Conservative members want to resign to make a further test of the disaffection of the people with the Conservative Party, we'll take them on any time, anywhere.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The Liberals are very brave now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, as we look at—

Mr. Singer: We'll start with the hon. minister!

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): The first time the Liberals get the opportunity—

Mr. Singer: Who is the first volunteer? Let's see!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As we look at this political turning—

Mr. Singer: Great noisemakers, that's all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Which one of them is the first?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Why doesn't the member try?

Mr. Bullbrook: We weren't Ministers of Health and wasted all that money. Why should we resign? The Tories are the ones who did that.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): The member should resign.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Tories are the ones who lost the $50 million, under the minister's portfolio, his ministry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: He should resign.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we as the Liberal Party, are prepared to accept the confidence of the people of Ontario as they turn to the Liberals as a reasonable and a rational alternative.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No other way.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We are continuing to work in that connection and, you know, probably the best people working in our favour are those people right over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's been a long afternoon, I'm sure, for us all, and we have just begun the valid criticism of the inadequacies of this administration and putting forward the alternatives which we propose, but for these reasons, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Does the member have another blueprint?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I move, seconded by Mr. Singer, that the following words be added to the motion:

But this House condemns the government:

1. For its failure to bring order and efficiency to the financing of our health insurance programme;

2. For its costly lack of planning in providing hospital and other public facilities at great expense which are now by ministerial decision declared to be redundant;

3. For proceeding with the imposition of high-cost, democratically remote regional governments without pausing for an assessment of the usefulness and cost of the ones already in operation; and,

4. For fiscal extravagance, mismanagement and lack of financial control leading the Treasurer to threaten higher income taxes that would cancel the federal tax reduction initiative so necessary to bolster our economy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: By God, the Leader of the Opposition has got the NDP with him too over there.

Mr. Bullbrook: That will no doubt carry.

Mr. Lewis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:50 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 26, 1973

Solandt commission, statement by Mr. Lawrence ... 161

Public housing rents, statement by Mr. Grossman ... 162

Non-payment of traffic fines, statement by Mr. Bales ... 162

Public housing rents, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon ... 163

Sunday opening of retail stores, questions of Mr. Davis, Mr. Yaremko and Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Renwick ... 164

Kingston Penitentiary riots, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon ... 165

Metro housing shortage, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy ... 165

Integrated community housing project, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis ... 166

Study of payments for medical services, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis ... 167

$55 million error, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis ... 168

Pre-clearance of customs, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Givens ... 169

LCBO markup of wine, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Shulman ... 169

Hospital cutbacks, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Spence ... 170

Layoffs at Ryerson Institute, questions of Mr. Guindon and Mr. McNie: Mr. Drea, Mr. Bullbrook ... 170

Strike of French-speaking students, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Cassidy ... 170

Elizabeth Gardens project, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Burr ... 172

Insurance rates, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Renwick, Mr. Singer ... 172

Complaint about OMB, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Singer ... 173

Integrated community housing project, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Young ... 173

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Reid ... 175

Alberta natural gas, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. MacDonald ... 175

Motion to appoint chairman and deputy chairman of committee of Whole House, Mr. Davis, agreed to ... 176

Motion to appoint select committee re standing committees, Mr. Davis, agreed to ... 176

Motion to appoint standing committees, Mr. Davis, agreed to ... 176

Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Drea, first reading ... 181

Appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the Government of Ontario and its agencies and to define the commissioner's powers and duties, bill to provide for, Mr. Singer, first reading ... 181

Introduction of new members, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis ... 182

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. R. F. Nixon ... 183

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lewis, agreed to ... 206

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to ... 206

No. 7



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors with us today. In the Speaker's gallery we have students from the Niagara College of Applied Arts and Technology of Welland; in the east gallery students from David Maxwell Public School of Windsor and the Bayview Secondary School of Richmond Hill; and in the west gallery students from Our Lady of Perpetual Help School of Toronto.

At 2:30 in the east gallery we'll be favoured with students from Kincardine High School of Kincardine; and at 3:30, in the east gallery also, students from Lansdowne Public School of Sarnia.

We are pleased to have these visitors with us.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the minister responsible for the Ontario Housing Corp. said he was going to make a statement on his responsibility today. Does he want to revert now that his—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): No, I haven't had an opportunity to get it ready. I'll probably have it Thursday. Tomorrow is Wednesday. I shall probably have it Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

QUARTERLY REPORT ON FINANCIAL STATUS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put a question to the Treasurer concerning the first edition of the special quarterly report on the financial status of the province.

Can he explain why the OHIP premiums were $14 million higher than expected? Was the coverage more extensive or is this just a reflection of a change in the premium status?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer of Ontario): I'd like to get a more definitive answer, but my expectation is that this will be within plus or minus one per cent. My expectation is that this is within the range of accurate forecasting. But let me get a more precise answer for the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: If the minister is concerned with a plus or minus of one per cent, then he feels that the $14 million comes within that ambit. Will he, at the same time he is getting that further information, report to the House the results of his studies into the apparent loss of $55 million in premiums through old hospital services, which was brought to our attention by the auditor?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I tried to shout over the member for Downsview yesterday, I think without success, to explain that I had made certain off-the-cuff remarks last week with regard to this $55 million—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The minister was out of order; that's why.

Hon. Mr. White: —which I now have reason to believe were not appropriate. I am comforted by the fact that the Leader of the NDP may have fallen into the same trap.

Yesterday, I commissioned an investigation into this matter—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What a trap!

Hon. Mr. White: —and I hope to make a statement to the House later this week.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary and for clarification: Did the Treasurer say that he hoped to report to the House later this week the results of the investigation into the apparent loss of the $55 million?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Not apparent, it is real.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, "apparent loss" is not the wording. There was a change—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —in the timing of coverage which resulted in a bookkeeping alteration.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A shortfall!

Hon. Mr. White: As I understand at the moment, although I must confess the investigation is not complete, the Provincial Auditor's remarks related only to the authority of the OHSC to do this in the absence of an order in council. But as I say, I will have full information by the end of the week and I will be making a statement to the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Wouldn't the Treasurer consider it a very serious matter that a public servant, even the chairman of the then OHSC, would move toward a policy change that would lose the province $55 million when no one in government had approved it or evidently was even aware of it?

Hon. Mr. White: It doesn't lose anybody $55 million. The question is—

Mr. Lewis: Of course it does. He's the only man who could say that and get away with it.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, thank you!

Mr. Lewis: He tells us it is a loss and then says he has lost nothing.

Hon. Mr. White: I think I will not make further remarks on this subject, except to say that one set of lawyers thinks the OHSC was right and one set of lawyers thinks the Provincial Auditor is right.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Is the provincial Treasurer suggesting that the investigation so far suggests to him that the $55 million shortfall was subsequently recovered?

Hon. Mr. White: This is a complicated technical matter.

Mr. Singer: Oh, it is very technical.

Hon. Mr. White: It hinges around the fact that one of these two health plans was payable one month in advance while the other was payable three months in advance. They had to synchronize the two. My understanding to date is that no money is missing; no money was uncollected with respect to the term of the coverage. But I say, it's a technical matter and I'm getting into deeper waters than I would wish. I would like to make a statement to the House by the end of the week.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question: Why would as sophisticated a person as the Provincial Auditor misrepresent the situation when it's only a bookkeeping entry or a change?

Mr. Lewis: He didn't understand the synchronization of the dates.

Mr. Singer: I'll buy that!

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I don't think he'd ever once again. Would the members mind waiting for a day or two until I have the statement ready?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

STATUS OF HEALTH OFFICIAL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Health the status of Dr. N. H. McNally, director of emergency health services division. Is he employed by the ministry or has his position been vacated?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): As far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in his present status.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the minister can explain why the Ontario Ambulance Operators' Association is writing to a number of people, myself included, protesting the fact that he has been removed from his responsibility? If the minister is not aware of this I wonder if he would look into it and give us a report at an early date?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't had any correspondence with the ambulance association, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not aware of any changes at the present time.

Mr. Lewis: The minister's department very seldom makes him aware.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another question—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a supplementary.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Is it not correct that Dr. McNally has been having some problems in getting along with a number of the ambulance operators and this might be a reason to move him to another less sensitive post?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, there is no—I'm very leery of making any statements in the House any more, Mr. Speaker, concerning—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Does the minister imply when he says he is leery of making statements that in fact there is some information pertaining to the employment of Dr. McNally that he could give the House if he chose to?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware there is no intention and never has been any intention of dispensing with Dr. McNally's services.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Does the minister mean dispensing with Dr. McNally's services in his present post?

Hon. Mr. Potter: In the reorganization of the ministry, Mr. Speaker, we now have—

Mr. Lewis: Oh come on now! Sort of the Kinloch shift, they call it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —we now have consulting services and health delivery services. Under the old programme Dr. McNally had a dual responsibility and under the new programme he will have one responsibility.

Mr. Singer: What is that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, quite frankly I think he is much more qualified to be a consultant in the delivery area—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —but whether or not he agrees with this of course—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary question: Is the minister now saying to the House that he is aware—and in fact was aware when I asked him the original question—that the present director of the emergency health services division has been assigned new responsibilities?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, he has not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, is it the minister's intention that he be assigned new responsibilities? Or would the minister simply like him to be reassigned?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, at the present time it is a question of filling the vacancies in the ministry as they come up. Both of these—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Well, we can think of one—

Mr. Reid: How about starting with the the ministers?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Both of these positions will be filled, Mr. Speaker, and I anticipate that Dr. McNally will fill one of them.

Mr. Cassidy: Why not start at the top?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that the minister's answer has every indication of being a misleading one—

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —but we shall see what the information is as it develops.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

OTTAWA HEALTH CENTRE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Minister of Health. Can he explain to the House why he decided to cancel the programming and planning that would have established a community health centre in the city of Ottawa—in Nepean township, I believe?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, it would take too much of the question period to answer that at the present time. I'll make a statement in the House at a later time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the minister make it clear in his statement as to whether or not it was because of the objections of a few medical practitioners in the area who felt that their position might be undermined if this policy that the minister had previously supported was carried forward?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I most definitely will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Well, the hon. minister has indicated he will make a statement; there has been one supplementary for clarification. There will be no more supplementaries.

ONTARIO HYDRO HEAD OFFICE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Can he explain to the House the role that he or any member of the cabinet played in the decision of Ontario Hydro to accept the tender put forward by the Canada Square Corp. in the building of their new headquarters just down the block?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, no role whatsoever.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the Premier assure us then that he was not aware that this decision was being made at the time that Ontario Hydro announced it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I was aware that Hydro was in the process of solving its problems with respect to head office accommodation. There is no need under the legislation, or as a matter of policy, for it to come before cabinet or myself. Neither the cabinet nor myself were involved in the decision process whatsoever.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary—and there are a number that come to mind: Can the Premier further assure us that he discussed this matter with no individual outside the government before the decision was taken? And can he further assure us that Mr. Moog, who is the chief executive officer of that company and others that have done extensive work with the administration and for various ministries, was not at any time a contributor nor a fund-raiser for the Progressive Conservative Party?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to get into a discussion of who contributed to this party or to the party of the Leader of the Opposition. We have enunciated a policy—

An. hon. member: We don't mind!

Mr. Reid: We don't hand out million-dollar contracts!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the member's federal colleagues do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Cassidy: It is a relevant question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention at all of getting into a discussion of who contributed or who did not contribute to the Conservative Party.

Mr. Lewis: Of course not!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That was the purpose of the new policy; to close the door on the past.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the Premier then indicate to the House that he does not feel that the utilization of that block of land, valued at $7 million, admittedly owned by Ontario Hydro but responsible to this House through the cabinet, was an object at least for consideration on a policy basis by the Premier or one of his policy ministers, or the minister reporting for Hydro?

Mr. Lewis: Not at all!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The transportation problems alone should have concerned the Premier, who is well known as a person concerned with these matters.

Mr. Lewis: They are putting that office complex in—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, we are quite concerned with transportation problems—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier is not showing it!

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that if there is a man in the House less concerned than himself about transportation, it would only be the hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) or the hon. member for Downsview, I guess; and their concern is of a different nature.

I would say, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: I'm glad he has brought money away.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If one could only trust all of his friends!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the policy for Ontario

Hydro to go ahead with the head office, this was really determined, I think, some three or four years ago, perhaps five years ago. The determination not to move ahead was related then to a relatively healthy economy. The chairman of Hydro and members of the commission have had this under advisement for several years. The government knew that Ontario Hydro was going to develop a building on that site. The question of who was to do it and the terms of it were matters entirely within the purview of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Why, then, was it not put out to tender? Why was the operative part of the proposal that those submitting proposals must at least have had experience with government business previously; which Mr. Moog obviously had, having built the OISE building, which the Premier was so concerned with when he was Minister of Education, and the educational television authority building?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well to be really specific about it, the ETV authority building is not in the same technical or legal situation as either Hydro or the institute, it is a straight lease. The institute is a lease-purchase whereby the public becomes the owner for $1 at the end of a stated period, the same way as with Hydro.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: After he collects $180 million!

Mr. Lewis: After a quarter billion dollars for both.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, when I have an opportunity to reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I will point out: (a) that his own mathematics, as calculated on that great graph of his, were factually incorrect. And of course he also missed two or three rather relevant points, which will indicate that once again his mathematics was many, many millions of dollars in error.

Mr. Reid: What's a million?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say many millions of dollars, and apparently to the Leader of the Opposition they are relatively insignificant. All I can say is his calculations are all wet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are all wet.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary Mr. Speaker: I am providing the Premier with the opportunity I know he wants to exert. Since he has now apparently examined the nature of the contract entered into by Ontario Hydro in the building of the head office, can he explain to the House where the calculations presented yesterday were incorrect? And as an additional supplementary: Is he satisfied about the contractual arrangement that was entered into by Ontario Hydro, given his present assessment of it?

Mr. Speaker: We have had seven supplementaries, which will be sufficient.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to comment on the actual contract, and I am sure some of the members opposite have studied it in some detail, it is a very complex legal problem and I cannot comment in any meaningful way on that aspect of it. I shall, in my reply on the Throne Speech, and in relation to the mathematics, be prepared to point out rather conclusively the rather large errors in the mathematical assessments made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The Premier doesn't have the answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I shall.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Surely seven supplementaries are reasonable.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Surely seven supplementaries are reasonable. The hon. member is out of order.

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? The hon. member for Scarborough West is next.

TAX CREDIT FOR MACHINERY

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the provincial Treasurer. Can he tell me how much he anticipates the manufacturing sector will use of the investment tax credit on machinery and equipment provided by this government in the fiscal year which is about to end?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I was given a figure a month or so ago. I think it was

$80 million. I would like to double check that, but I think it was $80 million. I would like to double check that and inform the House later in the week.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the additonal income received from the corporate revenue, of which the Treasurer spoke just prior to the by-elections, is explained in considerable part, is it not, by the money the manufacturing sector did not use from the investment tax credit.

Hon. Mr. White: I am sorry, I cannot be exact about these figures, but it seems to me that when the plan was announced by the Treasurer of the day a couple of years ago, we expected the cost over two years to be about $200 million.

Mr. Lewis: $250 million!

Hon. Mr. White: And it seems to me that a month or so ago I was given an estimate for that 24-month period of something like $80 million; but I would like to refresh my memory and give the exact figures to the House.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: In the first year they used $36 million of it, which was an error of $90-odd million in the Treasurer's estimate; and given his figure, this year they will have used about $44 million of it, an error of another $90 million in the provincial Treasurer's estimate. Can he tell us, then, how many jobs were created by this tax credit system which was the single greatest incentive to the economy introduced by his distinguished predecessor.

Hon. Mr. White: There's no question that it's hard to push on a string. When one uses fiscal policy it's easy to pull and hard to push.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: No doubt the Treasurer had high hopes for that particular stimulant which were satisfied only in part. How many jobs did we create? I think 150,000 last year.

Mr. Lewis: No, by the programme.

Hon. Mr. White: I think we've got a seasonally adjusted unemployment figure of 4.1 per cent, compared to 6.5 or thereabouts for Canada. I suspect if our numbers were omitted from Canada, we'd be looking at seven or eight or nine per cent for the balance of the country—18 per cent unemployment in Newfoundland. We must be doing something right.

Mr. Lewis: Not the industrial tax credit! That was $80 million to corporate profits, not the creation of jobs.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Because the tax figures are not that bad it doesn't mean the government is doing it right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN TO ARBITRATION PANEL

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Labour: When is he going to appoint women to the arbitration panel to be chosen by this government, as chairmen of the various arbitration disputes which come before the minister?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend probably knows, we had one woman on our list of arbitrators who has now been honoured by becoming a member of this Legislature, and we have no other women on our list. However, I would certainly welcome submission of names from all members to see if we can have some of them appointed to our list.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary—

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—I have two or three supplementaries—as I understand it correctly there are over 40 people on the arbitration panel and the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) is the sole woman on that panel. Can the minister explain to me how it is conceivable that in the Province of Ontario until now he has not been able to appoint an equivalent number of women to that area; and—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: —further, can the minister explain to me why in the arbitration of hospital disputes in this province—the majority of the employees affected are women—he has so far appointed 23 men as chairmen? When is he going to change the discriminatory policies of his own department?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Gee!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I have a very easy answer. For one thing there was only one application from a woman—

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean, application?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: One woman who came forward to be appointed.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): What did the minister do, advertise in the Globe and Mail?

Mr. Cassidy: Does the minister appoint men by application?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: And she wasn't qualified.

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean by application?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Oh, be quiet. Why doesn't the member have women as candidates?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I have already told my friends opposite if they want to give us some names we'll look at them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member is supposed to be sex blind, not colour blind.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: Perhaps the minister will comment tomorrow on the dozen names which I submitted to him by way of letter today. Perhaps he can shake up his ministry in this regard.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Today!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I trust that the Minister of Labour's comments do not mean for a moment that the new member for St. George is suddenly disqualified for some reason from continuing on that panel of arbitrators?

Mr. Lewis: Well, surely not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There probably would be a conflict of interest.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: If she is, Mr. Speaker, it's not because of the minister, that's for sure.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Is the hon. member for St. George now disqualified? Is there a conflict?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Pardon?

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I didn't hear the question.

Mr. Lewis: Is there a conflict, in fact, in law? Is the hon. member for St. George disqualified from sitting on the arbitration panel?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check on this. I think the hon. member is no longer a member of the board. I'm not sure. I will have to check.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: We do trust that the minister is wrong and if the minister is in doubt about this I hope that he will get advice on it. We'd be pleased to proffer some.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): She was probably fired the day she got the Liberal nomination.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

An hon. member: No more questions!

SUPPORT FOR PHYSIOTHERAPY INTERNS

Mr. Lewis: Just one, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health. Has he decided on the additional support to physiotherapy interns that they have been requesting?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member knew there was a gallery.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I have been quoted before as saying I'm very sympathetic to their cause, and I hope within a very few days I will be in a position to make a statement to the House on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions? If not—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary. The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Health says that there is to be a statement in a few days, having promised a statement to these students in mid-February, does he bear in mind the fact that they must make their decision as to summer employment within five weeks?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

With regard to the price increase in milk that is to take place next week, what conceivable justification is there for the distributors taking a larger cut of this two-cent price increase—

Mr. Reid: It was our turn to ask a question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: —than they took of the price increase—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. member for York South, I am sure, will oblige me if he defers, because the hon. members from the Liberal Party are complaining that I called the member out of turn. I will assure him that I will call him next, if he doesn't mind.

Mr. Reid: He is usually out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: I was almost going to insist in holding the floor now, Mr. Speaker, in view of that rather cheeky interjection there.

Mr. Speaker: I asked the hon. member for York South if he would mind deferring.

Mr. MacDonald: Since you have asked me, I will do it.

Mr. Speaker: I must admit that I did not first call properly on the Liberal Party for its first question. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville is first.

LICENSING INCOME TAX CONSULTANTS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

In light of the explosion in the numbers of individuals and concerns now involved in filing of income tax returns, and as a result of the wide variation in the filing of these returns as illustrated by the recent article in the Toronto Globe and Mail, does the minister plan on protecting the public against such practices either by licensing control or some other method, that is protecting the public by licensing and control of income tax consultants?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Even the government makes those mistakes.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the article referred to by my friend from Windsor-Walkerville. No, I have had no requests that such controls be imposed. I have not in truthfulness considered it. I read that article with interest and I wasn't aware of the problems that existed until I did, in fact, read it the other day.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Roy: After reading this article, Mr. Speaker, has the minister consulted at all the combine section of the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs? Does the minister not feel that there might well be an infringement of the misleading advertisement provisions of this section; and has he consulted with the federal government about the laying of charges on the advertisements of these companies?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I presume with reference to those particular types of ads that the federal authorities have had them brought forcibly to their attention. I have not personally brought those to the federal minister's attention. I did meet with my counterpart in Ottawa in January, along with the consumer minister from Quebec. Among the things discussed was misleading advertising, which I might add causes great concern to my counterpart in Quebec over the TV.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South; and I want to thank him very sincerely for the courtesy extended.

An hon. member: He is so gracious.

MILK PRICE INCREASE

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. With regard to next week's price increase in milk, what conceivable justification is there for the distributors taking a larger cut of this price increase, namely one-third of the two cents, than they took of the January price increase, when they took only a quarter; particularly, if I may add, when this price increase is to compensate the farmers for having been shortchanged in January?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): It is all going into increased labour costs.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, my friend has made certain allegations about the farmers being shortchanged. That's a matter of debate and opinion.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister doesn't think they were?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: With regard to the price increase, there is no price control in the Province of Ontario on consumer goods that I am aware of. This is a matter for the processors, to set their price at the retail outlets. The price of milk, as I am sure my friend knows, varies considerably between home deliveries and between store purchases in various types of stores. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the 50-cents-per-hundred increase that's coming April 1 to producers for class one milk means about 1⅓ cents to the farmer. I am not sure what the processors are intending to sell milk at—

Mr. MacDonald: Generally two-thirds of a cent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I have heard that figure mentioned. I have also heard that some of them are simply passing it on as a straight increase of 1⅓ cents. I have heard also that some of them may be adjusting it on the three-quart plastic jug container pack —the three individual quarts—up to four cents or five cents. Three times 1⅓ cents is four cents, but I am not sure what the retail price will be. I have heard some say that it will be five cents, so it's not really determined as far as I know.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker; I have one or two supplementary questions. The minister is correct in stating there is no control at the consumer level. In view of the discussions in Ottawa, does he not feel there is a role for this government to get into the picture and protect the consumer from the extra gouging on the part of the distributor?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I think it is singularly noticeable that my hon. friend is always talking about the person who is in the middle-man role—and I am not defending him particularly. But there is never a reference made by that group, nor was it made to the food inquiry committee at Ottawa by the CLC, with regard to salary increases for those people who are involved.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the minister answer my question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I'll deal with that some time. He is always talking about gouging.

Mr. MacDonald: What's the answer to my question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Always talking about gouging. Now who is doing the gouging? It is a matter of some concern.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister a question. Since the distributors are taking one-third of the price increase this time when they only took one-quarter of it in January, what justification is there for that extra gouging; and does the minister think this government has some obligation to stop it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, for many years we have not been in the field of milk pricing at the consumer level. We were in it a great many years ago, and because of the very great difficulties that were encountered at that time, the Milk Industry Board, I understood,—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The government controls the price of booze; why not milk?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —recommended that we pull back out of it and get out of it entirely. Frankly, I think that's the place for us to stay, because the free competition within the industry itself does, in my opinion, act as a very effective control.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Oh, nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now with regard to what my friend has suggested about the last price increase, which was effective Jan. 1 and was based on 35 cents per hundred; there was, I believe, a greater than one-quarter increase taken by some processors. If memory serves me right, and I don't have all the figures here, to say that it was a strict quarter at that time and there will be one-third more now, I think begs the point a bit. I don't think it is quite accurate.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is just trying to confuse the issue.

Mr. Lewis: Sure he is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not trying to confuse the issue. I am simply saying that different processors took a different markup. Now are we to suggest that everyone should take the same markup? I don't think that's what my hon. friend wants.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a final supplementary question. Would the minister explain to me what conceivable justification or rationale there is for the milk commission

this time accepting an increase when it refused it in January?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I will. Yes, I welcome the opportunity to do that.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: For the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, that the milk commission was honouring the milk formula pricing structure that has been evolved over a great many years.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the minister suggesting the OMMB had breached it?

Mr. Yakabuski: Quiet. Let him answer it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now just let me answer the question if I may, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend thinks he knows everything and he knows very little, obviously.

Mr. MacDonald: I perhaps know more about this than the minister does at this point.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the member always thinks he knows things that everybody else doesn't.

An hon. member: And most of the time he's right.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the Milk Marketing Board came forward with the presentation. At the time it calculated the increase requested, it was based on the price of all of the factors that go into the formula pricing structure. These figures were established on a price basis from Jan. 1, 1972, to Sept. 1, 1972, before the major increases had taken place in feed prices, and particularly high protein feeds, that took place after that. Based on the figures that were available to the milk commission in the formula pricing structure they made their decision that it be 35 cents a hundred instead of the 56 to 57 cents.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not what the Milk Marketing Board says, and they happen to be involved in the thing.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is very true, but the chairman of the Milk Marketing Board admitted to the chairman of the milk commission that the decision they made covered the formula pricing structure at that time.

As a result of concern that I had and that I'm sure every other person in the Legislature who was knowledgeable about the costs facing the producer had, I made a statement at the time of the annual convention of the Milk Marketing Board in early January. We suggested that while the formula had worked well in the past, there was one problem that we felt was a criticism of the formula and that was that it did not reflect accurately enough the changing price structures of those factors that make up the formula—that is there was too long a lag.

I wanted it brought up to date so it would be kept more current, because the increases in prices for feed products and for other costs, hydro and so on, they had gone into the farmers' cost of production. I felt they should be given greater consideration and suggested that the milk board might explore the possibilities of coming back, based on more current figures, with another presentation to the milk commission. That is what has been done and the milk commission, in its wisdom, has approved the application.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition with a supplementary.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a laboured and elaborate answer. We will deal with it later.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can we now expect the commission and the Milk Marketing Board to work more closely in any changes of milk prices, that obviously will be forthcoming if the price is going to be tied as closely as the minister describes to the cost of the input, such as hydro?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I'm quite sure of that, Mr. Speaker. We've had conversations with both groups. There is an honest effort being made by them, and I believe the processors and distributors as well, to improve the formula to make it more accurately reflect current pricing structures.

But I think we have to recognize that there is some lead time required, because the time the figures are compiled until they are properly reviewed and put into a presentation to the milk commission does represent some time lag. With the incredibly fast-escalating costs that have characterized the dairy industry this winter particularly, it would be difficult to keep it right up to date. Fortunately some of those feed prices are coming down more in line. I have every hope that they will come back to a more reasonable level shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. David.

RYERSON RADIO STATION

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Can the minister inform the House if it is true that the licence for the Ryerson radio station CJRT will be up for review by the CRTC next year and that it is unlikely that this licence will be renewed, and further, that it appears probable that a French-language station will obtain the right?

Mr. Roy: The member should ask that in the federal Parliament.

An hon. member: She would have, had things gone well.

Mr. Lewis: How can he predict the—

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, answering the first part of that question: It is up for review next year; there is no determination yet as to whether it will be renewed or not. We are looking at it very closely as a government, not only as a ministry, because we have some very considerable interest in the whole question of educational broadcasting and this is only part of a study that is being done right now.

With regard to the second part of the question: No, we've no information with respect its being considered even tentatively as a French broadcasting station.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister implying in his statement that if the radio station cannot continue with the regular grants through his ministry, then some other ministry, like Education, or perhaps some other source might channel funds in there to keep it operating simply as an educational television broadcasting unit, responsible to some minister?

Mr. Singer: Or authority?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't implying anything particularly. I was saying that the government is studying the matter and it shares the concerns that the member opposite and members of the public have with sustaining the radio station if it fits into our overall policy with regard to broadcasting.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the actual educational content of that radio station is very nominal; it is only about 8½ hours out of 133 hours of broadcasting. There are other considerations, obviously, that make it of interest to our ministry—the cultural aspect of it.

We are looking at its very seriously, and I think I can assure the hon. members of the House that we are not going to see the station abandoned lightly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre with a supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the minister subsided, saying, "We will not see it abandoned lightly". I wish he hadn't said that. I would have been quite satisfied—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member ask a question?

Mr. Cassidy: Will the minister assure the House that it is the government's intention to keep the non-commercial service of CJRT in operation, either through Ryerson or through some other means?

Mr. Bullbrook: He has just answered that he would not.

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I find that I have to choose my words very carefully.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): The minister should tell us how far he has cut back.

Mr. Speaker: There are four minutes remaining in the question period.

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. members that the matter is going to be given very serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue has the answer to a question previously asked.

Mr. Reid: That's a switch.

Mr. Sargent: Give us the answer to something.

ELIZABETH GARDENS PROJECT

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Stall them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's their time.

Mr. MacDonald: Go ahead; don't be so easily stopped.

Interjections by hon members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm always a gentleman to the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville

—yesterday, I believe it was—respecting complaints from occupants of the Elizabeth Gardens condominium project in Windsor. Ontario Housing Corp., I should advise, as second mortgagee, has the responsibility for inspections relating to the release of mortgage funds. In addition to the inspection of foundations, plumbing, electrical installations, framing, roofing and insulation carried out by the municipality, Ontario Housing Corp. has been carrying out regular inspections of these units as construction proceeded.

I am advised that during that time a number of deficiencies, as normally found in a project of this kind, were noted. The developer has been informed of these deficiencies and is in the process of correcting them. As a matter of fact, OHC had an inspector on the site last week and I am also informed that two more senior inspectors are on the site today to check on the progress of this work.

OHC is holding back $345,000 in mortgage funds, and will continue to hold them back until the deficiencies are corrected to the satisfaction of OHC.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask of the minister if it is his intention to have an inspector on site up until the completion of the whole project?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I couldn't answer that off the top of my head, although I would imagine it would be very costly for OHC to have inspectors permanently on very project until they were finished.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: However, if there appears to be a necessity for it, of course we will do it. At this moment I couldn't give a commitment to the hon. member in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: There are three minutes left and there is another minister who has an answer to a question. We will take one supplementary.

Mr. Bounsall: Since the problem with Elizabeth Gardens has been imputed to relate partially to the design, did OHC play any part in approving the type of design for this condominium housing in Elizabeth Gardens?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has given an opinion as to the design of the project, and I am not familiar with that. I'll go into that matter for the hon. member and get him an answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Colleges and Universities has the answer to a question previously asked.

TESTING OF MEDICAL STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the hon. member for High Park, who asked the following question the other day:

> Can the minister explain why applicants to the University of Western Ontario medical school are told they must first apply to a US corporation headquartered in New York to take a psychological test to see if they are fit to become Canadian doctors?

First of all, there is a test employed by all English-speaking medical schools in Canada called the MCAT—the Medical College Admissions Test. It isn't a psychological test. As I understand it, it is essentially an objective measure of academic achievement that has proved to have a high degree of success in predictability in academic areas, and I think all of us will agree it is only one of the criteria for measuring what makes a good doctor.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Why go to the States?

Hon. Mr. McNie: According to Dr. Shute, the chairman of the Council of the Faculties of Medicine:

> The weight given by the selection committees in Ontario schools to the MCAT is small, probably less than five per cent. The test, however, identifies the calibre of students applying to various schools throughout America. All medical schools in Canada are jointly accredited by the Association of Canadian Medical Colleges and the Association of American Medical Colleges.

This is the important thing, Mr. Speaker: He went on to say:

> This permits our students access to postgraduate training facilities in the United States without examination.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Henderson, from the select committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the standing committees of the House, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the lists of standing committees ordered by the House be composed as follows:

1. PROCEDURAL AFFAIRS: Messrs. Burr, Cassidy, Dymond, Deans, Eaton, Edighoffer, Ewen, Henderson, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Johnston, Meen, Sargent, Scrivener (Mrs.), Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Spence, Timbrell, Turner, Walker—18.

2. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: Messrs. Carruthers, Davison, Downer, Givens, Havrot, Irvine, Lane, Lawlor, MacBeth, McKeough, McNeil, Nixon (Dovercourt), Renwick, Rhodes, Roy, Ruston, Singer, Taylor, Wardle—19.

3. SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: Messrs. Beckett, Belanger, Bullbrook, Campbell (Mrs.), Drea, Dukszta, Foulds, Gisborn, Hamilton, Handleman, Leluk, McIlveen, Morningstar, Morrow, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Parrott, Root, Smith (Nipissing), Smith (Simcoe East)—19.

4. RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT: Messrs. Allan, Evans, Gaunt, Gilbertson, Good, Haggerty, Jessiman, Laughren, MacDonald, Maeck, Miller, Newman (Ontario South), Nuttall, Reid, Rollins, Stokes, Villeneuve, Wiseman, Yakabuski—19.

5. ESTIMATES: Messrs. Beckett, Braithwaite, Deans, Drea, Eaton, Hamilton, Jessiman, Leluk, Martel, Nixon (Dovercourt), Nuttall, Parrott, Riddell, Scrivener (Mrs.), Stokes, Walker, Wardle, Worton—18.

6. PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Messrs. Allan, Breithaupt, Cassidy, Deacon, Dymond, Germa, Lane, MacBeth, McIlveen, Taylor, Timbrell, Wiseman—12.

7. REGULATIONS: Messrs. Belanger, Bounsall, Handleman, Havrot, Johnston, Maeck, Morrow, Paterson, Reilly, Riddell, Turner, Young—12.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

MOTION FOR INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. Mr. White moves, seconded by Hon. Mr. Welch, that the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay, and the Provincial Auditor be authorized to approve, the payment of the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments, pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1973, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could rise on a question of privilege for just one moment. It's been brought to my attention that we have a group of visitors in the gallery, a study group from Japan, and they are members of International Rotary visiting the chamber this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: If I might speak to the point of privilege, the hon. members of this House are aware of the fact that the Speaker's gallery is reserved for important visiting persons —not that these people are not—but the important visiting persons are usually parliamentarians. I might further advise the House that the visitors are my guests and that I received a previous indication that I overlooked introducing them. I did not so overlook introducing them. They are not parliamentarians.

Mr. Reid: The House leader is wrong again.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the motion put forward authorizes the Treasurer to spend, I would suppose, $7 billion, a tremendous sum of money, which means that through this motion the auditor can approve the expenditure of the sums that will eventually be discussed item by item and approved by the Legislature. Obviously there is no way that we are going to stand and obstruct such a motion, but it occurs to me there are a number of practices associated with this motion that the Treasurer and probably the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet ought to take under consideration.

The first, surely, is that interim supply should become more meaningful in this House than it has been, and as it is in many other Parliaments and Legislatures; that in fact we should only be asked to vote supply to carry the government through a month, or at the most three months of the fiscal year so that we are not giving carte blanche to the government to proceed with the total expenditure of the billions of dollars which eventually will be authorized by this House.

The second thing has to do with the authority of the cabinet itself to approve expenditures that are not approved by this House, nor in fact reported to them for final approval. I refer to the Management Board payments that have been mentioned by the

Provincial Auditor in his most recent report. The auditor, as you know, indicated that half the costs of Ontario Place, as far as its construction was concerned, were met by these special authorizations from the Management Board.

I would simply say to you, sir, that we should not be asked to continue, year after year, with a procedure that I know everybody in the House finds so compelling, that in fact by the passage of this resolution we give carte blanche to the government to spend probably $6 billion to $7 billion. It simply means that for the rest of the session in the consideration of our work we become rubber stamps. They should obviously, in my opinion, bring forward interim supply only, and also announce to the House that they are going to bring—

An hon. member: Right! Right!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —under some reasonable control the practice that has been growing inordinately of approving certain expenditures through Management Board orders only.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, if I may just reply very briefly—

Mr. Speaker: We have a motion before the House and I think if there are any other members who wish to speak it might be well to have them all speak.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the only comment I would like to make, without getting into an extended debate on this, is I don't know how we're going to avoid the anomaly—and that's putting it mildly—of this kind of blank-cheque arrangement to the government when we have a sessional schedule beginning so late that we don't get a budget until we're into the new fiscal year.

I go back to the comments of the Premier yesterday or the day before with regard to what he envisages as the appropriate and the ideal pattern. It would seem to me that the ideal pattern would at least be to have the budget down before the new fiscal year begins. If we're going to delay as long as we've done for the last year or two in terms of getting the session going, we're getting almost as confused in our handling of the situation as the Liberals have been for years when they were lucky if they got the estimates passed by the end of the fiscal year in which the expenditures had been made.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, at least they had interim supply.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have one comment to make. There are the obvious anomalies that have been drawn to the attention of the Treasurer, but I would like some assurance from the minister that it is the intention of the government to complete supply before the House rises for—whatever one wants to call it—the summer recess or whatever the other name is, and that we will not be dealing with supply at the end of this year when we should be completing supply as rapidly and efficiently as possible before the House rises for the summer adjournment.

I would also like the minister to comment about whether he sees any resolution to this kind of anomaly in his proposal that we should move to a calendar year for the fiscal year of the government rather than continue with this rather old fashioned fiscal year ending on March 31.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few words on this, I think this whole procedure is circumventing the responsibilities of the members of this Legislature. We arrived at the present system of responsible government through a long historical process in which the king, before he could receive the approval of his lords, had to listen to their grievances. The government is coming here year after year to ask us to vote interim supply with little explanation of what it has done in the interim between the sittings of the Legislature.

Perhaps the Treasurer or some of the members opposite who are on the select committee on the rules of the Legislature, might recall that the committee suggested that at the beginning of each session the Premier would rise in his place and give an accounting of the business of the government in the time between the last sitting and the present sitting of the Legislature.

My leader has referred to the matter of Ontario Place and the millions of dollars that were voted without any direct application to the Legislature to give approval for these public moneys to be spent; nor has there been any justification from the Premier or the cabinet benches for the amounts of money that were spent under Treasury Board orders.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this practice is circumventing the Legislature as a whole, denigrating our responsibilities and is directly inimicable to the whole legislative process. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, am not prepared to continue with this practice of voting interim supply without some kind of justification or defence or explanation from the government side in regard to these funds to

which I am asked to give approval when I have been given no reason to approve such funds.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would like to—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't mind.

Mr. Speaker: I think it might be as well to let everyone speak and the hon. minister may reply. We'll not cut them off.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'm not going to wind up now.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, my point is with regard to the public accounts standing committee. I would like to bring this to the attention of the House leader or the Treasurer in view of the fact that, progressively, the public is focusing on public accounts.

I feel, watching last year's performance of that very important committee, a great job was done by my two colleagues from this party on that committee. One of them is the chairman and one is a member so we only have one vote on that committee. In giving them tribute, I also pay a great tribute to the former Treasurer of Ontario, the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) for the fair-minded approach he took on this committee. Mr. Speaker, to me, having only one member of the Liberal Party as a voting member on this very important committee is not representative nor right nor fair.

I would like to ask the Treasurer or the House leader if they will rethink the fact and that there should be more representation on this committee than the 12 members who have been appointed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion has to do with the voting of supply.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words before the Treasurer answers the questions that have been put forward.

I think it is very safe to say that this year the situation has arisen primarily because of the reorganization of government which will become apparent as we present the estimates to the House. It is not, in the future, the intention of the government to have to go through the procedure we are going through today; and we are doing it, as I say, simply because of the new method we will use in the presentation of estimates. In answering the question from the member for Grey-Bruce—

Mr. Bullbrook: What the minister is saying is completely wrong.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Pardon?

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is completely wrong.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the minister mean that this is a new procedure?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No.

Mr. Bullbrook: They do it every year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the minister mean that we won't have to do it again?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, no.

Mr. Reid: What's it got to do with government reorganization?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, it's just that I cannot give the members the rest of the plan today. I don't think the Treasurer is in a position to tell them, unless he wants to. That's his prerogative.

But we will change the routine this year to reflect the change in the organization of government. And if the members will possess—

Mr. Reid: This is the last time the government votes supply?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And if they'll possess their souls in patience for a few days, they'll find out.

Mr. Reid: Is this the last time the government votes supply?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And in regard to the question posed by the member for Grey-Bruce—

Mr. Speaker: Who was out of order.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —I may have sympathy for his point of view, but I think he'll find that it is a formula that has been developed by the members of the committee; and certainly under the rules of the House we can have a look at it.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sarnia suggested that we always vote supply. The difference is that we usually have the estimates in front of us. We haven't got the estimates in front of us this year because, unlike Ottawa, we have attempted to embrace the expenditure side as well as the revenue side in presenting our budget statement every year. And the reason the budget statement isn't available before the end of March, as indeed is our custom—

Mr. Reid: March 15.

Hon. Mr. White: —is because the Treasurer assumed this responsibility Jan. 15 and wanted another short while to come to grips with certain fundamental considerations.

So this is the sequence which leads to the expression of dissatisfaction we hear from the members of the opposition. I quite understand this, but this is the background to it. Certainly I would expect to bring in a budget before the end of March next year. This is an unusual year because of the change in ministerial responsibilities.

Funnily enough, I got a Teletype just a short while ago, just a few minutes ago, which says that Newfoundland Finance Minister John Crosbie says he will introduce his provincial budget in the Legislature on Friday. The last time a budget was introduced before the end of the fiscal year, March 31, was in 1968, and certainly it is true in many Legislatures that the budget does not come in before the end of the year.

As the Chairman of Management Board has touched upon, we will—

Mr. MacDonald: Newfoundland doesn't give us a pattern for duplication.

Mr. Drea: Tory government.

Hon. Mr. White: We will be presenting the estimates this year in several separate booklets relating to the new policy field committees.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is going to simplify things just like the telephone book.

Mr. Reid: Simple to the minister.

Hon. Mr. White: We think this will make the estimates more intelligible to the members of the Legislature, and equally important, more comprehensible to members of the public who have an interest in the area of resource development, or social development, or justice and so on. The Chairman of Management Board will be providing full details on that some time within the next couple of weeks.

The possibility of changing to a calendar year which the Premier has mentioned and which was drawn to our attention by the member for York—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: South!

Hon. Mr. White: —York South, is something that is very interesting to me personally. I mentioned the prospect to the members of the municipal liaison committee last Friday and their initial response was that to bring our fiscal year into synchronization with the 882 municipalities is the best thing we could do.

This possibility will be dealt with at greater length in the budget, with certain of the technical advantages and disadvantages being enunciated. Following public comment from those affected, a decision will be made.

I rather think that having a fiscal year which was coincident with the calendar year would fit better into a more balanced legislative session, with perhaps half of the workload in the fall and half of the workload in the late winter and spring. We believe it would fit in better with our own internal budget-making process and the rather sophisticated techniques we have developed in the last year or two for scrutinizing expenditures microcosmically and macrocosmically. So I think that deals with the various matters—

Mr. Singer: Oh, is that how they do it? Microcosmically and macrocosmically?

Hon. Mr. White: —which have been broached here in this short debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: As long as it's cosmic.

Mr. Singer: Yes, that certainly solves that. There will be no questions from here on in.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Downsview is right.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that commencing tomorrow, and until further ordered, this House will not sit in the chamber on Wednesdays, such Wednesdays being reserved for

meetings of the standing and select committees.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is to facilitate the cabinet, that is all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, surely it would be reasonable and acceptable on all sides if the House leader would recognize the fact that the committees are not yet organized and that if they choose to organize tomorrow, which I presume is possible but has not been announced, there will be little or no work for them to do and many people have come a great distance to be in Toronto for the session which began very late indeed. Why don't we work tomorrow?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, further to the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I dread the thought of trying to make up those three hours immediately prior to the budget being introduced. I don't really relish the idea that we might be sitting at 3 or perhaps even 6 in the morning in an effort to make up the time. We don't have really enough time between now and budget date to complete the Throne Speech debate. I think there is a sufficient number of members who have indicated a willingness and a desire to speak in the Throne Speech debate that we should try to make available as much time as is humanly possible.

To my knowledge there is only one committee that is meeting tomorrow, and it is meeting at 10 in the morning. There is no reason why other committees can't meet in the morning or prior to 2 o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of establishing themselves and choosing a chairman. I think that we should make better use of that time, even if it were only to deal with second readings of some other legislation the government has brought in; we could make better use of those hours than to have the afternoon free to sit in the sun or the rain or whatever happens to be outside.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Legislature progressively sits less than any other Legislature in Canada. Further, to bring members here from all parts of Ontario and to say that there is a day in the middle of the week when we don't work because there is only one committee, I agree with the member for Sarnia that it is simply to facilitate the cabinet. I think we should get back down to business, get the business finished and get out of here.

Mr. Bullbrook: So that we formally record this, I say to the government House leader, through the Speaker, that nobody is fooled by this. He recognizes that the organization of those standing committees tomorrow is burdened with about 10 minutes' onus; that's all.

Mr. Singer: To confirm what the cabinet has already decided!

Mr. Bullbrook: That's all they'd have to do tomorrow.

The point that the hon. member for Wentworth makes is a completely valid one. Hearken back, if you will, to last November and December, when night after night we were on our own, not sitting in this Legislature, and then at the 11th hour we found ourselves, in one circumstance of trauma, sitting from 2 o'clock in the afternoon until 10 o'clock the next morning.

The fact of the matter is that we have come long distances to do the business of our constituents. But we want to do it while this House in in session. We understand quite fully—although I shouldn't say quite fully, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Withdraw the motion!

Mr. Bullbrook: —the impossibility sometime of reconciling the meetings of standing committees, especially during the time of the estimates, with the sitting of this House. But there's no answer. I invite a reasonable response now saying that there is business to be done by us tomorrow—public business, not direct constituency business that warrants that this Legislature should sit.

Mr. Lewis: Withdraw the motion.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement. The member for Wentworth said that there was only one committee sitting—

Mr. Lewis: Then why doesn't the—

Mr. McIlveen: —at 10 o'clock. Our committee on the utilization of educational facilities is sitting tomorrow afternoon at 1 o'clock.

Mr. Martel: Well sit in the morning then.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect that is a committee which in fact probably shouldn't have planned to sit on a Wednesday, which is reserved for standing committees—

Mr. Stokes: Or presume to dictate to the House.

Mr. Lewis: —or to pretend that the House should abide by the whims of a select committee; although at least two very distinguished members sit on it.

But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the House leader should simply withdraw the motion and reintroduce it again when we have productive work a week from tomorrow. We are wasting another day. Surely that's not necessary.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, in consideration of what has been said, I want to say that I recognize the time required here to budget for people making a contribution to the Throne Speech debate. I have asked for the list of names of people who wish to make contributions. I'm prepared to adjust the business of the House accordingly. We will start sitting nights next week. And I think as a matter of courtesy I will withdraw the motion and reintroduce it next week. And we will sit tomorrow afternoon—

Mr. Bullbrook: Very good!

Mr. Lewis: Okay.

Mr. Deans: Excellent!

Mr. Singer: Now we'll see what the next—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —but not subsequent Wednesdays.

Mr. Speaker: The motion then is withdrawn.

Mr. Lewis: That is greater flexibility than was shown in the last two years.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed that the motion be withdrawn?

Agreed.

Introduction of bills.

ONTARIO BUREAU OF STATISTICS ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ontario Bureau of Statistics Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, this bill repeals the present Statistics Act and establishes the Ontario Bureau of Statistics with a view to promoting a provincial social census at five-year intervals and with a view to broadening the data collecting process.

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Charitable Institutions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): The main purpose of this bill is to amend the Act to make provisions in it consistent with those in the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a pleasant announcement to make, as I usually do each year about this time. We have maple sugar that the pageboys are now going to distribute to every member of the Legislature and the clerks as well, and the Hansard girls and so on. Mr. Speaker, this is with the compliments of the Algoma maple syrup producers.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, as I rise, the House leader (Mr. Winkler) asks me sotto voce across the floor, "How long, Stephen, how long?"

An hon. member: Oh Lord, how long?

Mr. Lewis: Oh Lord, how long? Right. That's what he said. I may say that I have no idea, sir. But my preamble should take me to the adjournment hour and I'll get into the serious matter tomorrow.

I'm going to break the pattern of Throne debate speeches in this House: This is going to be a political speech, Mr. Speaker; not jovial, endearing or generous. Well, as a matter of fact, I'll amend that—it will begin by being generous. I'm sorry that not all the Treasury benchers are here. In a while I will have little vignettes to express of their unfailing character, but maybe they'll wander in.

In one respect I want to be generous, if that's the word, and say to the Leader of

the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon), or have his colleagues say to him in his absence, that particularly as he drew his remarks to a close yesterday, in the final part of the address which dealt with health care and builder proposals, I thought he was dead on and splendid. It was a very worthy contribution to the Throne debate.

I may say that I start in a mood as ebullient as he began with; an equally excellent frame of mind. We too draw extreme comfort from the by-election results, rather more comfort than the party opposite. Well, some of the members may think I'm reaching—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Reaching! He is straining.

An hon. member: I think he's retching.

Mr. Lewis: —but the fact of the matter is that those seats were profoundly difficult for us, we didn't kid ourselves. I think the outcome demonstrates a scenario in Ontario which is absolutely clear and now predetermined. I would think that 1975 will be purely a ritual exercise: the Liberals are likely to win most of the seats in which they came second in 1971; we will win all of the seats in which we came second in 1971: ipso facto, there will be no Tories left in the Legislature.

Thereafter we will vacillate between the forces of progressive and enlightened socialism and the reaction which is so well exemplified by the Liberal Party. As a matter of fact, the Liberal Party continues philosophically to be rooted in pre-Keynesian days, so variable in its responses as to be without equal. Mr. Speaker, the most significant thing about the Liberal wins in Huron and St. George is that they will now have 22 positions on every issue.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The NDP was left with seven on the elevator issue.

Mr. Lewis: I disagree partially with the leader of the Liberal Party about the talentlessness of the government. I think they are fairly able by and large—the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) will be relieved to know that—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): As he peeks through his fingers.

Mr. Lewis: I think that's the first nice thing I've said in 10 years to the Solicitor General and I will amend it as quickly as possible. Actually they are pretty able—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): I'll try hard to keep the member that way.

Mr. Lewis: I knew it. They lack coherence or discipline or cohesion. They have no esprit de corps, that's pretty obvious; as a matter of fact they have no corps, to be spirited. They are at times bumbling, addicted to error occasionally, ineffectual in many ways—surprisingsly so, for a government of such time.

You know, Mr. Speaker, as with you, sir, I have a fondness for children's books and for children's illustrators and for fantasies. On the—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Is this a policy statement?

Mr. Lewis: This is a policy statement.

On the walls of my office I have a favorite illustrator of children's books. His name is Maurice Sendak. One little section of the pictures is called "Where the Wild Things Are." It is a fantasy because the characters portrayed have luminous eyes, horns, tails, teeth that are filed—a little reminiscent of the House leader, although not an exact depiction—they all start off all right on every conquest, do these wild things, and then they collapse in disarray.

What has happened to the government, in the same way, is that the COGP revision of the cabinet I think has probably ruined the cabinet and every member of the cabinet now has serious difficulties. I love them all. I don't want to be unkind or uncharitable. I just want to choose a representative sample of some of them to suggest the difficulties which they are experiencing and why the weaknesses continue to flow. Then I want to get down to matters that are right at the core of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, as for the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter)—he was in here a moment ago and I hope he returns, because a large part of my remarks will be devoted to him.

Was there ever so beleaguered a man as the Minister of Health? Was there ever so botched a ministry? The Legislature thought that we had let loose a cat amongst the chickens and, like some Orwellian Animal Farm, the chickens devoured the cat. The Minister of Health is in profound turmoil.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) is not here. Well, he is not so namby-pamby now as he used to be. He has more strut to his jaw, you will notice, but so do I. He is impeccably dressed. He is usually in the front row, his eyes darting almost uncontrollably as if drawn by magnets to seat No. 7. His aides are telling him that that is the destiny of all Ministers of Education; but he is in

trouble. His tough and arbitrary application of the ceilings is winning opposition throughout Ontario. Some day he will speak out about cutbacks in the education bureaucracy; but as long as this Minister of Education continues to apply the ceilings that he presently exercises his road will be strewn with thorns.

Mr. Speaker, beside the Minister of Education is the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, Bob Welch.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): We never see him.

Mr. Lewis: "Bob whom?" they now say. "Where?" they now say. 'What does he do?" they now say.

Whatever happened to the little giant of a man whose rhetoric rolled like the doyen of Prince Albert? Where is he in this Legislature? When he speaks, he speaks only of grapes. That's all, just of grapes—which, I admit, are a matter of considerable interest to him personally but not exactly within his purview of Social Development. He has withdrawn. He is unavailable. Dare I say it? It is said of the Social Development minister that he is indolent. In the corridors of his ministry they talk of the grapes of sloth.

I would like to speak, Mr. Speaker, for a moment of the provincial Treasurer (Mr. White)—an elegant, regal aristocrat he, preening with self-confidence. Look at him in question period. It is just a pleasure. He never suffers fools gladly. As a matter of fact, he never suffers anyone gladly. He has a fertile, imaginative mind; an acid, inflammatory tongue; a querulous, provocative temperament. I would predict that before the tenure of the provincial Treasurer is over, someone on the opposition side, probably the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), will invoke the Nova Scotia precedent to settle the debating point.

The provincial Treasurer is probably the only man in this House artful enough to say that the $55 million wasn't a loss; it just wasn't collected—and that will be further dealt with. He will be a splendid Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, but he will cause this government whole weeks of remorse.

Then there is the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence). I am sorry he isn't here—I am sorry they are not all here.

One begins to feel left out in the Throne Speech reply. It wasn't my place to say anything—maybe you know, Mr. Speaker, that as leader of the third party in the House, one can't be afforded any particular repute—but I'll tell you, sir, when the Leader of the Opposition in this House speaks in the Throne debate, those benches should be filled out of respect and interest. As a matter of fact, they should be far more filled—and the Speaker nods in agreement—when any member of the opposition is participating in this debate.

However, the Provincial Secretary of Resources Development is again a mystery, a sort of dismembered talent in the Legislature, relegated to leading the Group of Seven around the province, drawing on his vast experience in the taking of trips. Even the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier (Mr. McKeough) removed energy resources from his purview. To this provincial secretary one is inclined to say: "Forget your private anguish of Cuba. Let it stop haunting you. Every politician has that experience once in his life. It is over. You are a respected politician. Come into your own again."

I have no idea whether he will accept the advice or can.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), who was just here, demonstrated today with his acerbic responses to the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) why we have a new reverence for his capacities as a man whose agricultural policies managed to disaffect almost all the farmers of Huron county.

To the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) one can only see a truly startling metamorphosis from what went before. He is turning environmental preservation so far back in time that his entire ministry moves counterclockwise.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr). I want the Solicitor General to tell him that he's a man of pathos. There is real poignancy in the social policy minister for Justice. There is the stuff of which Eugene O'Neill would have written if he had lived in Burlington! Oh for the olden days when the minister crunched his fist into his desktop and determined to lay low the corporate polluters! Now he is himself a slightly more corpulent shadow of his former self. He's had a series of degrading demotions, sapping his spirit and effectiveness. The greatest injustice to the member I suppose is that he is now the Provincial Secretary for Justice. One is reminded of F. Scott Fitgerald's quote in "The Great Gatsby" that by the age of 48 he had "achieved such a limited excellence that everything after savoured of anti-climax." Not exactly an epitaph perhaps, but good reading for the Premier (Mr. Davis) some day.

Then there is the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Bales). I want to tell you something about the Attorney General. Never was the Attorney General more transformed, more enthused, more excited and more voluble than on the night of March 15 when Margaret Campbell won St. George. On that night the Attorney General breathed the greatest sigh of relief that he's breathed in a long time. Having arranged rather effectively for the defeat of Roy McMurtry and the maintenance of his post, he then went on to pretend to establish himself further in the ministry. I may say about the Attorney General that the public is still not secure that his department means business or speaks with authority in many of its undertakings.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the pièce de résistance of the cabinet, the Solicitor General.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier). A well-intentioned bear of a man. Here is a minister destined to become the centre of controversy as no other. He heads a ministry so totally in the grip of the resource industries that it's difficult to extract one ounce of the public interest. Single-handledly this minister may provide all of northern Ontario for the opposition in the next provincial election and we welcome his compassion.

Who dares exclude the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) from any litany of luminaries? The Minister of Revenue once described himself as the father of citizen participation. Some of us thought he was the father of Larry Grossman and gave him no further credit to other claims. He is surrounded by trouble daily, sinking into the quicksand of his own argument and still he hurls defiance into the teeth of the mob. Later this week we will hear another orgy of self-congratulation by this minister of apologia. He'll find more infidels to blame for the absence of housing than there are houses.

He's like the little tailor striking seven at one blow. You have to admire him. But all the admiration in the world doesn't compensate for the failure of one housing policy after another during his tenure in the ministry, and while the programmes roll on the waiting list grows.

So there is an amiable dozen, and collectively they are enough to bring the government down. But they have at their head the Premier. They stand like the old pre-French Revolution aristocracy and they are headed by a man who could appropriately be characterized as Louis XIV.

I have to be extremely careful, Mr. Speaker. Once when I was criticizing the Education estimates, when the Premier was Minister of Education, I used the analogy of Louis XIV and I said that he was followed by a retinue of sycophants. In Hansard it came out as "a retinue of psychopaths." I was profoundly embarrassed. I have since learned the distinction and I appreciate its validity although there is sometimes confusion.

The Premier has lost contact with mortal man. He has become too political, a most remarkable transformation from the days of John Robarts when one said otherwise. The barefoot sharpshooters of Bay St., as they are called affectionately, have surrounded him and he has surrendered ultimate judgement to a group of political professionals isolated from the cabinet, isolated from his party, isolated from the Legislature, infatuated by power and their own sense of mortal rightness. The problem is that group around—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): The member has got to be kidding.

Mr. Lewis: Now, now! The member made his most incisive contribution of the session before the orders of the day. Don't let him spoil it now.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is the old philosopher-king business, and even the newspapers are now picking it up with that rather painful cartoon in the Globe and Mail the other day about fiddling while Rome burned. The Premier is in difficulty, in very great difficulty, because he has so drastically isolated himself from the people of the province and from those who are best equipped to give him advice. The old regime is cracking. They know it over there, those countless hordes—sure they know it. They know it. They feel it in their bones.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Never more confident.

Mr. Lewis: The member laughs nervously.

Mr. Drea: Me?

Mr. Lewis: The interjections from the hon. member for Scarborough Centre are even more incoherent than usual, if that is possible, Mr. Speaker. A little too much heckling. A little too boisterous; stopping me in the hall, Mr. Speaker, grabbing my forearm and begging for reassurance. I won't give it to them, because I believe that the—

Mr. Drea: Not me.

Mr. Lewis: Not the member for Scarborough Centre. Not him. Good Lord, no.

Mr. Drea: Good. Let's have that clear.

Mr. Lewis: In that sense, Mr. Speaker, the by-elections were critical and there is no need to pretend or dissemble about them, neither for us nor the government.

Never before in 30 years did two Tory seats fall simultaneously. It was a singular achievement for the Premier. It speaks of a deep malaise, inarticulate in public, hard to pick up from time to time, but there. It was much more than a traditional slap on the wrist and every member of the Tory party knows it and is anxious about it and is apprehensive about the future.

Now, they probably want me—I know if they had the opportunity they would ask me—to outline the reasons for the underlying discontent in Huron and in St. George and in the province now as we see it. They would want me to deal indirectly with the Throne Speech and I will deal only indirectly with it, Mr. Speaker, because it is really indigestible prattle. I would much prefer to deal with the issues which are alive and current in the province today. Some of this may be old ground and some of it may be new. At the end I want to raise a matter which seems to me to strike right to the heart of the Tory regime, and why it is gradually deteriorating in power and influence in the province.

First, Mr. Speaker—I did not believe it before but I believe it now—the conflicts of interest cut deep in the electorate. I was very sceptical about that but I had a feeling, as one knocked on doors and sounded public opinion and tried to understand what was happening, that the conflicts of interest have gone deep for the government. I have to admit that the opposition did rather less than at least one of the newspapers. You see, the government must say to itself "It wasn't just John Zaritsky who was after our hides." He is out in Leningrad or Paris, or somewhere of that kind.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is he attacking the government there?

Mr. Lewis: He is exhorting the masses to revolt. It is really a sort of secret society of whom the sole members are Richard Doyle and Clark Davey who have joined to sink the Conservative ship; they have not done badly and they continue to do reasonably well and, uncharacteristically, I salute them for it. It is the last salute I'll provide.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the Fidinam affair cut deep, it seems to me. What is more the deep public suspicion continues. One of the problems is that there have been no subsequent disclosures. The Premier's performance in the question period this afternoon will not do him credit. It is another chink in the armour. It is another feeling, vague in the electorate, that there is much to hide and that they refuse to speak openly. What the Leader of the Opposition revealed at the end of his speech yesterday about the Ontario Hydro building, and about the associated interests in OISE and the Educational Television Authority cannot but develop the sense, publicly, that there is something profoundly wrong in the corporate relationships in the Conservative Party. And the refusal of the Premier to discuss political disclosure of financial support when he already moves in that direction reinforces that suspicion. That suspicion is reinforced on every front.

Mr. Speaker, some little time ago, Warren Gerard of the Toronto Star wrote about the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough): "The Quiet Comeback of a Cabinet Star." He talked about his new powers and authority in the field of energy resources and he talked about what a heavy day the member was having and how, in the afternoon, and I'm now quoting: ". . . he had a private meeting with Davis and executives of Imperial Oil Ltd. It was a long meeting and attending was Bill Kelly—"

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Shameful!

Mr. Lewis: "—a behind-the-scenes influence in the Davis government and the chief bag man for the Ontario Conservative Party."

Mr. Speaker, you will forgive my language when I ask what the hell was William Kelly doing at a meeting of Imperial Oil and the Premier and the assistant on energy to discuss energy policies? He wasn't pouring drinks, I'll let you know.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Answer that!

Mr. Lewis: And one would like to know how the government expects to dispel the suspicion about the involvement of the Tory Party and the financiers in the corporate community if it engages in that kind of thing.

Do you remember the Premier before the Tory convention when he said: "I want the processes of politics and government in Ontario to be open and above cynicism, suspicion or reproach." Well, he doesn't achieve it by inviting his chief bag man to

high level meetings on energy policy with Imperial Oil.

Again to my surprise — because I was skeptical, a little cynical myself, Mr. Speaker —I have to concede that the Fidinam affair cut deep, that it is probably a permanent wound and unless the Tories are willing to talk in advance of their legislation in itself about those who support them, the legislation in itself will not be sufficient to rescue public admiration.

The third area I want to discuss, Mr. Speaker, is one to which the member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon) alluded yesterday and that is the question of regional government. I myself knocked on many a door in Huron county—with apparently not quite the influence of success one would have wished—but regional government for this government has become a very serious Achilles heel.

It is conceptually valid, and in principle those of us who supported regional government did it because it made sense to amalgamate a vast number of municipalities into more efficient units. But, in the process we went all wrong in the implementation and the people in Huron, and now all over the province, demonstrate their apprehensiveness on what regional government portends.

The word filters through, Mr. Speaker, into every area of Ontario. I'm surprised, as a travelling politician who does occasional open-line shows, does occasional interviews, who does occasional press conferences in remoter parts of the province, to be beset by questions about regional government.

I am surprised to be asked questions about why St. Catharines wanted to secede, to be asked questions about the cost of the police force in the Niagara region subsequent to the introduction of regional government. I am surprised to be asked about costs in Muskoka and York and the bills subsequently to defray those costs, to be asked about what has happened in Ottawa-Carleton.

The only study that has emerged, and a kind of quiet study, called "The Investigation of Financial Impact of the Introduction and First Year's Operation for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton" says, as its main conclusion: "Changes in the rates of taxation in particular municipalities were much higher than was anticipated at the time the legislation was introduced."

Word filters through about regional government west of Metro and about the abdication of the Steele report and the use of crude political muscle to satisfy the needs of the member for Burlington (Mr. Kerr) and the member for Halton (Mr. Snow), who sits now in the House as Minister of Government Services and, above all, the Premier himself. They drew the boundaries of regional government west of Metropolitan Toronto with a profound contempt for the economic and social realities of that region. In the area east of Metro, Mr. Speaker, there has been enough clamour that it has penetrated even to the north.

I remember quite vividly a public meeting at Port Hope High School when a number of members of the NDP caucus and myself attended to discuss with citizens questions of regional government. I have never experienced, as a politician, such a range of feeling and passion and sensitivity as came from that meeting that day of more than 100 people, at any given time in the room, presenting briefs and making observations.

I had not realized for a moment the depth of feeling that was involved. And the Tories are so insensitive to what they are doing about regional government in those parts of the province that they even publish it openly.

Mr. Speaker, there was recently printed in the March 8 issue of the Port Hope Guide a quite amazing series of questions and answers about regional government. The answers being given by the parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer, the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Irvine).

And I want to read you some of the questions and some of the answers because I don't know of anything more illuminating of government policy than what is reproduced here.

Question from the people in the area: "Why was there no consultation in this area prior to the announcement of this specific proposal?"

Answer from the member for Grenville-Dundas: "The province felt and still believes that discussions are bound to be more productive if they focus on a specific proposal."

There is a man who takes the bit in his teeth. He says, "to the devil with discussion with you in advance." He'll make a specific proposal and that will be the basis of the argument.

"We therefore made," said the member, "the proposal to the whole area at once and after a week or two began an extremely intense round of meetings with local representatives. We are now involved in an equally intensive set of follow-up meetings and public discussions."

"Is it possible," questioners asked, "for citizens or citizens' groups to talk directly to cabinet members?"

Answer: "Within reason it is quite possible. For the purposes of this proposal probably more can be accomplished if you speak with your MPP."

Well, can you imagine speaking to the MPP from Durham about regional government for Port Hope-Cobourg?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: "And if you can't speak to your MPPs first, and the minister is not available, they will arrange that you meet one of his parliamentary assistants."

Mr. Worton: That is what you call passing the buck.

Mr. Lewis: How the hierarchy grows.

And then the question: "We are told that anything we say will have little effect; then why do you ask for submissions, letters and briefs?"

Answer: "Again, I do not know who told you that anything you say will have little effect. When good, sound and rational arguments are represented, the government will make changes."

Well, I'd like to know where the government has made changes and where they will make changes. The only change in terms of regional government east of Metropolitan Toronto is in the extension of deadlines for briefs until the end of March—and that is the sole change that has been made.

And then the question: "Why is it not possible to follow this sequence: planning, government restructure, and development?"

And the parliamentary assistant answers in part: "If local government is reformed so that the resource space of a large region is made available to every constituent municipality, the need to compete so madly for assessment is greatly reduced and the incentive to develop a rational land use plan is greater."

I would suggest that the process should go: general provincial planning, local government restructuring, local government planning, co-operative implementation of the two levels of plans.

Last question: "Why doesn't the government come out with its overall plan for the province, the all-area, all-region concept?"

Answer: "We are now beginning to develop such a plan. It will not be ready for discussion for at least two years. But the areas of high priority for reorganization have now had reorganization and we can now try to get away from the piecemeal approach."

Well, you know Mr. Speaker, in those questions and answers the entire Tory philosophy is exposed. And Mr. Speaker, it means that regional government has been profoundly mutilated in this province. I know if you could, sir, you would agree with me—but you're not wont to intervene in an obstreperous fashion.

The government has hanged itself on its own strangled logic. It's a kind of political self-immolation. Many people have written feelingly about regional government and strongly about regional government. And the people in Port Hope-Cobourg, and the people in Streetsville, and the people in Dundas, and the people in Wentworth county generally feel that there is a sort of calculated duplicity in process.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you how the New Democratic Party feels. We supported the principle of regional government, and we still do, and we are not interested in trading off moratoria in return for certain views on regional government. But we are no longer prepared to support regional government in this province until four essential conditions are fulfilled in every case:

First, that the government makes known its overall intentions without, may I say, however, harshly, the dishonesty that was inherent in what was said during the Huron by-election; second, that there is appropriate and adequate consultation in advance with the people who are affected; third, and most important in a very real sense, that fiscal reform accompanies the introduction of regional government in every case; and, fourth, that there is a guarantee of subsequent evaluation written into the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, those are the only conditions on which we will in the future be willing to support regional government in this province, because regional government is serving to disaffect vast numbers of people, to make them cynical and abject about the political process and to develop a kind of hostility in the hinterland of Ontario, which is not appropriate in the field of politics. I will have more to say about that in a short time.

Next Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about the question of health. This is a difficult field, as it were. No words are strong enough, Mr. Speaker. The Health Ministry is what can be described as a disaster area. Every day rings down the curtain on yet another wretched scene played in this seemingly endless drama.

I shall try to be as little repetitive as possible, but I think certain points have to be made.

First, Dr. Kinloch's charges and the documents which accompanied them, all of which were in the hands of the minister and the Premier, have never once been refuted by this government.

An hon. member: They can't be.

Mr. Lewis: Not once, and that is extraordinary. I cannot remember in my political experience in this Legislature a cri de coeur of the kind that came from Dr. Kinloch, an attack on a minister and on the government that was so unsparing, a rapier-like dissection of the ministry, with all kinds of charges and documents produced, and not a single defence coming from the government.

It is inconceivable that the Minister of Health didn't stand before the orders of the day and say what he would say. It is inconceivable that the Premier doesn't consider this serious enough—or perhaps he does quietly to himself—to stand in the House and respond to the charges that were made by Dr. Kinloch.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the reason there has been no response is that Dr. Kinloch's charges are irrefutable. OHIP is a shambles and the $50-million constraint package was flushed down the drain by irresponsible neglect and obstinacy.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kinloch's suggestions should go on the record because they are fascinating. I hope the House will bear with me. Perhaps my sense of fascination and theirs differ. But amongst the documents which Dr. Kinloch submitted, or circulated, to the Leader of the Opposition and myself was something that I never dreamed to get hold of, and that was the actual accounting of how the savings would be made.

We talk in broad terms about a $50-million constraint package; we talk in broad terms about 15 or 20 per cent cuts. But what Dr. Kinloch did in his submission to the policy and priorities board was to make an actual number of specific suggestions with percentages tied to them, which suggestions were in large measure accepted by that committee of cabinet. What Dr. Kinloch did in the summary of his conclusions at the end of 1971, is that he said:

> It will be seen that it is quite impossible for OHSIP to effect a 15 per cent saving over present costs without either a radical switch away from fee-for-service for at least half the doctors, or introduction of deterrent fees or deductibles, or a considerable reduction in the percentage of the fee schedule paid by OHSIP, or very strict and rigid limitations of payments to basic necessary medical care.

It was largely the latter, the strict and rigid limitation of payment to basic necessary medical care, that was submitted and that was approved. I want to put it on the record, Mr. Speaker, because as I stand here on behalf of this party, when the constraint package is introduced these will be its components.

First, Dr. Kinloch suggested the implementation of computer rules, strict adherence to fee schedules and OHSIP'S interpretation thereof by all agencies. The accurate estimate was not possible, he said, but it would be in the range of a saving of three to five per cent of present costs. It was approved by the policy and priorities board.

Second, he suggested strict unilateral enforcement by medical adjudicators of the clause permitting payment for medical necessity only, which refers to individual extra visits, unnecessary full assessments, bogus consultations, etc. The estimated potential savings—if every doctor was paid for one fewer routine visit a day—would be $17 million a year, that is, four per cent of the cost. Again, it was approved by the policy and priorities board.

Third, he suggested greatly stepped-up production of profiles, detection of overutilization, and the imposition of formula payments on high-cost doctors. The savings—if five per cent of the doctors were put on a formula payment of 60 per cent of schedule instead of 90 per cent—would be $5 million a year, that is, 1.5 per cent. Again, it was approved by the policy and priorities board.

Further, Dr. Kinloch went on to suggest replacing existing fee-for-service benefits for immunizations, outpatient laboratory services, well baby and certain psychiatric services, and to establish any new services—such as dental—with public programmes budgeted through the Ministry of Health. The savings, he said, would be considerable, perhaps one per cent of total cost. Again, it was approved by cabinet.

Fifth was the limitation of certain investigation and treatment services to those based upon standards for care developed jointly with appropriate professional groups. Sizeable savings, he said, could be 2.5 per cent of the total cost.

Then there are the last two suggestions which he ultimately made about salaries or sessional payments where work volume is steady, that is, chronic care, emergency rooms, community clinics, health centres, pathology services, etc. He says, under savings:

> In the 10 or 12 places where these new projects are in effect, there is always a saving over fee-for-services payments, generally about 15 per cent, plus administrative savings applied to all facilities; they might save one per cent of the total cost.

Finally, with budget payments for laboratory and radiology departments in hospitals, for both inpatients' and outpatients' services, savings would be considerable and could be as high as 30 per cent of lab costs—two per cent of total cost. All of that together came to the 15 per cent saving which Dr. Kinloch had been requested to arrive at.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that all of those approaches save one, and it's not consequential, were approved by cabinet. This key committee of cabinet went on to make further recommendations itself to bring the level to 15 per cent.

Can I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, what one of the things Dr. Kinloch did—and, again, it's the first time I have ever seen it; we discussed it in causus as a matter of some fascination—is that he discussed salary in a broader sense. He suggested, as a possible approach, salary or partial salary for all doctors or specialists only or for hospital work only. He pointed out that the advantages show predetermined costs; an average net income can be determined; and it would be publicly defensible to administer.

He pointed out that the disadvantages would likely be an outcry from the medical profession. He gave an estimate: An average gross of $45,000 to the 8,000 active doctors would cost $360 million, a saving of about 25 per cent plus administrative savings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that to those of us in the New Democratic Party a gross income of $45,000 on the average for doctors in this province is a perfectly acceptable income. And we think they can handle it quite comfortably. It would undoubtedly be a reduced income for a number of medical practitioners, but in terms of the public imperative it seems to us a proposal which the government should seriously have considered.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to get to that in a little while. In his memo to Dr. Charron, the deputy minister, dated Dec. 22, 1971, Dr. Kinloch said, and I quote:

> As we prepare for implementation of a constraint package aimed at ensuring more appropriate and economical use of provincial health insurance programmes, we should keep in mind the combination of factors which produced the current level and rate of increase of expenditures. The most important of these are:
>
> (1) Lack of planning forced by the precipitate decision to enter Medicare and the consequent compromise administration.
>
> (2) An operations orientation which placed primary, almost exclusive emphasis upon prompt payment of submitted claims.
>
> (3) Acceptance of the OMA fee schedule without adequate safeguards, and inability or unwillingness to elaborate upon, modify or define items in that schedule.
>
> (4) Inadequate communication with both public and profession regarding the aims, limitations, policies and procedures of the plan.
>
> (5) Political meddling with the organization administration and benefit structure of the plan.
>
> (6) Failure to recognize that hospital and medical care programmes must be integrated.

May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that what in effect Dr. Kinloch is saying—and what we in the New Democratic Party have said for a number of years since the implementation of this plan—is that these kinds of savings should have occurred at the outset. And that these reasons enumerated by Dr. Kinloch imperilled the entire plan and have brought us to this sorry pass.

We learned almost by accident, because of a supplementary estimate, of the question of doctors' incomes and the additional $50 million. And we learned from Dr. Kinloch of the 15 per cent constraint package.

Mr. Speaker, if that 15 per cent had been applied to the total expenditure in this field since Oct. 1, 1969, when it should have been applied—a total expenditure of $1,508 million—we would have saved $233,741,000 in the interim. And that money, Mr. Speaker—not the $50 million but the nearly quarter of a billion dollars—is what this government has squandered through maladministration of the plan since Oct. 1, 1969; and one need make no mistake about it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to get the full sense of that, if you apply that kind

of figure to the 1972-1973 estimates we could have covered the cost of the Ministry of the Attorney General, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, the Ministry of Labour, the total for the office of the Lieutenant Governor to the office of the Provincial Auditor, and an entire dental care plan for everyone in this province between the ages of two and 12. And as the final exemplary capping feature, all the indemnities for every member of this esteemed Legislature.

Let me take it a step further, Mr. Speaker.

Well, the number of Tories to whom I speak affects one little—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the Solicitor General were to leave, the Tories would be all gone.

Mr. Lewis: I know that at least the cabinet is awesomely represented.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take it further. The refusal to accept Dr. Kinloch's suggestions and the implications for the entire plan cannot be lightly dealt with by this Legislature. But the third area to which I make reference is the unfolding of the administrative bungling. The $55 million which was referred to in the Provincial Auditor's report, which is not a matter of "synchronization", or whatever word it was the provincial Treasurer used—that man has an infinite capacity for Fowler's English Usage—but $55 million was not collected. The only—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to bring to your attention, sir, that there is only one member of the government of Ontario present in the Legislature at this time—

Mr. Bullbrook: Arrogance. Arrogance!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —to listen to this aspect of the opening of this debate—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is no point of order!

Mr. Deans: It is a point of order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —and I feel that it should be recorded in Hansard, because it is going to be a matter of considerable debate in the future. The arrogance of this government is nothing but open conceit!

An hon. member: Exactly!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It stinks; it absolutely stinks!

Mr. Bullbrook: One cabinet minister to listen to the leader of the New Democratic Party! That's what they think of the people of Ontario!

Mr. Lewis: As I look at the treasury benches, I have never seen them more open or receptive than they are at this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Here comes one balloon floating in!

Mr. Lewis: I am not sure I consider this adequate compensation, Mr. Speaker. I may say that aesthetically it was almost more pleasing—

Mr. Bullbrook: It gives it a degree of balance though.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): They're called the anchor men—like two bookends.

Mr. Lewis: I know that my words unfailingly reach the populace. Who cares of these mere transient representatives of the public weal? They will come and go.

The third area of administrative bungling involves the $55 million outlined in the Provincial Auditor's report. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that was a decision, almost an inconceivable decision, which was born of the shambles which confronted the ministry at the time. And although the Minister of Health was immensely sanguine about the stewardship of Mr. Martin, his deputy minister, over this $55-million miscue, the fact of the matter is that it says something about the Ministry of Health.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to you that medical incomes have passed all reason. I am sorry to put that point again, but if they are to be continued without immediate intervention on the part of this minister, they will bankrupt the plan. Medical incomes were increasing in the latter years of the 1960s by 8.8 per cent per year; in the first year of the plan by 10 per cent; and in the second year of the plan by 12 per cent. If they continue even at the 8.8 per cent rate, they will cost us $1,272 million more than should be the case through the period of the 1970s.

Fifth, as one looks at this Ministry of Health, which is falling apart before our very eyes—and I may say that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Miller) knows the respect we have for him in this party; I don't know why he is lost in the middle of the rump to my left—

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): He is not lost.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He is the leaven in that unleavened loaf.

Mr. Lewis: —because he clearly has capacity—but perhaps he will convey for me to the minister—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's a fate no one deserves!

Mr. Lewis: I didn't think it needed to be drawn attention to. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that the parliamentary assistant to the Ministry of Health might draw to the minister's attention that the entire department is falling apart; it's not just a question of OHIP and of hospitals.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the arbitrary five per cent limit on the operational budget and capital expenditures of hospitals in the province is nonsensical; it has been employed often without thought, and it has done destructive damage to many little communities.

I don't often receive this kind of thing from this particular source, Mr. Speaker, but very recently, I received a petition of 2,900 signatures from citizens in Pembroke, protesting the cutbacks in the Pembroke General Hospital. Before the cutbacks, Pembroke General Hospital had 156 active treatment beds; then 30 beds were removed. Pembroke Civic Hospital had 121 active treatment beds; then 27 beds were removed. These 57 beds represent 20 per cent of all the active treatment beds in Pembroke; and they were removed without providing any alternative care.

And that area needs right now 23 psychiatric beds, because it has an excellent department of community psychiatry. There are none. It needs 11 rehabilitation beds. There are none. It needs 22 more chronic beds. In other words, at the moment, it needs 55 beds in addition to the original complement and it was cut by 20 per cent. And when you look at the ratios for Pembroke, which serves a catchment area of 90,000 to 100,000 people, you find that the number of beds per 1,000 is somewhere in the two to three range whereas it is in the four to five range in most of the rest of the province.

It shows the extent to which an absence of planning destroys basic health care.

It is not only that, it is not only the foolhardy arbitrary ceilings on the five per cent administrative cutback which the minister applied, it's also what it's doing, Mr. Speaker, to questions of hospital bargaining and hospital negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, we in this caucus will never be able to convey to the government what we feel about the plight of the hospital workers in this province. But let me tell you, sir, that when the Minister of Health stood on his feet and said that he would apply a five per cent ceiling in the next fiscal year, he imposed a brutal wage control on hospital workers, a selective wage control on hospital workers unlike any other group in the province. Now they are all going to hospital arbitration boards—all of the hospitals are going that way—because they can't possibly bargain under those circumstances. Let me show you what happened after the minister made his statement.

The hospital workers, in this case represented by the London and District Building Service Workers Union, were in bargaining with the Norfolk General Hospital in Simcoe —I think that's the right hospital—and in the midst of the bargaining the minister's statement came out. So the consultant representing the hospital wrote to the Ministry of Labour and said as follows:

> In light of the general guidelines restricting hospitals to a maximum of five per cent in wage increases, as announced by the Ministry of Health, the seven per cent average increase as offered by the hospital in negotiations is hereby withdrawn. The hospital is prepared to grant a five per cent increase to the employees in accordance with the above-mentioned guidelines.

So the hospital workers, already the worst-paid group in the entire public sector, have the offer from the hospital lowered as a result of the guidelines imposed by the Minister of Health.

But it is not only the question of the hospital workers and the effect it has on hospital beds. Every day there is a new absurdity.

A couple of days ago on radio station CFRB in the city of Toronto, the Minister of Health made reference to dental care for children. No discussion of how it's to be financed. No discussion of the plans. No discussion of possible fee for service. No discussion of whether it would be done by nurses or by dentists—the kind of irresponsible public announcement which cannot possibly be made in the midst of this shambles of a department.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the story of community clinics is equally depressing. It will

be interesting to hear what the Minister of Health has to say about the Ottawa experiment, because in fact the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development guaranteed to the community association in Ottawa that the government would support the clinic; the government put $60,000 of public money into that clinic and then the Minister of Health turned his back on it.

On Nov. 10, 1972, the Ministry of Health tried quietly to scuttle the financial viability of the clinics at the Soo and at St. Catharines and it was only because it was discovered that the position was reversed.

Last night, Professor John Hastings, at a public meeting on community clinics discussing the Hastings report, said that at the recent meeting of health ministers, eight ministers of eight provinces had approved his report, one province had given conditional approval and the only province which was equivocal, Mr. Speaker, was the Province of Ontario. Professor Hastings made the point that the view of community clinics in Ontario largely depends on what side of the bed certain people get out of in the morning. And everyone gets into the act, Mr. Speaker, everyone gets into the act.

Not very long ago, earlier this month, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development emerged from his catacombs and announced something called "Community Living for the Mentally Retarded in Ontario, a New Policy Focus." Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something about this, because it really bothered me at the time and I want to get it off my chest now.

This document is a hoax and it's cruel and it's irresponsible, when so many people in this province who are personally affected lean on every word about the mentally retarded, to put out a document like this kind—spurious, inconsequential, totally irrelevant—and pretend to call it a new concept of living—community concept of living for the mentally retarded.

The document said, as though it were some kind of blessed revelation, that the government had introduced a number of Acts during the 1960s and then says, "despite these changes there has been little overall improvement in the actual pattern of care received by the retarded." Well that's for sure. That's certainly true in this province.

Then the document goes on to say, "in either case—" referring to various forms of treatment, "—services geared to the needs of the retarded are being neglected." Then it goes on to say that "they should be provided in an institutional setting," and there is a lot of nonsensical gobbledy-gook.

That's all, that's all they say in this policy paper—that community support for the mentally retarded is more desirable than institutional support.

My colleague from Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) could have told you that 20 years ago. And when Dr. Franks was superintendent of the Ontario Hospital School at Smiths Falls, as long ago as 1963, he begged this government to go to community support for the mentally retarded.

The government outlines the survey of needs—they've been outlined a hundred times—they have this specious, vacuous, trifling document, produced by a task force, saying community care is necessary. Then they have the audacity to produce the Williston report recommendations, which came down, Mr. Speaker, in August, 1971 and have not been acted on to this day, and which advocate everything that is in this document.

It is this kind of really insubstantial material flowing from the Ministry of Health which truly plumbs the depths of its disarray. I would have been ashamed, as a minister of the Crown, to stand at a press conference and produce a document of this kind and raise the hopes of people across the province as though there is anything in this of any kind—not a single undertaking. Another document for discussion inviting opinion and review.

I could go on for ever. The per diem rates for psychiatric hospitals remain low. The staff problems in psychiatric hospitals remain the same. We now have more than enough doctors in the Province of Ontario, according to the Ontario Council of Health. Why then are there so many under-doctored areas?

We are going to have a Throne Speech bill to strengthen the College of Physicians and Surgeons. That's the last thing which this province needs. Public health is not functioning appropriately in this province because there's no commitment to preventive medical care.

The ministry in every single aspect is in a hopeless mess. I don't doubt that we have a highly sophisticated medical apparatus in the province, but I don't know how long it's going to last.

One hardly knows where to begin or what to suggest. After all, we've had endless reports—the Commission on the Healing Arts, the Council of Health. We probably should have a standing committee to look into the discrepancies in payments in OHIP and Dr. Kinloch's charges, but that isn't going to solve

the problem. I therefore make these observations on behalf of my party.

This session there must be a plan produced for the next five years which shifts totally away from hospital care to alternative patterns of delivery or we will never be able to control the costs. That doesn't mean we won't have active treatment hospitals, but unless there is an alternative plan for delivery we will never be able to control costs.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we have to deal with the medical profession. I guess there is really only one way to deal with them. The government will have to decide on an appropriate percentage of the gross provincial budget. I don't set it arbitrarily. There are many more capable of arriving at the figure than we who do not have the expertise at hand. The government should arrive at an appropriate percentage of the gross provincial product to cover all health care in this province that presently exists, plus dental care and plus drugs, and within that overall percentage the money is distributed to the medical profession and to those areas where the cost must be covered, and not a penny more.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to you that in many western countries that percentage is roughly five per cent. It is interesting to note that in the Province of Ontario we now spend almost exactly five per cent of our gross provincial product for medical care costs of all kinds, and we do not now cover drug costs and dental costs. So if a clear implication of what I am saying is that doctors' incomes will be reduced, then that is a legitimate implication to draw.

Let me go further, Mr. Speaker. When sorting out the method of payment of this sum, determined in that fashion, we will simply have to sit down with the doctors themselves. I think they should be consulted —after all they are the recipients of public funds—and work out the method of payment that they find congenial within the maximum determined by government. This means that the government will have to set the fee schedule itself as a public responsibility through the Ministry of Health; and that the government will pay 100 per cent of that fee schedule within the limits of the money arranged.

Gradually some doctors will clearly go on salaries, as we extend salaries to those who service hospitals and as we extend salaries to those who work in community clinics. There may be some who choose capitation grants, but the fee schedule will be set by government. We will pay it all, and no more, and the only way in which a doctor can operate outside the plan is if he operates or she operates wholly outside the plan, which means that the patient pays entirely and cannot claim from OHIP.

Mr. Speaker, that seems to us to be the only way to handle it. As we see it, the problem with the suggestion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday is, if you are going to have less money to pay in the last quarter of the year, what you are really saying to the doctors is, to overservice the population during the low service period of the year in the spring and summer and do not be available to service them during the high demand period of the year during the fall and winter. It just won't work.

The money has to be taken out; you have to have the fee schedule set by government and you have to relate that fee schedule to the total amount of money and to the participation of the doctors. I think that puts us pretty clearly on record. We would wish that every doctor in the province operated within the plan. But they will not have one foot in and one foot out. They will have to remove themselves entirely, if they don't want to participate.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the senior civil service must be changed. It is now a case of bureaucracy run amuck. It is obstructing, impeding, hindering. It provides every obstacle known in the bureaucracy to the provision of adequate health services.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and I am not quite as reticent as the Leader of the Opposition, I say categorically that the Minister of Health must step down for three specific reasons: One, whatever his intentions, he has failed to produce order in the chaos of the health delivery system in this province; two, he doesn't understand finances or costs.

That used to be a matter of merriment in this House. I can remember when we asked the Minister of Health at the time he introduced the nursing home legislation about questions of cost. I asked him myself where the $30 million was in the estimates on home care. The minister replied: "As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is just like a cat's breakfast—all spread through there somewhere. I don't know, but we'll find it somewhere." He says earlier, "The only way I can figure this one out—and members must admit that as far as money is concerned I don't know too much about it." That's a pretty succinct statement. When we talked to him about the figures involved he said:

I agree with the member and I'm concerned that the figures are that far out of line. Certainly, there is no way I can explain why we are that far out of line but I must reiterate that this is a service that has to be provided.

The Minister of Health understands nothing about finances or costs. That's his problem. That's not a problem to be visited on the people of the Province of Ontario.

At the time it was one of those earthy boasts which everybody chortled about; this strong impetuous doctor, who had wandered in from Quinte to take care of health in the province, admitted that he didn't know anything about costs. Little did we know that there would flow from that a financial disaster.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health has to go because he has become an orderly for the medical profession. There's something about doctors as Ministers of Health. I don't know what it is. I really can't figure it out. One can successfully have a lawyer as Attorney General but one can't have a doctor as Minister of Health.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Right on.

Mr. Lewis: In the final analysis they are totally seduced by their own profession. There is some kind of mystique at work which makes it impossible for the minister to resist the wiles of his profession. I may—

Mr. Bullbrook: There goes the fleeting hope that the member for Parkdale had.

Mr. Lewis: If the member for Parkdale had it, we'd have a health system the envy of the world but—

Mr. Bullbrook: It would be costly, mind you!

Mr. Lewis: The member for Parkdale is biding his time. He's a man of patience and insight.

Mr. Foulds: He'll be a super minister.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Here comes somebody now in the field for contention.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Medical Association and the College of Physicians and Surgeons still run the Ministry of Health. I know it is fashionable to say that the minister has alienated some of his colleagues. Let's not kid ourselves. Precisely at the moment that he is alienating them, Ross DeGeer is sending around a letter asking them all for contributions, and pretty confident that he'll get the contributions he wants. Someday we might learn how much he actually received from the doctors in the Province of Ontario. But a doctor simply can't be a Minister of Health.

The last time there was an equivalent shambles was in the festive days of the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond) which some of us remember and would rather prefer to forget.

It shouldn't have been Kinloch who went. It should have been somebody else in the civil service who went, but Dr. Kinloch went because the Ontario Medical Association and the College of Physicians and Surgeons demanded it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the minister was a little bashful with me yesterday when we talked about who had been appointed to review medical care insurance from the Council of Health primary advisory group on medical care insurance. Perhaps some of the members of the House and my colleagues would like to know who is on this group, whose views will be the primary views in the determination of government policy, other than those which were advocated from within the ministry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who is the chairman?

Mr. Lewis: Dr. K. C. Charron, chairman; Dr. H. C. Baumer; Dr. H. O. Beck; Dr. A. Bodrug—I didn't know he was on it but that is an exemplary appointment—Dr. John R. Brook; Dr. William H. Bryant; Dr. Donald F. Butt; Dr. H. Hoyle Campbell; Dr. Donald R. Clark; Dr. Robert W. Cornett; Dr. E. W. Dowd; Dr. Arthur J. Dunn; Dr. Robert G. Elgey; Dr. Donald Fraser; Dr. John H. Fraser; Dr. Reynold H. Geld; Dr. J. Edward Gibson; Dr. Douglas J. Grant. It goes on—

Mr. MacDonald: It is a balanced selection.

Mr. Lewis: —for twice that number and not a single member of the task force, the primary advisory group on medical care insurance review, is other than a doctor.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it just cannot be allowed to continue. I think that the Minister of Health should go elsewhere. We'd all like him to stay in the cabinet. I don't want to be ill-spirited as to pretend he should lose cabinet stature. I think that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Clement), or maybe the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Carton), might be excellent gentlemen to occupy the post of Minister of Health.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York Forest Hill): Whom does the member want to kill off?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I'm really not willing or anxious to, quote, "kill any of them off"—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: No, no. I want this health care plan rescued, Mr. Speaker. All of us want it rescued and we don't need any more studies. We don't need any more legislative inquiries. We don't need any more commissions. We have them all, the material is available. If you shake up that civil service, antiquarian as it is, and if you replace the minister with perhaps one of the appointments suggested—and I probably seal their political doom with that suggestion—then I think you can begin to sort it out along the line which many of us in this House have recommended.

Let me turn, Mr. Speaker, so that I go on not too long, to another matter which gnawed away during the course of the by-elections as a matter of some general public anxiety—a certain vague disquiet through the electorate about the government handling of and response to energy problems.

I'm not going to deal with the member for Chatham-Kent's three-tier price system and I know that the Premier is about to make a statement on energy matters which may at some point be debated in this House. I think we should point out, Mr. Speaker, that we in this caucus were profoundly disturbed at the way in which this Premier capitulated to Premier Lougheed in his trip to Alberta.

It was abject and total. Rather than take the bit at that time and make the statements that should have been made at that time, he in effect gave the Premier of Alberta carte blanche to ask the people of Ontario to pay the two-price system which would increase the coffers of the oil companies in that province.

My colleague from York South, in two excellent articles—at least two that I can recall—in the Globe and Mail, has outlined the background to the two-price system and what it implies for Alberta and Canada, and I need not go into that now. But I do want to go into certain other observations because I think they are important.

No one, Mr. Speaker, questions the worldwide preoccupation with the shortage of energy or the rapacious lust of the United States in the energy field, but Ontario need not be panicked with false assumptions just because the member for Chatham-Kent needs a job. We'll find something else for him to do.

The advisory committee on energy report—I'll call it the Ace report—was a gloomy one. It estimated natural gas usage in 1970 of 440 billion cubic feet and then estimated a jump in 1990 to 1,400 billion cubic feet and the total energy demand was comparable to that.

The solutions within that report were clearly those that frontier gas should be turned to. That is, the report was saying quietly, "Let's have the Mackenzie Valley pipeline and as much government support as possible and increased consumer prices."

Well Mr. Speaker, it's time for one party in this Legislature to say—my colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) has been urging us to say this often and loudly—that we are not going to be panicked into the conventional wisdom about an energy shortage. There is an enormous scepticism to be exercised about the advisory committee on energy report—an enormous scepticism.

The composition of that committee raises one's suspicions. There were representatives on the committee from the Ontario Natural Gas Association, the Canadian Gas Association, the Ontario Petroleum Institute, the Bituminous Coal Institute of Canada, the Propane Gas Association of Canada and the Petroleum Association of Ontario. In addition, there were two representatives of the electrical energy sector, one from the nuclear energy sector and one from a manufacturing industry closely related to mineral fuel.

A clear majority of the committee was drawn from the energy industry. Now, may I say, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: I'd say a pretty objective group.

Mr. Lewis: Well there was a very objective group. As a matter of fact there was somebody on it from Pollution Probe and there was one person on it from the Consumer Association of Canada and the rest were government appointments. It was not unnatural that this group of people, a clear majority of whom belong to the energy industry, decided that they would produce conclusions favourable to the energy industry. And so it becomes a self-serving document.

Let me go further, Mr. Speaker: They made an extraordinary error in the content of that document, and I quote:

> Of importance to the forecast for energy needs is a significant slowing down of

> population growth. The average annual growth rate over the past two decades in Ontario has been 2.7 per cent, while the outlook for the next two decades suggests an average annual growth rate of at most two per cent and quite likely somewhat less.

And yet that statement, that the population growth over the next two decades in Ontario is quite likely to be less than two per cent, is followed by this amazing statement:

> On the basis of a high assumption of a two per cent average growth rate, the Ontario population would be in the neighbourhood of 11 million in 1990.

In fact, the Ontario population will not be 11 million in 1990. Incredible as it may seem, the fertility rate in Ontario this year will be below the replacement level. Population growth in Ontario is levelling out. The population of this province, as demographic studies show, will not be more than 9:5 million in 1990, which means that the report made an error in the estimate of 1.5 million, at the very least; and that makes for a 15 per cent change in the way in which they computed their various targets. We could then exist on 600 or 650 billion cubic feet, which is not a great deal more than current usage. Certainly gas usage figures of that magnitude would greatly lessen pressure to develop frontier gas resources.

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is that it is possible for Ontario to pace itself. It is not necessary to turn to frontier resources, and it is not necessary for us to advocate the development of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline, as one expects.

Population is the crucial variable in the estimation of future energy requirements. I find it simply incredible that the advisory committee on energy chose a future population figure without bothering in any way to justify its validity.

The committee undertook 16 internal research reports and commissioned another 16 reports from outside consultants. Not one of these reports deals with the probable size of Ontario's population over the next two decades.

The failure to consider carefully the crucial population variety raises serious questions about the validity of many of the committee's conclusions.

That is one area which we will question as closely as possible in the House so that we are not immediately involved in an increase in consumer prices to satisfy the alleged problems which some in the energy industry put forth.

The report goes on, however, to point out that uranium will be crucial to the Province of Ontario in the years ahead; that in fact we have 15 per cent of total world reserves —190,000 tons of uranium—which can be produced at prices of less than $10 per pound.

Mr. Speaker, world annual demand for uranium by the mid-1980s is expected to be 140,000 tons, according to the committee, so one can imagine the pressure that will be on in the area of uranium just as it is on us now from the United States and world markets for natural gas. Therefore, in order to preserve uranium as a basic energy resource, it is the submission of this party that we should take the uranium reserves in this province into public ownership.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we are expropriating the Sandbanks for Stephen Roman; I don't see why we shouldn't expropriate the uranium reserves as well on the same basis of adequate compensation. There may be some constitutional difficulties, which can be worked out with the federal government, although I think not. I think it is well within the power of the provincial government under the British North America Act. But if that is so important an energy source, then it should be taken into public ownership.

That leads me to another point about public ownership. The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development issued a report on Onakawana, the lignite deposit in northeastern Ontario. We were profoundly disturbed by that report as well, because what the government of Ontario apparently intends to do if it develops Onakawana is to allow it to be developed by the Manalta Coal Co. based in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, over the 30-year period involved for the development of the lignite reserve, the profits to Onakawana, on the basis of of what we know in 1972, will be something in excess of $100 million. We frankly object to an Alberta-based company coming into a natural resource hinterland of Ontario and taking out $100 million of profit over a 30-year period.

One asks the government to think of what could be done with that $100 million for a service base and a manufacturing base in northeastern Ontario were the money ploughed back into that region represented by some of the members of this caucus. So I may say, Mr. Speaker, as well, that we think that since all that the Manalta Coal Co. now has is

exploratory rights — that's all — it should be compensated for those rights and that all of the development of the lignite deposit should be done in the public sector. We think that every development of an energy or natural resource nature in the future in this province that is not now currently in the private sector should be done by a Crown corporation. In that, Mr. Speaker, we are very much at one with Eric Kierans and the report he did for the government of Manitoba.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Who shares in Manitoba's Crown corporations?

Mr. Lewis: Who shares in Manitoba's Crown corporations? The people of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Rhodes: And the people of Sweden.

Mr. Lewis: The people of the Province of Manitoba will share. The profits remain in the province for subsequent development. As a matter of fact, the whole of the Kierans report related to that. Let me quote from the Kierans report just for a moment. He says:

> Nations or provinces which follow such a policy [the policy that the member for Sault Ste. Marie would wish us to follow of putting it all in the private sector] must inevitably remain as resource-producing economies until their resources are exhausted. The capital that is generated bolsters the power and assets of the agents, the large corporations to whom they have turned over the management of their land and labour. These are the new institutions that will grow, not the province or nation. The dynamism of the new capital generated leaves the province; it does not remain to transform the province into a stronger agricultural force or an efficient industrial community or a strong service economy.

Let me just put a little more of Kierans on the record, because I think it is important:

> To be satisfied with the new jobs created and to forego the surpluses and profit inherent in the development of its own endowment is hardly the mark of a strong and mature government.

So what strength and maturity is there in the member for Sault Ste. Marie's advocacy of the Manalta Coal Co. taking out $100 million in profit from northeastern Ontario? From Sault Ste. Marie! The member would deprive the northeast of $100 million over the next 30 years? No wonder Anne Valentine is hot on his neck. He'll never survive.

Mr. Deans: He would sell this province out.

Mr. Lewis: I continue to quote:

> The government accepts the role in that way of hewers of wood and drawers of water for its people when they are capable of much more. That role provides wages and salaries and little else.

That's all, just wages and salaries. Does the member know that in the Statistics Canada analysis of the energy industry, and the natural resources industry generally—I have the exact figures with me somewhere—every dollar in wages and salaries produces something more than a dollar in profit in that industry? That is for 1972. That is where the figure of $100 million comes from.

It is perfectly appropriate that Kierans, when he is looking at an economy like Manitoba's, said that the exploration and development should be done by a Crown corporation. He didn't recommend as yet—we will get to that in the estimates—what happens in the processing and refining sector, but there is no question that it belongs to us.

Let me read to the member the best part of Kierans. He puts it better than I could ever put it.

Mr. Rhodes: I agree.

Mr. Lewis: To quote:

> It is not a question of capitalism or socialism. It is simply searching for the better way. In any event, one cannot nationalize what one already owns, and it is clear that the province owns its own resources. What must be determined is the manner in which one can gain the highest returns from that wealth, both now and in the future. This is not a matter of questioning the sanctity of private property; the issue of proprietorship has long been settled: it is public.

Mr. MacDonald: The government is being doctrinaire, that's the problem!

Mr. Lewis: Whether it is uranium or lignite, it belongs in the public sector; and that's what we will fight for in this Legislature.

We'll fight for more than that in the field of energy. We're going to fight to give power to the Ontario Energy Board to regulate prices of all petroleum and natural gas products at the wholesale and retail levels. That is now an absolute requirement in the present continental situation. And I'll tell you what

the first task of that board will be: to equalize gasoline prices across this province. That will be the first task.

Mr. Foulds: How does the free-enterpriser from Sault Ste. Marie feel about that?

Mr. Lewis: The second task will be to look at the discrepancy in prices charged to residential and industrial purchasers, since it is now 2:1 in the area of gas.

Mr. Speaker, I had some remarks on Task Force Hydro, but I will leave them out of this portion. They will be dealt with by other colleagues as the Throne debate evolves. I think it is worth pointing out that what we're asking for is an integrated energy policy in Ontario that includes the Onakawana reserves, uranium, natural gas and Ontario Hydro, and which is not dictated by the fallacious assumptions of the advisory committee on energy reform. That report was given a wide circulation in the province and served only to bolster the mythology which the oil companies are frantically attempting to make pervasive, that somehow in Ontario and Canada at the moment we are in a state of total panic, and therefore consumer prices must go up commensurate with the corporate profits which will be received.

We have problems in the energy field. No one disputes that for a moment. They are serious problems. But if we don't alienate our energy to continental sources in the United States, and if we implement the policies suggested here, I think we can keep them under control.

That, Mr. Speaker, you will be extremely pleased to know, leads me to the last point I want to make in this presentation. This is something some of us have thought a good deal about in trying to sort it out, because it's odd and confusing. It is something which we collectively think strikes to the root—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Before the hon. member proceeds, I wonder if he would permit me to interrupt at this time in relation to standing order No. 27(g), which provides for debate on certain subjects that were brought up during the question period.

The hon. members will recall this was discussed last Wednesday.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, yes.

Mr. Speaker: According to the rules, it is incumbent upon me to inform the House prior to 5 o'clock on Tuesday, and I thought this would be a good opportunity before the hon. member went on to another subject.

There have been two notices given, by the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) and the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), in that they were not satisfied with the answers given to certain oral questions.

The question from the hon. member for Ottawa East, in the first instance, and I will read the notice:

"Please be advised that I am not satisfied with the response from the Premier to an oral question on the royal commission on criminal activities, and I intend to raise the subject matter at the adjournment of the House."

The motion of the hon. member for Grey-Bruce reads:

"With regard to my question to the Premier, will the Premier advise with regard to the Fidinam affair why the terms of reference of crime commissions should not be extended to Queen's Park. The Premier refused to acknowledge the question and remained in his seat. I am not satisfied with this response to an oral question."

And his second notice was regarding the question:

"Will the Premier advise why he will not call at once a royal commission on the Fidinam affair; to furnish lists of donors, and if they have government contracts, with powers to subpoena."

The next section of his question was purely hypothetical and will not be permitted.

"Why has he for a second time refused to name the legal firm handling the multi-million-dollar deal? Who received the finder's fee?" The hon. member indicated he was not satisfied with the response to that oral question.

Therefore, in accordance with the rules, five minutes will be allowed to each member to introduce and speak on the subject matter of his original question, after which the Premier, in this case, will be permitted five minutes to reply, if he so wishes. He need not reply if he does not wish to reply.

Therefore, there will be three subjects brought up at the adjournment hour of this House today, which is 6 o'clock; and I might point out that the motion to adjourn will not be necessary in accordance with the provisions of standing order 28(a). I am to deem that the motion to adjourn has been made. In accordance with the same rule 28,

when the 15 minutes or 30 minutes have expired, I will deem the House to have been adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, will it be necessary for the Premier himself to reply to any of the standing orders; or is it possible for somebody on the government's side to substitute for him?

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the answer would be no.

Mr. Deans: No what?

Mr. Speaker: No one can substitute. The questions were directed to the Premier.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): He should be here to listen too.

Mr. Singer: He won't recognize his responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I suppose I should thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the break. On the other hand, I would not have been dismayed had you done it before the orders of the day. May I deal with the last point I wanted to raise.

It is strange and ironic that the Conservative government is being largely repudiated by the electorate in all areas of the province, for reasons which one wouldn't have expected. Put simply, simply as I can, the Conservative party has developed a fixation with Metropolitan Toronto at the expense of the rest of Ontario.

And who would have believed it, Mr. Speaker; this rural-based Tory monolith contracting an obsession with Metropolitan Toronto, against which all else is measured and by which all else is conditioned.

And as a crowning achievement, the Conservatives have managed to win the worst of both worlds. Outside Metro, the populace condemns the government for its neglect and indifference; inside Metro, government is condemned for the massive urban blight, for what it has failed to do by way of housing, and land values, and the environment, and transportation, and for the inexorable concentration of people, goods, services, and industry in one jam-packed section of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is growing resentment and not a little bitterness inside and outside Metro at the way in which Queen's Park has distorted social priorities and abandoned intelligent economic planning.

Citizens' groups, Mr. Speaker, are not just a reflection of democratic participation; whether it is Ramsden Park in St. George, or "Save the Jail" in Huron; whether it's "People or Planes" in Pickering or "Stop the Garbage" in Minto and Hope townships.

People are protesting the way in which social decisions are arrived at and the way in which wealth, power and opportunity is distributed across Ontario.

This province is starting to show its hostility to the undue concentration of influence at the centre, and the centre expressed its hostility in the municipal elections last December pretty vividly. I really think that that Tory party is losing its grip on credibility and judgement.

Now, it's very hard to provoke any response from those Tories that are here; so what I'll do, Mr. Speaker, is put a number of rhetorical questions which I think reach the root of it.

How do you explain, Mr. Speaker, that the Toronto-centred region plan preceded an overall plan for the Province of Ontario and that that has not been corrected to this day?

How does the government explain that processing and refining in this province for northern Ontario are dependent on the Metro-centred region plan, as are jobs in Cornwall?

How does it defend the continued quest for eight million people by the year 2000, when the levelling of population figures would allow for a reconsideration of the whole Toronto-centred region proposals?

How does it explain, Mr. Speaker, the lunacy of North Pickering—building a quarter-of-a-million-bedroom suburb for Metro right on the periphery, in violation of the Metro plan?

How does it defend North Pickering when Oshawa was intended to be the appropriate growth centre, and how does it defend the consequent destruction of regional government?

How does it defend the expropriation of 25,000 acres of prime agricultural and recreational land and then talk of environmental preservation in its Throne Speech?

How does it allow Port Hope and Cobourg to be sucked into the vortex of Metro—a new linear city stretching 75 congested miles along the lakefront?

How does it protect the interests of little communities outside Metropolitan Toronto—whether it is Port Hope, Cobourg, or Orillia-Midland—when they are always subservient to this emphasis on Metropolitan Toronto and its growth?

How does it explain a $1.3 billion transportation policy, primarily designed for Metropolitan Toronto, perhaps to be used a little by Ottawa or Hamilton, but offering virtually nothing for the rest of the province?

How do government members explain, when they go up to Huron county, that this government didn't fight hard enough the discontinuance of the rail line between Goderich and Stratford, or that the buses don't connect properly with the trains, or that we haven't got the money for STOL aircraft development in this province so we could have a route from Owen Sound to Goderich to Stratford to Toronto, but that all the money we spend is spent to satisfy the obsession with Metropolitan Toronto?

How do they explain a massive new Queen's Park office development right in the heart of downtown Toronto?

How do they defend its adding to the congestion and oppression that is already felt by thousands of citizens?

I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Metro resent these perverse priorities as much as do the people in other parts of the province.

How does the government explain to the rest of Ontario that the civil service and all its head offices must forever be centralized? Why the Workmen's Compensation building here? Why Hydro here? Why the Centre for Forensic Studies here? Why the Ontario Housing Corp. here? Why the enlarged Downsview area for Transportation and Communications? Why OISE? Why is everything to be centred here—and now this ultimate abomination, the new complex for Queen's Park?

How does the government explain that educational television's full schedule of school and adult programmes is still confined solely to the Toronto area?

How does it explain Ontario Place—losing money endlessly, subsidized by Treasurer's warrants, and accessible on a regular basis only to people in Metro, with as yet no counterpart in another part of the province, while the rest of the province pays for the endless deficiency?

How does it explain that with 27.5 per cent of the population in Metro, this area receives 35 per cent of all Ontario hospital public funding, 42 per cent of the psychiatric beds are here, and so are 66 per cent of the special and rehabilitative beds?

How is it that OISE, in contemplating likely budget cutbacks, has to consider abandonment of its field centres in London, St. Catharines, Peterborough, Thunder Bay and Kitchener? How does the government explain why it permits problems of university financing to fall most heavily on Peterborough, on Brock, on Laurentian, on Thunder Bay? Why must Trent fight so desperately for such an excellent little system of education as it has developed, while the University of Toronto never seems to experience these problems?

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, people in Metropolitan Toronto are bewildered by the government's preoccupation with growth. The government is mesmerized by growth—growth for growth's sake—and they're creating enormous problems as a result. And where, one might ask, are the incentives to get some of the growth out of Metropolitan Toronto? After the EIO development loan programme, nothing has emerged to take its place—and it was a pretty unhappy effort itself.

Where is the campaign to move the head offices out of Metro? Where is there to provide for the citizens of Metro some sense of relief and sanity and where is there to provide for the rest of Ontario some sense of balance and opportunity? How is it that the Tories have managed to incur the wrath of those both inside Metro and outside?

That was the real lesson of the by-election. Let me leave out for a moment, if I may, the standing of the parties. Let me say to the hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that what was happening in St. George was a rejection of their mania for growth; and what was happening in Huron was a rejection of the way in which they neglect parts of this province outside Metro.

Growth has become such a fetish in this province; it has become so intoxicating for the cabinet that all else pales. The cabinet is drunk on growth in one area primarily. Those of us who live in Metropolitan Toronto don't like it, because it distorts the social and economic priorities of this region; and it is obvious that people outside don't like it either.

And you have a Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, which the member for Sault Ste.

Marie probably quietly burned in the dead of night so as to avoid the embarrassment of sharing it.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that when he burns?

Mr. Lewis: Because what is there for northern Ontario in this Throne Speech?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Same as usual!

Mr. Foulds: As much as there has ever been.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, as much as there has ever been.

The member for Sault Ste. Marie and the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot), now leaning forward on his desk in anticipation, went to the Conservative conference and predicted—the only time the two of them had ever shown such insight—that the NDP would sweep the north in the next provincial election unless something was done. And then, Mr. Speaker, you bring forth a Throne Speech—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): The hon. member must have read the newspapers. Don't believe what the papers say.

Mr. Lewis: —in which nothing was done for the north. There has never been a document so insulting to northern Ontario as this one. So what do you substitute for it? Well you substitute what we called earlier the group of seven. The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence) and six of his associates wander through northwestern Ontario between Jan. 19 to Jan. 21, quote: "To take Toronto to the people of the northwest." Not only didn't they want them, they didn't want them so badly the plane broke down; the weather interfered.

An hon. member: Maybe it was sabotage.

Mr. Lewis: It may indeed have been sabotage. Well, 35 briefs were presented reiterating what we all know: pleading for assistance. The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development pronounced it an "unqualified success," and he went on to say that he was impressed by the quality of the briefs and the great concern that was expressed for further development of the northwestern Ontario region. What a lot of gratuitous paternalism that is; and it is a further indication of what you people over there think of northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: The government has had a Design for Development in mothballs for the last 2½ years.

Mr. Lewis: Design for development means not a tinker's dam in northern Ontario.

Mr. Foulds: I think the member should resign.

Mr. Lewis: That is spelled "dam" in northern Ontario.

The group of seven—not satisfied with the north—wandered into eastern Ontario and sat down at Smiths Falls. I guess it was Norm Webster's report—

Mr. Martel: With all their advisers too—the whole firm.

Mr. Lewis: —in the Globe which pointed out that among the kinder adjectives which the group of seven received in eastern Ontario were "ivory tower bureaucrats in Toronto", "absurd", "obstructive", "stupid" and "ignorant".

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): That says it all.

Mr. Lewis: That is pretty concise.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is them all right. Those are the ones.

Mr. Lewis: They knew who they were talking to. They certainly knew who they were talking about.

Mr. MacDonald: The Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) looks puzzled.

Mr. Lewis: Sorry, the Solicitor General is yearning for a repetition. The words were: "Absurd", obstructive", "stupid", "ignorant". Why, pray tell, does he laugh?

Mr. Foulds: Because he wasn't included.

Mr. Lewis: He knows who they are. Smile that away.

An hon. member: He agreed.

Mr. Lewis: I know he agrees, but it is not nice for him to agree, because his colleagues are involved. They speak kindly of him. They always speak kindly of him.

An hon. member: Not always.

Mr. Lewis: The 65 briefs presented included examples of government insensitivity and obstructionism toward small town planning. Problems of young people leaving the

area because of lack of economic opportunities; briefs dealing with the problems of waste disposal in the area; problems of milk producers in Lanark county and throughout eastern Ontario; the need for improved road subsidy legislation: the need for more recreation land. In this instance the group of seven didn't pronounce it an unqualified success and they made no comment.

An interesting comment was made by the Ottawa Journal. It was advertised as a confrontation and on Feb. 23 the Ottawa Journal editorialized:

> A confrontation? Certainly, though too polite a series of discussions to meet the 1970 definition of that word. But Mr. Lawrence's committee had come looking for a confrontation. That it got its wish in such numbers and with such force merely shows that Queen's Park has a long way to go before eastern Ontario stops feeling it is still the neglected poor cousin in the province.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that eastern Ontario like northern Ontario has never been more neglected than under a Tory government. For the first time I have experienced it politically, when I was on the Green-line Programme in Ottawa just a week or two ago and people started phoning in to say why they were rejecting the Tories and what was going wrong.

The Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps) knows just how bad it is in eastern Ontario. The government has absolutely nothing but contempt for the people of eastern Ontario. One would think that that is the most neglected region of the province, right?

We have a Design for Development report for Metro Toronto. We have one for the northwest. We have one for the northeast. And we have them for the southwest—Niagara; midwest—Lake Erie; Lake Ontario, Lake St. Clair and Georgian Bay. More than two years after the Design for Development plan was introduced in the province we get prospects for the eastern Ontario region. It is the last region in Ontario to be dealt with.

For two years they laboured, this clutch of civil servants, using all their creative and intellectual energy to produce a document—in over two years—fully 20 pages in length. I may say that any pre-pubescent adolescent taking interviews on a street corner in Smiths Falls could have written a better document than this one. This is a piece of such nonsense that it is really beyond parallel, and it shows how the government feels about eastern Ontario. It took more than two years to bring down a report—the last report to be brought down. Let me tell the government what it learned in two years.

The first thing it learned—and I want some of the members to listen to this because they probably don't know it—is that the following cities—Ottawa, Kingston, Cornwall, Brockville, Hawkesbury, Pembroke, Renfrew and Smiths Falls—all lie in the eastern region. One has to admit that, for insight, that's hard to beat as a report. Then it said, turning to the lyrical prose which is so dominant and characteristic in this report:

> There is a wide range of lifestyles from the urbane diversions of Ottawa to the old continental charm of Kingston, the historic character of Perth and the relative simplicity of the many rural villages.

That's a pretty good economic forecast. Yes, that certainly cuts to the problems of the region. Then the government goes on to deal with the goals, and goal No. 1 is pretty breathtaking; kind of unusual for a plan of this kind. Goal No. 1 says, "To provide opportunities and encouragement for every person in the eastern Ontario region to live a full and satisfying life."

Imagine taking two years to come up with that! I mean that would surely take a lifetime. It is one of those glimpses which isn't often revealed to mortal men.

The document has a number of problems set out and it puts them in the form of questions and answers. I can't possibly give members the full flavour of the questions and answers but to give a sense of their content, let me read one question and one answer.

Question: How should the lowland's recreational attractions be preserved? Answer: With pressures of population and economic growth likely to intensify along the St. Lawrence shoreline, the best means should be found to preserve the scenic area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: That is good, yes. It sounds like the Minister of Health.

Mr. Lewis: Do the members remember that extraordinary line in the regional development report for northeastern Ontario? I think it was on page 237 in the section on public safety where at the end of the analysis, the government said: "The incidence of drowning is likely to increase near bodies of water." Do the members remember that

one? That's basically the quality of these documents except that—

Mr. Deans: The same person wrote it.

Mr. Lewis: The same person wrote it, is right.

—they took 300 pages to do it for northeastern Ontario and here they did it in 20. Well, they don't stop there. They go on endlessly in this fatuous array of nonsense which is such an insult to the people of the eastern region.

And then they talk about techniques and they reveal again, albeit begrudgingly, some of the marvels of creative intellect. They say there are at least two alternatives; they might concentrate growth or they might disperse growth. Then, on the last page they say: "Inevitably, the final plan will be based on policies lying somewhere between the extremes." Well, who would have believed it?

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Health and his mess.

Mr. Lewis: And then they invite our thoughtful representation.

Oh, I'll tell the government members something. Your MPPs are in trouble. Your MPPs are in very real trouble, because they've managed to alienate most of the people in this province who live in hitherto neglected areas outside Metropolitan Toronto, and they have managed to alienate those in Metropolitan Toronto who worry about housing problems, who worry about transportation problems, who worry about urban congestion, who worry about all of the social problems attendant on what is happening in the Metro area. Mr. Speaker, it's comic, perhaps, in some ways, but it's a perfect example of the nonsense with which regional government planning is presently riddled.

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to convey to the Premier for me that there is, throughout this province, an all-pervasive sense that no one is listening. Indeed, you, sir, may be the only person listening. The Premier has distanced himself.

Mr. Ruston: The Speaker doesn't always listen.

Mr. Lewis: He's alienated himself from the province. The Premier is no "Wacky" Bennett. He's no Ross Thatcher. He's no Joey Smallwood. Nobody pretends that. But that posture of homey urbanity isn't working. It doesn't ring true.

The barriers between the Tory party and Ontario now are not merely bureaucratic. They're psychological. The cynicism of which the Premier speaks is a reflection of the sense of impotence which the public feels about its politicians and the sense of estrangement it has from the Tory party. I want to tell the government, as much as I'd like to say otherwise, I think it is probably beyond correction and this government is vulnerable everywhere. Mr. Speaker, give us a by-election in this province where we have—

Mr. Rhodes: The NDP wants one?

Mr. Lewis: —a reasonable fighting chance and we'll take—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: —the Tories and the Liberals and we'll trounce both of them.

Mr. Foulds: Try Timiskaming.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Somewhere between the extremes.

Mr. Lewis: And that's about 75 seats that I can think of, and that's off the top.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: If I thought harder I'd work the percentage up. May I say that I wish well to all Conservative and Liberal members.

Mr. McIlveen: Try High Park in five years.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, easy. I wish well to all of them.

Mr. Rhodes: You and I both resign.

Mr. Lewis: You and I both resign? All right, I'll tell you what. You do it first and I'll consider my options carefully.

An hon. member: That sounds like the way the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) resigned. By the way, where is he?

Mr. Singer: Yes, he hasn't been here all afternoon, we notice.

Mr. Rhodes: The member for Scarborough West is closer to the end than I am.

Mr. Lewis: I may say, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: His days are numbered — back to Kentucky.

Mr. Lewis: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that now that we have introduced the fear of God into the Legislature, for all of those who sit in the reactionary benches—that's the only way I can characterize it in a friendly way —I don't want them to be faint of heart. I don't wish any ill on any of them, but we look forward to the opportunity of which I spoke. We also look forward to the opportunity of participating further in this Throne debate and covering a whole variety of subjects relating to pension payments, Workmen's Compensation benefits, profits, prices, and all of the things which should be developed by ourt party. Therefore, in direct continuity with that I move, seconded by Mr. Deans, that this House further condemns the government:

1. For its failure even to recognize that soaring prices are making it difficult for families and pensioners to make ends meet and maintain good nutrition;

2. For its failure to bring our pensioners up to a minimum income of $200 a month;

3. For its failure to deal adequately with the exorbitant increases in housing costs in the Province of Ontario;

4. For its failure to provide adequate public low-cost housing;

5. For its willingness to subsidize private speculative development with public funds in the building of houses;

6. For its failure to develop an integrated energy policy which would ensure adequate supplies for Ontario residents and industry at reasonable prices;

7. For its failure to exercise its stewardship over the resources of Ontario and to ensure the maximum return to the people through public ownership, control and intervention;

8. For its failure to reorganize the delivery of health services to the people so as to ensure accessibility to comprehensive health care at a reasonable cost;

9. For its failure to provide an adequate financial base for regional governments to enable them to attain true autonomy and carry out their functions;

10. For its failure to correct the imbalance in development between the Metropolitan Toronto region and the rest of the province by creating a provincial plan for Ontario and, as a first step, by decentralizing the new Hydro headquarters and the new provincial office complex to another region of Ontario.

They are a sorry lot over there.

Hon. Mr. Kerr moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Since the debate has been adjourned, in accordance with the provisions of standing orders 27 and 28, I shall deem the motion to adjourn to have been placed before the House as provided in the orders just mentioned.

The notices of dissatisfaction with the answers to oral questions given last week were handed to me, firstly, by the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) who will now be given five minutes to speak to his point. The hon. Premier (Mr. Davis) may reply for five minutes if he so wishes.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think I understand from reading Hansard the question of the member for Ottawa East; I think I understand that. I'm at a little loss, Mr. Speaker, and I'm certainly not objecting to your ruling, but as I read Hansard I'm still not clear as to exactly what the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) was asking.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It's possible he may clarify it, and he speaks ahead of the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am doubtful that he will.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): What is the purpose of this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Reading this, where you yourself, sir, had ruled it hypothetical and out of order—that is if I am referring to the same question that I think the member is asking—I really want some clarification whether, in fact, you did say it was hypothetical and out of order; and as a result of this whether it is an appropriate thing for us to debate under this particular rule.

As I say, even if it is not hypothetical and out of order, I had some difficulty in understanding the question, but certainly—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I'll make it clear to the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I'll be delighted to listen to and hopefully will be able to clarify it for him.

Mr. Sargent: I'll be glad to.

Mr. Speaker: I might inform the hon. Premier and the House, of course, that the second question posed by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, which I had last Wednesday deemed to be hypothetical and which I reiterated today was strictly hypothetical—I didn't even read it to the House—was what he would do if the Leader of the Opposition led his party out of the House if this information, and action—

Mr. Sargent: Read the whole question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I read it before and I am reading the part which I ruled to be hypothetical and out of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He has already led his party out of the House. He's gone.

Mr. Speaker: It was what he would do if the Leader of the Opposition led his party out of the House if this information and action was not forthcoming. That part of the second question is purely hypothetical and will not be included in the question today.

The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question had been raised by myself to the Premier in response to the Throne Speech. On page 21 of the Throne Speech, which had been read in the House by the Lieutenant Governor of the province on March 20, it stated that a royal commission was to inquire into the possibility of criminal activity within the plastering, lathing and drywall sectors of the building industry in Metropolitan Toronto. The reason for the question was simply that we could not understand why this inquiry was so limited, first of all to the plastering, lathing and drywall industry; secondly why limit it to Metropolitan Toronto?

The speech states that the royal commission was only established as a result of extensive investigation by law enforcement agencies, and I have difficulty believing this, Mr. Speaker. Are they not aware of violence in other sectors or other areas of the province? Apparently they are.

Mr. Speaker, after we spoke last week and raised the matter in the House, one of the Ottawa papers, the Ottawa Citizen, after a fine piece of investigative reporting, came out with a story from Ottawa on Friday, March 23, at which time two union officials, two leaders of unions in the Ottawa area, a Mr. Jean-Guy Denis, who was the representative of the plasterers and cement masons union, and Leo Martel, of the plumbers union, fully supported what had been mentioned in the House.

They went on to state, according to the story, that organized crime is beating and threatening its way in the Ottawa area. These two union officials went on to say that officials had been sent to the hospital since January as a result of beatings. Others have been beaten as well. One man's family has been roughed up. Legitimate construction companies have been ordered to stay out of the building of certain projects.

This all goes on, at least that we know of, in the Ottawa area. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these two individuals know exactly what they are talking about.

For instance, take the question of Mr. Jean-Guy Denis. Some three months ago paid thugs entered his home on a Sunday morning; they were going to teach him a lesson. Unfortunately, in his home was only his 16-year-old son; they decided to beat him and sent him to the hospital. For good measure, they went on to kill the dog.

As far as Mr. Leo Martel was concerned, he was beaten up as well. Now these people have stated, Mr. Speaker, that they are prepared to testify before a royal commission but how can they testify if the royal commission is limited to any activity in the Toronto area?

The second point is this, Mr. Speaker, is it only coincidence that violence has started only since certain lathing firms or companies have moved into the Ottawa area? The member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) would recognize some of these names here. They were very easy to obtain, as all one had to do was call the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations and get the officers of some of these companies. For instance, recently a firm called Cesaroni Bros. moved into the Ottawa area and violence followed shortly afterwards. Who is the head of Cesaroni? The president of Cesaroni, of course, is Mr. Samuel Cesaroni.

Another firm moved into the Ottawa area a short while ago—Durable Driwall Ltd. Again a name that was mentioned in this house by the member for High Park. This gentleman here, the president of this firm, happened to be one Siduel Romanelli.

Another member who's out recruiting very strongly in the Ottawa area these days, and pushing his weight around with the unions, is one Mr. Gus Simone. But apparently the

government, in spite of all its research, according to the Throne Speech, was not aware of any of these activities.

The union officials went on to say that they had informed the member for Ottawa South, the present Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett); but he goes on to say, "Well, no, I have not heard anything about this." That is surprising, because since the member for Ottawa South's entry into this House he has become a power in Ottawa. He is the giver and the maker of all good things emanating from the Conservative Party. He is called "the boy wonder" in the Ottawa area. And yet he knows nothing about this. Maybe we should have a new nickname for this particular minister and call him something like "the ostrich."

There was also mention in the article that the Ottawa Housing Corp. projects were nesting grounds for these people, that they were using this type of project to further their own means. Apparently the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) is not aware of this.

They go on to say—and I have discussed this with lawyers representing some of these firms—that they have extreme difficulty every time they appear before the Ontario Labour Relations Board to discuss some of these factors. Apparently the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) is not aware of this. The Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) says that CISO is aware of everything that is going on in the province. Apparently he was not aware of this, because it would no thave been a limitation in the Throne Speech, and so on.

So I say very simply, Mr. Speaker, there is a theory called wilful blindness, and I am suggesting that the approach taken, at least in the Throne Speech, would seem to indicate that on the part of the government they are not looking around themselves. If they had decided to establish this commission at the time that it was required, some three years ago, likely they could have limited it to the Toronto area—

Mr. Speaker: The time has now expired.

Mr. Roy: —but this was not the case.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I say simply that we on this side will oppose any terms of reference which will limit this commission to this particular industry and will also oppose it if they limit it to the Toronto area. We want it right across the province and we want it for the building industry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister may now have five minutes to reply if he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I doubt that it will take quite that long, on the assumption of course that this doesn't extend the time to the member from Grey-Bruce, who I am sure will be inhibited by the five minutes that he is allocated.

I would just state, Mr. Speaker, with respect, that I think really this was answered — and obviously the hon. member from Ottawa East didn't feel it was sufficient— when I observed to the Leader of the Opposition that while the Throne Speech set out the fact that we would have a royal commission, it did refer specifically to Metropolitan Toronto because I think it's fair to state that the discussions in the past two or three years have generally centred around this. I think I also made it clear in answer to both the Leader of the Opposition, and I believe to the member for High Park, that the terms of reference were in the process of being drafted. We did not want to inhibit or limit the activities of the commission; at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think it's proper to observe that we don't want the commission to embark on any sort of witch-hunt. I will take note of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis —what the hon. member has said. I tried to express this in the House the other day, that from the government standpoint—and really I hope this represents the views of the members opposite— we want to see the royal commission try to deal with specifics and come up with specific answers if at all possible. I am not saying at this moment that the suggestion of Ottawa, Hamilton and so on, Mr. Speaker, doesn't make sense; it may very easily. I think the point that has to be made here is that the terms of reference will be made public and the members in the House will obviously have an opportunity to comment upon them; and I say with respect, Mr. Speaker, I think this is what was implied in my observations to both the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce asked why the terms of reference of crime commissions should not be extended to Queen's Park. He may speak to this for five minutes.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a good idea to have the "untouch-

ables" on the carpet. It's a gimmick we should have had a few years ago. I'm thinking now that—

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds like padding; the hon. member can't fill five minutes that way.

Mr. Sargent: Well, we'll see.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Premier for coming. I didn't think he'd show up today, but I sincerely welcome him.

Mr. MacDonald: More padding. Let's get to the substance!

Mr. Sargent: Each day, Mr. Speaker, as events unfold, as a wee bit of the lid comes off, the people of Ontario are beginning to realize just what kind of a gang is running affairs at Queen's Park. Everywhere we look, every day, we have signs of corruption, waste, deceit and fraud.

I think of the story—

Mr. MacDonald: Here comes more padding!

Mr. Sargent: —about the fellow who asked the doctor what he should give a girl who has everything. The doctor said, "Penicillin." At this point, I think anything would help this government.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Montreal is spending $3 million to investigate organized crime—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): And that's a witch-hunt!

An hon. member: He's getting nowhere.

Mr. Sargent: If there's any place where crime is organized, Mr. Speaker, it's right here in Queen's Park. This is organized crime. On March 20 we had the opening of the House. We had a full-dress performance of who's who in Ontario filing past "the godfather" over here—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Who wrote that?

Mr. Sargent: He gave a performance that would put Marlon Brando to shame. Here was "smilin' Billy" shaking hands and giving his blessing to all the contractors and developers who have made fortunes at Queen's Park. And they stood in line for two hours to pay homage to "the godfather."

I ask the Premier, in the very brief time I have allotted to me, what right he has as leader of the Conservative Party to use the business contracts of the people of Ontario to raise money? What right does he have to do that? This business belongs to the people of Ontario, and the Premier sends his men out to put those guys on a list because they do business with the people of Ontario. What right does he have to do that?

As recently as three weeks ago, the Conservatives' Mr. Kelly approached an engineer with a large firm, which had a contract pending with the government; and the price tag was $50,000, the same as the Fidinam affair.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): How about Keith Davey?

Mr. Sargent: Is this going on 365 days a year? Is it an ongoing affair?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Who was this?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Premier expect us to believe—

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Name the company!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He really hasn't got a name!

Mr. Drea: Name the company!

Mr. Sargent: Does he expect us to believe—

Mr. Drea: Name the company!

Mr. Sargent: —that he is not informed about who gives what? Does he expect us to believe that?

An hon. member: Yes!

Mr. Drea: Name the company!

Mr. Sargent: The Progressive Conservative Party is reported to have raised $5 million or $6 million. The Premier has never denied the amount. The press says that is the amount.

Mr. Lewis: And he kept two-thirds of it for his own personal use!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I'm spending it every day!

Mr. Sargent: If the $50,000 deal with Fidinam is a relatively minor concern, what does the Premier expect us to believe happens in the really big areas of buildings and highways?

Mr. Drea: How did the member get his liquor licence?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, does the Premier expect us to believe that the other $4,950,000 was raised by legal methods? Each and every contribution would be a criminal activity if it was the same as Fidinam.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has 60 seconds left.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: He'd better get to the point!

Mr. Drea: That makes 50.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Premier agree, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: That's 45.

Mr. Sargent: —that if he made a full disclosure of how he raised the other $4,950,000, it would reveal criminal actvity, as my colleague from Ottawa tried to prove—

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. Drea: How did the member raise his money?

Mr. Sargent: —to prove it was a criminal activity would bring down this government immediately. If the people knew what was going on—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Ask him about Moog and the Ontario Hydro.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the Premier's failure to have a full scale royal commission, and his decision to conduct the investigation himself is an admission, I say to you sir, of fear of the results in taking the lid off.

Mr. Speaker: Time's expired!

Mr. Sargent: This Telex here—

Mr. Speaker: Time has expired.

Mr. Sargent: —is a glaring admission.

Mr. Speaker: Time has expired.

Mr. Sargent: I ask you then in closing, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: Five minutes have expired.

Mr. Sargent: In closing I say—

Mr. Speaker: Five minutes have expired.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot close, Mr. Speaker, if you won't let me.

Mr. Speaker: Five minutes have expired. The Premier may reply to the extent of five minutes if he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think really to dignify some of the observations of the hon. member from Grey-Bruce with a reply would be really offensive, both to me and my colleagues, and I would like to think, with some respect, to some of his own colleagues—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, I will reply to one or two other observations. He did ask a question which was not part of this debate, but he was asking as to the legal firm that looked after the legal work in the negotiation or finalization as between the Workmen's Compensation Board and Fidinam. I assume he meant the Workman's Compensation Board. I am informed that it was the firm of McCarthy and McCarthy; I think a firm with a very excellent reputation—

Mr. MacDonald: What are their politics?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They are good Grits.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —here in the metropolitan area. Now that is information, Mr. Speaker, that I did say I would give to the hon. member; and he has it.

To deal with the question raised, there is just no intent—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That's the end of that one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —on the part of the government to have a royal commission. I say with respect, as I recall the observations of the member from Ottawa East—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. Premier is replying to the second question. The hon. Premier has five minutes further to speak to the second question sir.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I say with respect, Mr. Speaker that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce referred to observations made by the member from Ottawa East to which I was going to refer in reply to the member from Grey-Bruce—

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Premier say that again!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —because he quoted the member from Ottawa East as suggesting certain things that, as I understood it, were observations made last fall by the member from Ottawa East. He referred to some form

of inquiry which was conducted, Mr. Speaker, by very competent law officers of the Crown; people in whom I have, and I say with respect, the public has confidence.

Mr. Reid: A new Henry VIII!

Hon. Mr. Davis: And it was determined after their investigation, without any question Mr. Speaker, that there was no evidence of any criminal offence. And I would say to the member from Grey-Bruce, when it comes to the financing of political parties I think I was the first one in this House to come to grips with the essence of the complexity of financing political parties; and that was the determination, as a matter of policy, that we would have disclosure. I say with respect, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —it was never a position put forward by the Liberal Party in the Province of Ontario—

An hon. member: The government was caught with its hands in the till.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and it was never a position of policy adopted by the federal Liberal Party as it relates to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The Pontius Pilate of politics!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we will come to grips with what I think is the basic element in election reform. We will come to grips with this.

I say to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that the way the Progressive Conservative Party raises funds in this province is within the law. I will say this, without any specific knowledge, I would think that there are many companies and corporations that contribute to his party, maybe not in equal amounts but certainly—

Mr. Bullbrook: We don't give them contracts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on! To try to wind up my brief reply—

Mr. Roy: What reply?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —we have no intention of extending — as I think the member's question was—the terms of reference related to the construction industry to any matters related to political finance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce had asked the question:

> Will the premier advise why he will not call at once a royal commission on the Fidinam affair, to furnish lists of donors and if they have government contacts, with powers to subpoena; and why he has for a second time refused to name the legal firm having the multimillion-dollar deal, and who received the finder's fee.

That was the hon. member's second question, to which he may now speak for five minutes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Any organized crime must have complete co-operation of the government in any area—

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Federally too.

An hon. member: Is the member for Grey-Bruce speaking from experience?

Mr. Sargent: —and the most ardent supporter of this should be the Premier of this province. He mentions the fact that he brought about full disclosure. Not until he got caught with his pants down did he do that—not until.

Mr. MacDonald: That's when you get full disclosure.

Mr. Sargent: I say it is a cowardly way of doing it—why doesn't he admit that he was caught?

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of personal privilege, that was never the kind of disclosure I contemplated. Mr. Speaker, that should probably not appear in Hansard.

Mr. MacDonald: It is what you call a Stanfield revelation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have great loyalty to my federal leader, but I have to confess that it would not be demonstrated in that way.

Mr. Sargent: Is this on my time, Mr. Speaker?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, our system here is corrupted by the people who put up finan-

cial contributions to get officeholders elected. The biggest improvement we could make to democratize our society, it seems to me, is to arrange for public financing of politcal campaigns. Right now, each elected official has two constituencies—his money constituency and his voting constituency. He can't even get the money to reach his voting constituency until he has satisfied his money constituency that he is going to look after its interests.

Mr. Drea: The member should speak for himself only.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Now Mr. Speaker, the Fidinam affair—

Mr. Drea: Why doesn't he tell us how he gets his millions?

An hon. member: Legally!

Mr. Sargent: I owe a million. I don't have any; I owe it.

Mr. Reid: Not doing business with the government, I can tell the member.

Mr. Sargent: This company, Mr. Speaker, got a $10 million loan with a $1.4 million lease over 20 years—an unknown company—and for this it donated $50,000 to the Premier's election pot.

Now, Mr. Thompson, the man in charge of the investment, said he didn't know who put the deal through. I maintain this; he told me this.

These funds, Mr. Speaker, are trust funds and not tax dollars, and by law they can't be lent out on this type of investment. But they were anyway. When you can get Hydro bonds paying 9.5 per cent, why would you lend this kind of loan unsecured at 10 per cent?

The bagman, Mr. Kelly, works out of an unmarked office downtown here. He works from a list of firms having contracts with the government. He makes the deals based on the size of the contracts. The cheques are made payable to him. Is that right, I ask the Premier? The cheques are made payable to him, is that right? The Premier doesn't know?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have no idea.

Mr. Drea: Has the member donated?

Mr. Sargent: If he wanted to give us a complete and unbiased, fair answer to this—

Mr. Speaker: Sixty seconds.

Mr. Sargent: Sixty seconds? I am just starting.

The Premier says he doesn't know who gives what, or doesn't want to know. Well surely someone must know, and I charge that the Premier, as the head of that party, has been engaged in pretty close to criminal activity by this type of operation.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will kindly withdraw that remark.

Mr. Sargent: All right. I said "alleged." By golly, we could prove it if the government opened the books. How did it raise $4,950,000? Was Fidinam the only crooked deal it had? Was that the only one?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Only $5 million out of the contract?

Mr. Speaker: The time has expired.

Mr. Sargent: Who is the government trying to kid?

Mr. Speaker: The Premier may reply if he wishes for five minutes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think, with great respect, a certain amount of what the hon. member said was repetitious. My observations, made earlier, that parts of it should not be really dignified with some form of reply would also bear repetition.

I would only say I listened with some interest and I really sensed a very distinct degree of hypocrisy. I would just repeat to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that I happen to be very proud of the party I lead. I make no apologies for the way we have conducted the affairs of the party. I think it is a credit to the party and the people of this province.

Mr. Sargent: A lot of people in Ontario don't believe that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, whether the member for Grey-Bruce believes it or not, it happens to be factually the case.

Mr. Speaker: This completes the special time allotment for this particular period. I now deem the motion that the House adjourn to have been carried.

The House adjourned at 5:43 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Quarterly report on financial status, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 211

Status of health official, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Lewis 212

Ottawa health centre, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon 213

Ontario Hydro head office, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 214

Tax credit for machinery, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 215

Appointment of women to arbitration panel, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon 216

Support for physiotherapy interns, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Campbell .. 217

Licensing income tax consultants, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Roy .. 218

Milk price increase, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. MacDonald, Mr. R. F. Nixon 218

Ryerson radio station, questions of Mr. McNie: Mrs. Scrivener, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy 221

Elizabeth Gardens project, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Bounsall 221

Testing of medical students, question of Mr. McNie: Mr. Shulman 222

Tabling report, standing committees of the House, Mr. Henderson 223

Motion for interim supply, Mr. White, agreed to 223

Ontario Bureau of Statistics Act, bill intituled, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 228

Charitable Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading 228

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lewis 228

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Kerr, agreed to 251

Motion to adjourn 251

Debate re answers to oral questions, Mr. Roy, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Davis 251

Adjournment agreed to 257

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 8



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Wednesday, March 28, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY CENTRES

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I have a short statement. After reviewing the submissions made by a number of municipalities regarding the termination of grants under the Community Centres Act to municipalities with more than 25,000 population I am pleased to announce that his restriction has been lifted. Municipalities with more than 25,000 population will be contacted on an individual basis regarding applications that have already been made.

I should also like to announce that a new pre-approval system will be introduced for new projects as of March 29, 1973. In this regard, municipalities would need to obtain approval of their projects if they wished to obtain a provincial grant. Approvals and the resulting grants will be based on an assessment of municipal needs and resources.

All municipalities will be notified without delay of the new procedures and will be provided with the necessary forms. I should like to assure the hon. members and municipalities that projects which have already been started or completed prior to March 29, 1973, will be considered according to existing legislation and regulations.

NAMING OF TOWNSHIPS IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to inform the members of the assembly that the Ministry of Natural Resources has prepared the way for the naming of 358 numbered and lettered townships in northern Ontario.

An all-party committee under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes), my parliamentary assistant, has been appointed to supervise the application of these names. Assisting my parliamentary assistant will be the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes), the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith), the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot) and the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane).

I am happy to report that qualified staff within my ministry have been and are being found to assist in the task of researching material dealing with the history of the areas concerned; the circumstances regarding dates, surveyors, decisions, etc.; information on the types of records and plans involved; names of officials and members in office responsible for the original surveys; and information on topography, geology and other distinctive features within the townships to be named.

Though its proper role in this programme is strictly advisory, the Ontario Geographic Names Board has provided us with much of our present information. Although they are the statutory authority in the province for the provision and maintenance of names for geographical features and other unincorporated populated places, and thus not responsible for geographical townships, they are prepared to accept, provided no problems of duplication are encountered, all names provided for the unnamed townships by the committee.

The names shall be drawn from the lists in the proposal submitted to the policy field committee, which includes:

1. Names of members of the legislative assembly, approximately 60 in number.

2. Names of chiefs from Indian bands, approximately 60.

3. Names of mayors and reeves from northern Ontario, approximately 175.

An hon. member: Does the minister think they'll name one after him?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: These lists will be updated and verified by the committee—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Leo the Lion township!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and their work should be completed within six months.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That should ensure their support for a considerable time.

ACID SPILL AT DUNNVILLE PLANT

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a brief statement concerning the explosion and resulting acid spill at the Electric Reduction Co. of Canada's Dunnville plant. The explosion took place at approximately 2 p.m. yesterday when the acid was being transferred from a tank truck to a storage tank. Eight hundred tons of sulphuric acid were lost. The blast ruptured another tank containing 80 tons of bunker C oil and seriously injured two company maintenance men and the truck driver.

Ministry of the Environment staff were immediately sent to the scene and a news release was prepared and distributed by late afternoon. Initial reports indicated that a considerable quantity of the acid had reached the Grand River. This proved to be unfounded. Investigations by my staff showed that the spill was contained on company property and a cleanup and neutralization programme was put into effect under the direction of the industrial waste branch.

A dike has been constructed to prevent the acid from moving and neutralization began almost immediately. The sulphuric acid was between 75 and 90 per cent pure, and additional ministry staff will be sampling both surface and ground water to determine if there has been any adverse effect on the environment in that connection.

The Grand River is being monitored as well as the area adjacent to the Dunnville water treatment plant which is 2½ miles from the scene. Latest reports show that the situation is well under control and there is no present danger of contamination of the river. Testing in the area will continue and a Ministry of the Environment industrial waste branch representative will be on hand to ensure that the containment and cleanup are carried out to our satisfaction.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, last night at the Academy Awards in Hollywood, Marlon Brando did not accept his award for "The Godfather," so I'd like to present this trophy to the Premier (Mr. Davis) with the high regard of the contractors and developers of Ontario.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, like the recipient last evening, on behalf of the public of the Province of Ontario, which we happen to represent on this side of the House, I return this very delightful award to the member for Grey-Bruce to remember that fact in the years to come.

An hon. member: The member deserves it.

Mr. Lewis: Now can we have a statement on Indian affairs?

An hon. member: That backfired on him!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): The Premier was very nice; he didn't tell him what to do with it!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: That really hurts.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ONTARIO HYDRO HEAD OFFICE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Premier if he would obtain from Ontario Hydro copies of the unsuccessful proposals that were submitted to Hydro with regard to the building of the new headquarters, and table those proposals in the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to discuss this with Hydro. The proposals, I would gather, are relatively complex in the evaluation. Perhaps some better method might be found for the Leader of the Opposition and others who wish to look at the system and the evaluations. I say, with respect, that perhaps just a tabling would not in itself solve the problem. I certainly would not undertake to do this but certainly I will discuss this with the chairman of Hydro.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: If the Premier will undertake to table them, I will undertake to ask for further assistance in the evaluation, if we feel it is necessary.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Will he comment on charges made by Pollution Probe at a press conference today that he, as the minister in charge of the environment, has stated that landfill is the answer for solid waste disposal, and that Pickering and

Port Hope should resign themselves to this solution? Would he further comment on the charges made by Pollution Probe, which is evidently represented on the minister's Solid Waste Task Force, that the task force has not met for almost 10 weeks, although there is a nine months mandate for the task force; that in fact the leadership of the task force has ignored the terms of reference and has not come to grips with any sort of discussion of the disposal of solid wastes; and, further, that the paid industry representatives on the task force dominate the discussion, if not in numbers, at least in their influence?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Speaker, I just happen to have with me a copy of the speech that I made on Monday—I won't read it all, unless the hon. member would like me to. Here is what I said on page 4—I had been talking about packaging and the fact that there was a lot of it and it was adding a lot to the solid waste stream:

> First, I believe that the best possible way of dealing with waste disposal is to have all waste recycled if at all possible, and this is the long-term goal of the provincial government: to try to generate interest and develop methods which will ensure that this becomes a reality.

I also said that because of the time frame facing Metro, and despite the activities they are already undertaking in a preliminary way to look into some sort of separation and reclamation, the sanitary landfill method was inevitable—they have about 11 or 12 months of space left. I said that in many parts of the province sanitary landfill was going to be the only solution for a number of years because of geography, volume and a whole host of economic reasons.

I also indicated some of the things that my ministry is doing and is proposing to do in the field of research and experimentation on uses of garbage other than simply sticking it back in the land.

As far as the Solid Waste Task Force is concerned, the task force was set up in November, and I have had a number of meetings with the whole force, although I couldn't say when the last meeting of the task force itself was held. But I do know that the first two tasks that I asked the force to undertake were to take a look at beverage containers and at milk containers.

The chairman of the task force told me last Friday that he thought the working groups, which are made up of people within and without the industries that would be affected and who are knowledgeable, would be reporting by the end of May as far as beverage containers are concerned, and probably before that as far as milk containers are concerned.

I am sure that there are many different opinions being expressed by those working groups, because they are made up of consumers, Pollution Probe, the bottlers, the can people, the paper people and a whole variety of interests who have made representations in the past. Now, I trust, they are cross-examining each other on the statements they are making, and presumably are going to make some recommendations to the task force, which will in turn make recommendations to me.

As far as the solid waste part is concerned, which is the biggest single problem and in my opinion the one that will take the longest to resolve, I believe the working group is in the process of being put together. It will be a larger one; it will have a lot of technical people on it. I would assume that they will be reporting from time to time, but I would be misleading myself as well as everybody else if I said that I expected they were going to come up with definite, perfect solutions in a short time. I would hope that they will have some suggestions and recommendations to make to us for specific areas in the field of reclamation, but my expectation is that they will be meeting for some time to try to give us some additional assistance on what is a North American problem and for which there is no simple solution at the present time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the minister would make it clear whether or not the task force has met in the last 10 weeks; and what is the difference between the task force and what he chooses to call the working group? Is the working group some special group from the task force?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can't say when the whole task force has met, because I just received a copy of the press release from Pollution Probe, which I gather it issued this morning. I haven't had an opportunity to get in touch with the chairman of the task force and find out when the full task force last met. But I do know that the working group contains some members of the task force and people who are not on the task force but represent industry and consumers—a broad spectrum.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong this, and I have difficulty hearing the minister, but why expand the

task force in such a peculiar way to include those people from the industry, when the industry is already well represented on the task force?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, it was the task force itself which recommended to me that it set up working groups in the specific fields, because there are different issues involved in, for example, the fairly narrow beverage container field as compared to the whole field of solid waste.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Pending something definite from them, the minister is going to continue with his attitude that the municipalities east of Toronto might as well prepare themselves to receive garbage?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker. Again I will—

Mr. Lewis: The member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers) wouldn't hear of it.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): I am listening.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That is a change.

Mr. Lewis: That is the first time he has stood up for his people in a long time.

Mr. Carruthers: I stand up for them every day and the member for Scarborough West tries to run them down.

Mr. Lewis: Don't get excited now.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I would really enjoy having an opportunity to read parts of this speech to you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wish the minister would speak up so we can hear him.

Mr. Lewis: There is a seat that would make a good by-election—Durham.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am now reading, Mr. Speaker, from page 14.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How many pages has the minister got?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is triple-spaced; it isn't that long.

> For all of these reasons [and I won't give those—those are two more pages before that] I must support the acquisition by Metro of space suitable for sanitary landfill. I must also support the action taken by Metro in obtaining proposals for the rail haul of waste.

I had said earlier I was supporting the proposal that had been made to them, I believe by one of the paper companies, for a form of separation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Surely the minister is going to stop it until the task force reports?

Hon. Mr. Auld: To continue from the speech:

> However, there are two major qualifications to this support. I must distinguish between support in principle of the need to acquire landfill sites, and approval for the use of specific sites wherever they are located. Before any particular site is approved, all the procedures laid down in the Environmental Protection Act must be followed, including public hearings before the Environmental Hearing Board.
>
> I can state quite categorically that under no circumstances will any site be approved where valid objections have been raised which cannot be overcome by changes in design or operation of the site, or if the requirements of the Act and regulations cannot be met.
>
> My support also might be qualified by the proviso that I shall expect Metro to do everything in their power to initiate other more sophisticated techniques when we consider these are practicable.

I went on to mention the two things that Metro presently is doing for its proposed Bermondsey site, one of which is to get the crushing equipment which will be required before separation takes place, and the other is certain other projects that it proposes to initiate there.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East, a supplementary.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Before the task force report, and in view of the concern of the employees and the manufacturers of the non-returnable products, why has the minister made such positive statements as, "Strong leadership will be taken in this field so that we will cut down as much as possible on one-way disposable cartons. That will include cans, bottles and plastic containers."? Why was the minister so positive in his position?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I was simply repeating what I said in other places at other times, that there is a great and growing amount of solid waste being generated, and that if any parts of that can be reduced at the source I think we ought to do so by whatever method.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay, a supplementary.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Would the minister consider making use of the facilities, the resources and the expertise of the Ontario Research Foundation to find out ways of recycling, rather than damaging our environment with landfill sites right across the province?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Good question.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I should take the time of the House to go into the various methods and things that we have been doing in the solid waste field since we got into it two years ago. In those specific areas where the ORF can be of assistance, we use them. As a matter of fact, this year we've used them on about two occasions dealing with private waste disposal systems which they can evaluate.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: We've had a reasonable number of supplementaries.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: We have had a reasonable number of supplementaries.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let's take one from the government side.

An hon. member: Let's not!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Come on, you shouldn't discriminate against a government member fighting for his life.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) would like me to be unreasonable, but I don't buy that.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No more questions at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

RECYCLING SUBSIDIES

Mr. Lewis: A question related to this matter but slightly different, I think: How much money is the government now spending on direct subsidy of recycling programmes?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I might be wrong, but I would say none other than—no, there is one—

Mr. Lewis: Well, that's a pretty positive programme.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Burlington, 45,000.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, there is nobody who is doing recycling in that sense.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I see, I see!

Mr. Givens: On a point of privilege—

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is one grant we made to Kanata for Pollution Probe.

Mr. Speaker: Order. A point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: Well, by way of supplementary.

Mr. Givens: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: By all means.

Mr. Givens: The minister says that nobody's doing recycling. May I inform the minister that I am the vice-president of a company that recycles 250 tons of paper a day. The name of the company is Atlantic Packaging Co., on Progress Ave.

Mr. Speaker: That's no point of privilege. No point of privilege.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: Why is the minister so pessimistic about recycling when it is being done right now? He is not helping it at all.

An hon. member: He doesn't know anything about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Givens: He doesn't even know anything about it.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): The member for York-Forest Hills has a conflict.

Mr. Lewis: All he's asking for is a forgivable loan.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Givens: We do it every day, seven days a week.

Mr. Foulds: The government are experts on recycling. It keeps coming out in the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Auld: In reply to the—

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister is on his feet replying. Will the hon. member for Grey-Bruce please wait his turn?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is this the minister's Throne Speech?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: All right.

Hon. Mr. Auld: In reply to what I assume was the question from the hon. member for York-Forest Hill—

Mr. Lewis: That was a point of privilege, not a question.

Mr. Speaker: I'm waiting for him to finish his answer, then you're next on a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —I'm quite aware that there's been a company recycling papers in Toronto for 22 years.

Mr. Lewis: What is he talking to?

Mr. Speaker: Well, is he not completing his answer?

Mr. Deans: It wasn't even a question, it was a point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I ruled the hon. member for York-Forest Hill out of order because he certainly had no point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Speaker: It was my impression the hon. minister was still continuing to reply to the hon. member's—

Mr. Lewis: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. minister is finished, then the hon. member for Scarborough West has a supplementary and he's in order. He may ask it.

Mr. Lewis: His reply was quite succinct, Mr. Speaker. It finished after the word "none." Now I, therefore, have a supplementary.

How is the minister going to prevent the pockmarking of the landscape of Ontario with landfill sites until he ploughs major amounts of money into recycling projects which do exist, or into the government undertaking a public recycling?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I'll send the hon. member a copy of my speech.

Mr. Speaker: The hon.—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Is the minister aware—

Mr. Lewis: The minister has given up on this and he has committed himself to solid waste disposal landfill. The member for Durham will lose his seat because of it and I am worried about him.

Mr. Carruthers: The member for Scarborough West doesn't have to worry about me.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that the large firm Black Clawson-Kennedy Ltd. in Owen Sound is the largest manufacturer of recycling equipment and it is building it for major cities in the United States? Is he aware of that?

Mr. Lewis: There is great self-interest here today.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the company, which has been in the business of manufacturing equipment for the manufacture of paper for, I think, 50 or 60 years—

Mr. Good: And he isn't interested.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am aware of the pilot project which they undertook in Franklin, Ohio. I am aware of the fact that they are building their first—

Mr. Deans: Where is the Ontario government pilot project?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —full-sized plant someplace in Long Island. I am aware of the fact that they are discussing with Metro a proposal whereby they will build a plant which will separate some materials, and I visited their plant and I have talked with their people. But they are not the largest manufacturer of recycling equipment in the world. They are building—

Mr. Johnston: We are going to separate the men from the boys. The member for Grey-Bruce is on the boys' side.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I'll send the hon. member the brochure from the company. I think I have a spare one.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Supplementary to the minister: I am sure the minister is aware of the pilot project at Queen's University to do with the composting of solid waste and I understand that this project is foundering because of lack of funding. Has the ministry put any funds into this pilot project and does the minister think it is worthy of it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the project that Professors Brown and Clark from Queen's were proposing to the city of Kingston. In fact we indicated in the sessions with the city of Kingston and the two gentlemen, who are quite knowledgeable in this field, that we would be prepared to assist in the construction of that part of the separation operation which they wanted to build—this was not a pilot project; this was a full-scale project to look after Kingston's waste—provided that Kingston would take it over when it was completed.

There was some disagreement in the figures that we produced, and that were produced at the other end, as to the economic benefit of those materials which they could separate, and the city of Kingston decided, as I understand it, not to proceed because they felt that it was going to be too costly.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, if the minister put it to them.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? I think there have been enough supplementaries.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can the minister inform the House whether or not the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) will still be conducting the hearings regarding the disposal of solid waste, whether or not it is recycled?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member to whom the Leader of the Opposition referred is chairman of the Environmental Hearing Board which will continue to conduct hearings on proposed landfill sites as well as carry out the other duties the board has in connection with water and sewage.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is ludicrous. It is a travesty.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Isn't there obviously a conflict of interest between policy and the impartial hearings associated with the administration of that policy? Doesn't the minister see that conflict and would he not move to remove the conflict?

Mr. Deans: The member is protecting the government every day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I don't see any conflict provided—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): No more conflict than the opposition member sitting as an arbitrator.

An hon. member: The minister is whitewashing.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have every confidence in the hon. member and I don't see any conflict—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's not the point. I've got confidence in him too. I don't think he should have that job.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There was a problem we might have had, had the PP proposal for the site in the hon. member's riding taken place.

Mr. Lewis: Look at his stand on Minto township. Why has the Ministry of the Environment deteriorated so badly since the former minister left it? What happened?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

HIGHWAY LITTER SIGNS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Treasurer (Mr. White), Mr. Speaker: He was here a moment ago. He's not here now?

Then another question of the Minister of the Environment just to satisfy a matter of curiosity: Is it true that the $50-for-littering signs on the highway are being removed by his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member is talking about the signs that I assume are put up by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and deal with a section of the Highway Traffic Act having to do with littering. It is not my legislation.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions? If not, the hon. member for Essex South.

REMOVAL OF AGGREGATE FROM LAKE ERIE

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Has the ministry decided as yet whether or not to renew the licences, which expire March 31, for the taking of sand and gravel from the bed of Lake Erie by National Sand and Gravel and Erie Sand and Gravel? And does his department now think that the taking of this aggregate is contributing in any way to the erosion of the shorelines of Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the member that we have agreed with the company to extend their licence for another year on the condition that they increase their exploration in certain parts of Lake Erie. Our studies are still continuing with regard to the erosion problem of which he speaks.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, can the minister advise the House as to whether or not this will change the number of cubic yards of aggregate that will be taken from the bed of Lake Erie, and the location in relation to the tip of Point Pelee where this operation is going to be conducted?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information at my fingertips but I will get it and make sure the member is well informed.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): By way of supplementary, would the minister advise the House when, if ever, his ministry is going to adopt any of the 12 recommendations contained in the select committee report tabled in this House in 1953 in connection with erosion and lake levels?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the answer to that particular question but I will endeavour to find it.

Mr. Bullbrook: A supplementary: Is the minister familiar with the 12 recommendations made in 1953? Why wasn't anything done to implement them in the intervening 20 years?

An hon. member: Twenty-one years!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am not totally familiar with all the recommendations but I will make myself well informed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

INCREASES IN PRICES OF HOUSES

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the minister responsible for housing.

An hon. member: Which minister is that?

Mr. Lewis: The apologist for housing.

Mr. Shulman: We wonder sometimes. Is the Minister of Revenue aware that the price of housing in this province, both under HOME and outside HOME, has risen between 20 and 30 per cent in the last eight weeks? Is the minister taking any action to control at least the price of housing under HOME and if so, what is he doing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, Mr. Speaker, we have always controlled the price of housing under the HOME plan. I don't know why the hon. member is—

Mr. Shulman: Why the tremendous increase in prices in the last two months?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Under the HOME plan?

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There hasn't been a tremendous increase in price. We have just recently considered a slight increase in price because we couldn't get any builders to build. Some of them, indeed, have abandoned—

Mr. Lewis: The government offered them the money. It increased their prices. There is no end to its dealing. It is such a ripoff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If it is such a ripoff, why aren't they all grabbing it?

Mr. Lewis: Some of them are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member should make up his mind. It is either too good or isn't good enough.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the government build its own houses?

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the government do something?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The opposition has all the answers but none of them is practical.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the government try it?

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. minister finished with his reply?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member asked me a question and I am trying hard to answer him, if his colleagues would give me an opportunity. I was pointing out that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister is replying to the hon. member for High Park, not the member for Wentworth. The hon. member for Wentworth is prolonging it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because of the limitations imposed by OHC on the prices for which the developer or builder was able to sell his houses to the public and because this price had not been increased for two or three years. I think it was, some of them, in fact, abandoned the houses because they could not build them profitably. Some, indeed, lost money on them so we are increasing the prices accordingly. I think they went up by some $1,200 or $1,600.

Mr. Lewis: That's very useful to middle-income earners.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park still has a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is very useful! It is better to get houses built for $1,600 more than no houses at all.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure that is true. It is better to be a developer and get $1,600 more.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary: In view of the tremendous increase in prices both within and without HOME amounting to over 30 per cent in some cases—and I have the statistics here if the minister wishes them—is he considering putting any ceiling or making any effort to prevent this continued rapid rise?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows perfectly well, except insofar as it deals with those matters which Ontario Housing Corp. is able to deal with—that is those buildings and those operations which it helps finance and those which it builds on its own—we have absolutely no power to do what the hon. member is talking about. That is, that we should have the power to impose ceilings on prices for housing. We don't have that power, sir.

Mr. Deans: The minister is part of the problem, not part of the solution.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Except—

Mr. Lewis: The minister has the power to give the builders money but not to control it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —where we provide the funds, as I have just told the hon. member, and he knows perfectly well what I am saying, and where we have some control over the lending of funds or where we do the building on our own, there we have the power to control the price at which these houses are sold and at which the units are sold, and we do control it. On the others we have no control.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre is entitled to the next supplementary.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Does the minister provide any control over the fast buck increase in the price of land or does he just control the increase in the price of building the house itself?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have no control over the price of land, sir. The only means by which we can hope to keep the price of land down is to do as much land banking as we can, as much servicing as we can, and provide as much housing on our own as we can and lend money where it will help get housing built.

Mr. Lewis: But it never gets built.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, only about 100,000 starts in Ontario last year! Only 100,000!

Mr. Lewis: The government is still short 10,000 to 15,000 starts a year for the last five years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is probably as many as the rest of Canada. It's not a bad record.

Mr. Lewis: It's terrible.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's a pretty good record.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview was attempting to gain the floor previously.

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the—

Mr. Sargent: May I ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Singer: No.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, there are a couple —if the Liberal Party will decide which one wants the floor I'll pick one of them out.

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Singer: We have lots of questions.

Mr. Sargent: I know this is a difficult field, but is the minister aware of the NHA finance programme in Hull, Que., where they bought 300 three-bedroom homes for $11,000 per unit? It is a beautiful development. I showed it to the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) and he has apparently inspected it by now. Does the minister know about this project?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have no control over what the NHA does in the Province of Quebec. Indeed there are some things which NHA will do for other provinces which they won't do for the Province of Ontario.

An hon. member: Tell us what!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He can't get away with that kind of thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: There can only be one member on the floor at one time.

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's irresponsible!

Mr. Lewis: But out of curiosity, perhaps the minister would care to tell the House what specifically NHA is doing for the Province of Quebec to which he refers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say they were doing it for Quebec.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Caught out again, caught out again!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Check the Hansard and see what I said. If the hon. member wants—

Mr. Lewis: Just like the Ottawa Tories. Just a little artful innuendo.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member wants an example. I refer him to the questions we raised at Ottawa, at the federal-provincial conference, for example, in respect of the NHA amendments which are now being processed through the House of Commons.

Mr. Sargent: When is the minister going to resign?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member will never get an opportunity to resign, because he won't have anything from which to resign.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Pretty weak slap, that one!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The NHA amendments to a fairly large extent will not help the Province of Ontario at all, because the limitations imposed and the amount of help given do not deal realistically with what the

cost of housing is in those provinces which have large urban areas, like Metropolitan Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton and so on.

Mr. Lewis: That's debatable.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right. These things will not help the Province of Ontario. There are other instances which I will talk about before this session is over. We will have an opportunity during my estimates, presumably, to go into all of the details, and I am sure the hon. members opposite will be convinced that it would be a lot better if Ottawa provided the block funding we are talking about and let us run our own housing programme.

Mr. Deans: It would be disgraceful. This government would abuse the money.

Mr. Lewis: Another opting out.

Mr. Shulman: Inasmuch as the minister is responsible for housing in this province, and inasmuch as he says he does not have the powers to control these prices, has he considered bringing in legislation to give himself the powers to put a ceiling on these prices?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if that decision is ever made it will be announced in due time in this House.

Mr. Lewis: It will be announced by this party.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

RESIDENTIAL TAX REBATE

Mr. Good: A question of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs regarding the residential property tax credit plan: Is the minister going to correct the situation whereby people who are unable to pay their taxes in the fiscal year 1972 and pay them in 1973, who will then pay their 1973 in 1973, will be denied the $290 base amounts on which to add 10 per cent of the taxes. Is he going to correct this in view of the fact that this is a direct hardship to elderly people who have had to postpone paying their taxes, and now have municipalities, under their welfare directors, trying to arrange a rebate for them?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) would have been able to answer that!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. What steps will the provincial secretary take to ensure that all of the municipalities affected by the flooding are notified of the provincial grant programme, that apparently is available but of which many are not aware?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to believe that any are unaware. But in the absence of a direct notice to them, I think the member has got a good point. I will ensure they are all formally notified.

Mr. Deans: By way of a supplementary question, may I ask whether, in the event the municipality is not prepared to proceed on the 80-20 basis set out by the minister, if an individual homeowner can proceed and make the 20 per cent available by himself or herself?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Not under the present policy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Will the minister alter the present policy to ensure that homeowners who are affected are not unable to take part in the programme because the municipality in which they live is either unwilling or unable to provide the 20 per cent necessary?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: That is a point we haven't discussed either in the policy field or in government—but we will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview is next.

SUSPENSION OF OTTAWA POLICEMAN

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Solicitor General. Is the Solicitor General aware of the difficulty existing on the police force in Ottawa which resulted in the disciplining by suspension of a member of that police force who was a member of the anti-theft bicycle squad? Has the minister

looked into, or will he look into, the advisability of laying criminal charges in that case and not just dealing with it by a private, police disciplinary hearing?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I don't recall that item reaching my desk. I will check into the matter and take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

SUDBURY HOUSING INVESTIGATION

Mr. Martel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the minister responsible for housing. Could the Minister of Revenue indicate why two contracts from Ontario Housing Corp. were granted to Elm St. Holdings on March 20, 1972, when in fact one of the owners, one Ross A. Shouldice, through his connections with Cambrian Real Estate, had been under investigation since December, 1971 by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think that is the question the hon. member asked of one of my colleagues the other day; I made note of it, and I did get some information at the time.

I think the answer to that—and I stand to be corrected when I bring in a detailed reply to the hon. member later—is that we actually did not give a contract to the gentleman referred to after his difficulties came to light. Indeed, I think that in a particular instance since then we have refused to accept a tender by the same group, even though they were the lowest tenderer, because of the difficulties they have found themselves in.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Martel: A question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Martel: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that the contract was released to them in two parts, for senior citizens' units and family dwellings, on March 20, 1972. That would indicate—

Mr. Speaker: Is there a question in this speech?

Mr. Martel: It is coming. Four months after the investigation started—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Martel: —why—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a question? Otherwise, he will be seated.

Mr. Martel: "Why" is an interrogative word, I suspect, Mr. Speaker. Why, then, if Silhouette was not granted the original contract, was it given to Elm St. Holdings, which was part of the same corporate entity?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is somewhat of an abuse of the question period when a member gets up and asks questions requiring so much detail—

Mr. Deans: Answer the question! We don't need a lecture on the rules.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, with great respect, the hon. member is asking for details about various companies and so on.

Mr. Deans: We don't need a lecture on the rules!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Really, I think he should give notice of such a question—

Mr. Stokes: Take this as notice!

Mr. Deans: The minister makes a statement on everything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because all I can say at this time is that I will get the information and give it to the hon. member when I have it.

Mr. Lewis: Don't tell us, "with great respect."

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. minister may take it as notice.

The hon. member for Ontario South has a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

REMOVAL OF BOOKS FROM CIRCULATION

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice. I would like to know if it is true that the Metro police have actually seized "The Happy Hooker"?

An hon. member: Holy smokes!

An hon. member: No!

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have some informa-

tion that some books that were written by the lady in question—

An hon. member: She's no lady!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —have been ordered off the bookstore shelves in Metro Toronto—

Mr. Lewis: No! Is that true? In Metro Toronto? Not really!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and the books have been labelled as obscene under the Criminal Code and the police have asked the distributors to—

Mr. Reid: So is the Provincial Auditor's report.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —stop the sale of these books and the distributors are co-operating.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! It would help a great deal if the hon. members would immediately indicate to the Chair whether or not they have a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has one first.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, does the minister believe that the police should decide what is or is not obscene? Should not their proper action have been to lay a charge if they believe that there actually was an obscenity here? What right do they have to tell the distributors that they may not sell a certain book?

An hon. member: None!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): What's the matter, didn't the member for High Park get a copy?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: My information is that the police have indicated to the distributors that they feel those books are in breach of the section of the Criminal Code; and unless the books are in some way removed—carted away, trucked away—charges will be laid under the Criminal Code.

Mr. Shulman: Blackmail, that's all it is.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The government is prejudging the issue.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has a supplementary.

Mr. Singer: Could the Provincial Secretary for Justice tell us if he believes the police have power to label something as pornographic under the Code? Doesn't the minister agree with me that that labelling can only be done after a trial in court and after charges are laid? Why does the minister misinform the House?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I'm not misinforming the House, Mr. Speaker; I'm just saying the police have indicated to the distributors that if the books are not removed, charges will be laid. I am not indicating—

Mr. MacDonald: That's a threat.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I'm not saying that the charges would hold—

An hon. member: Who did?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —or there are grounds for laying the charges. I'm just relaying for the information of the House that this was the information passed to me at about 2 o'clock, that this is what the police are doing. I'm not condoning it, or agreeing or disagreeing with it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Drea: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has a supplementary.

Mr. Drea: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May the decent members of the House expect that the minister will issue a commendation to the police for the beginning of a long overdue cleanup of smut in Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: The decent members of the House?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West has got a supplementary.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I haven't got a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No supplementary? The hon. member for Riverdale has a supplementary.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Does the Provincial Secretary for

Justice not consider that a police threat to lay charges if an act does not take place, is not answered by the minister saying that he doesn't approve or condone or comment upon it? Isn't he required to take some initiative to stop that kind of threat?

An hon. member: To discipline the people.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the hon. member is indicating that what I have told is in fact a threat. My information is that the police have indicated to the distributors—

Mr. MacDonald: Sure: "Remove the books or we will charge you."

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —that in their opinion, the sale of these particular books is a breach of the Criminal Code.

Mr. Lewis: Who the hell are they, in their opinion?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As the hon. member knows, if charges are laid the local Crown attorney would be involved. Whether or not they are, reasons for the charges would be decided by the local Crown attorney in most cases.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister read the book?

Mr. Stokes: What does the minister think of the book?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: So, I would think that if the merchants or distributors do not agree with the suggestion, or with the information from the Metro police, then the charges would in all probability be laid, and the matter would be heard in court in the proper manner.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: How does the government get away with this blackmailing act?

Mr. Martel: Oh, the minister is a sanctimonious bugger!

An hon. member: After the minister spent all of those thousands of dollars on lawyers' fees.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River with a supplementary?

Mr. Reid: No, not a supplementary.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Were there supplementaries or not?

Mr. Reid: No, a new question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: That is not justice in any way.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: The minister can't believe that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I want to clarify one point. I am not saying, at this point, and I never intended to say—

Mr. MacDonald: Leave it to the member for St. Catharines.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —that the distributors or the store owners have to comply with any such edict from the police at this time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am not saying that.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, what nonsense!

Mr. MacDonald: What obfuscation!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am just saying that that particular direction has been given.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: The minister thinks he is really top drawer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Rainy River with the next question.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources, referring to the auditor's report. Will the minister table the logbooks of government aircraft under his department, as I requested of the policy minister and as my colleague, the member for Grey-Bruce, requested last year? Can the minister tell us for what reasons cabinet ministers have been using these aircraft to transport themselves and their families outside the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as the member has very correctly pointed out, this

matter was very clearly gone over during the—

Mr. Reid: Not clearly enough.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —the last session of the Legislature. If he would turn to page 4761 of Hansard he would see my reply. That decision has not changed.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The question-period time has expired.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I doubt it very much, but I'll listen to it.

Mr. Sargent: I have twice had it on the order paper, and the Premier twice has agreed to furnish the logbooks of these aircraft.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Well, he certainly has. I wonder what right he has to ignore the rights of a member of this House. When he agreed twice on the order paper—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. The hon. member does not have a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: It's a pretty good point of order, it seems to me.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Henderson, from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case sufficient:

Aradco Management Ltd. and Oak Stamping Ltd.;

City of Hamilton No. 1;

Borough of East York;

City of Hamilton No. 2;

City of St. Thomas;

Simcoe and Erie General Insurance Co.;

Reliable Life Insurance Co.;

Constitution Insurance Co. of Canada;

Town of Orangeville;

Village of Glencoe;

Borough of Scarborough;

Board of Education for the Borough of Etobicoke;

Town of Espanola;

Bridge St. United Church;

The Tillson Spur Line Railway Co.;

Town of Tillsonburg;

County of Bruce;

Compania Shell de Venezuela Ltd.

Your committee further recommends that copies of the Canadian Parliamentary Guide be purchased for distribution to members of the assembly, and that the stationery and publications allowance to members for the current session of the assembly be fixed at $600.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. J. R. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CONSTITUTION INSURANCE CO. OF CANADA

Mr. Reilly moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Constitution Insurance Co. of Canada.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BRIDGE ST. UNITED CHURCH FOUNDATION

Mr. Rollins moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Bridge St. United Church Foundation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE

Mr. Downer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Orangeville.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

EAST YORK FOUNDATION

Mr. Timbrell moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the East York Foundation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF GLENCOE

Mr. Eaton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Village of Glencoe.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, this amendment extends the definition of "highway" to include privately owned parking areas where no fee is charged for parking, such as shopping centres.

ARADCO MANAGEMENT LTD. AND OAK STAMPING LTD.

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Aradco Management Ltd. and Oak Stamping Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF BRUCE

Mr. Gaunt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the County of Bruce.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to relieve Persons from Liability in respect of Voluntary Emergency Medical and First Aid Services.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to relieve persons from liability in respect of voluntary emergency first aid or medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency.

SAFETY COMMITTEES

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the establishment of Safety Committees.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: The purpose of the bill is to provide all employees in the Province of Ontario with some voice in industrial safety matters in the province.

COUNTY OF BRUCE

Mr. Gaunt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the County of Bruce.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF ST. THOMAS

Mr. McNeil moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Forest Fires Prevention Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill of a housecleaning nature and it brings the wording of corresponding sections into line.

SIMCOE AND ERIE GENERAL INSURANCE CO.

Mr. Handleman, in the absence of Mr. Ewen, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Simcoe and Erie General Insurance Co.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

FAIR PRACTICES IN MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL SALES

Mr. Deacon moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for Fair Practices in the Sale of Motor Vehicle Fuel.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to prevent the retailer of motor vehicle fuel from misleading the consumer as to the price and origin of the motor vehicle fuel sold by him, and to ensure that the cost of promotions and giveaways shall not be a burden on the retailer.

RELIABLE LIFE INSURANCE CO.

Mr. Handleman, in the absence of Mr. Ewen, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Reliable Life Insurance Co.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TILLSON SPUR LINE RAILWAY CO

Mr. Parrott moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Tillson Spur Line Railway Co.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF TILLSONBURG

Mr. Parrott moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF ESPANOLA

Mr. Lane moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Espanola.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ETOBICOKE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. MacBeth moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Board of Education for the Borough of Etobicoke.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Crown Attorneys Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make on the bill other than that it simply changes a reference, as I understand it, to the Deputy Attorney General, and the next two bills I presume that you are going to proceed with have the same change in reference.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker we have the identical comment the Leader of the Opposition has made to the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to enter the debate on second reading of Bill 4? If, not, the hon. Attorney General.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the change is necessitated by the reorganization of the ministry. Under the Criminal Code the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for prosecution in the criminal field. The director of public prosecutions has in the past been in charge of the work of the Crown attorneys. That position has been phased out and there is now a director of Crown attorneys within the ministry.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

CROWN WITNESSES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 5, An Act to amend the Crown Witnesses Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 6, An Act to amend the Administration of Justice Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third readings upon motion:

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill 5, An Act to amend the Crown Witnesses Act.

Bill 6, An Act to amend the Administration of Justice Act.

ARBITRATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend the Arbitrations Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, as I read Bill 13, its intention apparently is to take the fixing of arbitrators' fees from the schedule in the Act and prescribe it by regulation. I presume that the intent behind this is to give a little more flexibility to the government so that they will be able to adjust the schedule of arbitrators' fees in the light of particular circumstances pertaining at the time when arbitration is in fact required.

There is, of course, our usual concern about matters being attended to by regulation rather than in the statute. More and more power it seems is being taken by government in the form of a regulatory power rather than in the form of a specific statutory enactment.

What bothers me again is whether or not the government intends at this point in time to set up different classes of arbitrators. We have no idea what the regulations are going to look like.

Is the Attorney General going to have a class A arbitrator who might get $500 today and a class D one who might get $50 a day? On what basis are the regulations going to be framed? Is it merely periodic readjustments in keeping with the cost of arbitrators, or the cost of living, or the cost of food prices, or what real reasoning is there behind this?

One could suggest that perhaps if the present schedule is out of date that the Attorney General amend the schedule. At least his amendment should be reasonable for a year's time and if at the end of that time the schedule in the printed statute is found to be outdated, the government can easily bring in an amendment.

We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the real reasoning behind this and what, in fact, the Attorney General has in mind. Has he had difficulty in getting arbitrators within the present schedule? Does he want to bargain with each one individually? If he feels that there is a good arbitrator available, does he want to be in the position to offer him a very high fee? Those are the immediate concerns that we express in relation to this bill, Mr. Speaker, and we would like to hear the Attorney General's explanation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to be in my customary mood and allow this to pass but in actual fact I can't see permitting the government to carry on with the practice which has developed in the Province of Ontario of governing by regulation until such time as there are adequate changes in the Regulations Act which will permit a close scrutiny of the regulations prior to their being put into force—and not only that, a change in the Regulations Act which will permit discussion of the principle of the change in the regulations.

Quite frankly we don't trust the government to continue the practice which seems to be getting prevalent over the last number of years in its dealings with matters of public concern. It seems to want to gather to itself, the cabinet in particular, powers which ought to be powers which are the responsibility of the Legislature. Frankly we don't think there is any justification for taking out of a public Act, and therefore out of the sphere of public debate, any matter that pertains to the expenditures of public funds or for that matter any matter which has any far-reaching implications in dealings with the public.

We feel we couldn't support taking the schedule from within the Arbitrations Act and putting it in the responsibility of the government through regulation until such time as the government does bring in amendments to the Regulations Act. The Act permits this committee, which is set up by statute, to meet regularly—in fact, not only permits it but makes it necessary for this committee to meet regularly and to review all of the regulations which are being suggested by this government, and to pass comment on the regulations both in terms of the content of the regulation and the substance of the regulation.

We are worried. I don't know what it is that the Attorney General intends to do in regard to the amendments to the schedule. As the member for Downsview stated, neither does he. I don't know why the government

would feel it necessary to have the kind of power which would permit changes at random and at will. I am quite satisfied to sit in this House and to have the government bring in an amendment to the Act if it deems it necessary.

I am quite satisfied to sit in the House and to hear the government explain why it feels it necessary to raise the arbitration fees. I am not convinced that the arbitration fees as set out in schedule B are, in fact, out of line but if they are, tell us why they are.

If it is unreasonable that a person who should sit for not less than six hours should be entitled to receive up to $100 but not less than $50—if the government considers that unreasonable I want to assure the government that we don't consider that unreasonable. If the government says that a man who shows up for a hearing and the hearing doesn't take place should receive more than $40 I don't think and we don't think that that ought to be.

More than that, the overriding principle is that it gives this government additional powers to change things which affect the people of the Province of Ontario without us in this Legislature having an opportunity to discuss and to try to understand the reasons for it. We say to the minister that we have come to the conclusion that until such time as this government is prepared to make the necessary changes to the Regulations Act to ensure that there is adequate debate, to ensure that there is adequate perusal of all of the regulations prior to them becoming law, we don't feel that we are prepared to grant the government the additional powers it needs in order to ensure that it can make whatever changes it wants without the opportunity for the representatives of the public to be present and without the opportunity for the representatives of the public to express opinions on behalf of the public.

There is enough done by this government by order in council that directly affects, and quite often adversely affects, great numbers of people in the Province of Ontario, and there is enough done by this government by virtue of its extremely large majority in this House which is not always to the benefit of the people of the Province of Ontario. We don't think you need any additional powers in this regard and we will not support the legislation.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if I may just underline what my colleague has said in reference to the Regulations Act, this is a very good example of what our problem is with the minister's legislation and with many other kinds of legislation that are introduced into the House.

At the present time the statute is clear as to what the remuneration is, everyone in the House knows what it is and if you wanted to amend it by statute you would have to come before the House and there'd be some opportunity for views to be expressed. The Attorney General wants to take it into the regulations so that on some Saturday at some point in the distant future a regulation will be published which a few people may see, that a few practitioners in the field of arbitration may be interested in, but the vast body of the public, including substantially all of the members of the Legislature, will not see the regulation.

Now we went to very elaborate procedures a few years ago to provide for a standing committee of the Legislature and I want to make one point perfectly clear. This standing committee established under the Regulations Act is of an entirely different quality from the standing committees appointed by the Legislature each session to deal with the various matters which are referred to it by this House. This is, if there is such a thing, a statutory standing committee. But there is no regularized procedure by which that committee meets, except during the time when the House is in session, and yet regulations are published in the Ontario Gazette every Saturday throughout the year.

We consider that the statutory committee on regulations must be able to meet regularly, must be required to meet regularly by establishing its own procedures. I would suggest a meeting once a month or more often if necessary, for the purpose of considering the regulations before they are published in the Gazette and before they therefore have the force of law in the Province of Ontario.

But that is of no point, as any person who has sat on the regulations committee would be well aware. There is no point in doing that if its scope is limited only to making a very technical determination as to whether it is within the ambit of the regulatory power provided in the statute, because the section of the Regulations Act specifically states that the standing committee on regulations shall examine the regulations with particular reference to the scope and method of the exercise of delegated legislative power, but without reference to the merits of the policy or objectives to be effected by the regulations or enabling statutes, and shall deal

with such other matters as are referred to it from time to time by the assembly.

Now the restrictive connotation of the Regulations Act means that we are removing from public comment the very real essence of the matters which are dealt with in the regulations. We believe that there are matters which should not occupy the time of the assembly. But we also believe that if the standing committee had proper authority and proper power then it could deal with the merits of the matters which are dealt with in the regulations as well as dealing with the question of whether or not they are within the scope of the delegated legislative power, because they are all within the scope of the delegated legislative power except in very rare exceptions.

They are in there for two reasons. There are very skilled people in charge of the regulations and the drafting of them and the filing of them, so it is very much a marginal watchkeeping job which is done. But in addition, every statute that provides for regulatory power ends up at the end by referring to the power of the Lieutenant Governor in council to make regulations dealing with an itemized list of things "and such other things as may be necessary for the due implementation of the powers set out in the Act" or some such very generalized language.

It seems to us that a standing committee of the Legislature should have power, before the regulations are filed and become the law of the province and by regular meetings throughout the year, to deal with the kind of substituted regulatory power which the minister wants to provide in the statute.

Therefore, we consider that we are opposed to this bill and will continue to be opposed to the transfer of regulatory power out of the statutes into the regulations until such time as there is an amending provision to the standing committee on regulations which would encompass the matters I have referred to in these brief remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we will vote against the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill before the minister replies?

The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this particular bill—and I think the hon. member for Riverdale is speaking on a slightly different point—the schedule in the Arbitrations Act has not been changed for some considerable period of time.

Mr. Deans: Bring in an amendment!

Hon. Mr. Bales: We think it needs to be updated. The hon. member for Downsview suggested that we might be establishing a schedule for one person and a different schedule for another person. That, of course, would not be the case.

Mr. Singer: No, but the minister could do that. He's giving himself that power.

Hon. Mr. Bales: That would not be the case. The hon. member may say we could do it if we wished to—

Mr. Singer: Well, couldn't it be done that way if the minister wanted?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Theoretically, it could be done—

Mr. Singer: That's the power the minister is asking for!

Hon. Mr. Bales: —but it wouldn't be done that way.

Mr. Singer: But his successor might!

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Bales: This does not deal with the expenditure of public funds—and I recognize the principle on which the members opposite are speaking—the schedule sets out maximums and minimums. It does not deal with arbitrations, for example, under the Labour Relations Act. It doesn't have anything to do with that; by reason of section 37 of that Act.

But from time to time we do need to make changes in these schedules and in the fees. I think that it is good sense to provide a means whereby these schedules can be updated in a much easier and more sensible way than always bringing amendments before the Legislature of the province.

Certainly these regulations must be published and the people must see them and clearly understand them. Procedures have been taken in recent times so that the regulations get very careful scrutiny before they are passed by cabinet; and then, of course, they are published. The hon. member opposite said only a few people see them, but I take issue with that because a very large number of people see them and take careful note of the changes that are made.

Mr. Speaker, in many ways this would provide a more expeditious and a fairer way of dealing with the schedules under this Act, and for that reason the bill has been brought forward. I would move its adoption.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 13.

The House divided on the motion, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Campbell
Bales	Deans
Beckett	Edighoffer
Bernier	Ferrier
Birch	Gaunt
Brunelle	Germa
Carruthers	Gisborn
Carton	Givens
Davis	Good
Downer	Laughren
Drea	Lewis
Eaton	MacDonald
Gilbertson	Martel
Grossman	Newman
Hamilton	(Windsor-Walkerville)
Handleman	Nixon
Havrot	(Brant)
Henderson	Paterson
Hodgson	Reid
(Victoria-Haliburton)	Renwick
Irvine	Ruston
Jessiman	Sargent
Johnston	Singer
Kennedy	Smith
Kerr	(Nipissing)
Lane	Spence
Lawrence	Stokes
Leluk	Worton
MacBeth	Young—26.
Maeck	
McIlveen	
McKeough	
Meen	
Miller	
Morningstar	
Morrow	
Newman	
(Ontario South)	
Nixon	
(Dovercourt)	
Parrott	
Potter	
Reilly	
Rhodes	
Rollins	
Root	
Smith	
(Simcoe East)	
Snow	
Stewart	
Taylor	
Timbrell	
Villeneuve	
Walker	
Wardle	
Welch	
White	
Winkler	
Wiseman	
Yakabuski	
Yaremko—57.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 57, the "nays" 26.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

An hon. member: Committee!

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House?

Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CROWN ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 14, An Act to amend the Proceedings against the Crown Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I've got the explanatory note and, while I see what it says, I still don't understand it. I wonder if the minister could elaborate on the necessity for having Bill 14 and give us something more than is in the explanatory note.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill?

If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, provisions for trial and appeal of assessments similar to those in the Retail Sales Tax Act were added to the Motor Vehicle Tax Act in 1972, and consequently they do not come within the provisions of the Proceedings against the Crown Act. That change having been made, we simply make this change in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 14. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second realing of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: The first order resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough Centre.

THRONE DEBATE

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, first of all, through you, I would like to announce a change in conduct by myself in the House.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It can only be an improvement!

Mr. Drea: I am rather hopeful that the member for Grey-Bruce may follow suit.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Don't count on it.

Mr. Drea: Instead of the usual congratulations, may I commend you on the very difficult task that you have—

Mr. Sargent: Me or him—

Mr. Drea: I frankly—

Mr. Sargent: Which one?

Mr. Drea: I'm coming to the hon. member in a few minutes—commend you on the very difficult task that you have, because in the very brief time that I sat as your substitute, I now understand the complexities and the problems that are inherent with your role. Before, I will concede that I felt, like some other members of the House, that there were times when the Speaker was rather arbitrary and a little bit testy, and, frankly, from time to time—at least toward me—a little bit crabby.

I now say to you in all sincerity that having sat there, and at that particular time having to ponder in my mind the propriety of certain remarks that were being made in a debate, and, frankly, being unable to come to a conclusion on their propriety before the debate was ended, and realizing that this is a common, everyday occurrence for you, I extend my congratulations to you.

I certainly hope this session will be the most orderly, and certainly the most rules-minded, so that you will not be taxed in trying to determine whether the rules have been obeyed, or bent within a reasonable limit. I certainly commend your patience.

I know it is almost an occupational hazard to have to have patience in that seat, sir, but I think that the Speaker in this Legislature more than exemplifies the highest tradition of the office in those places where the parliamentary system has been the accepted form of government.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to depart—

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Good!

Mr. Drea: —somewhat from the ordinary remarks of an urban member because I am going to talk about my riding. I know that in the non-urban parts of the province the members do talk about their ridings. And ordinarily, in urban ridings we do not.

The reason I want to talk about my particular riding—indeed, the entire borough of Scarborough—is that I think there are some popular misconceptions about that particular borough. One of them unfortunately is that the seers of King St., the Star and the Globe and Mail, seem to be extremely condescending towards the entire borough of Scarborough. I would point out to you that my particular riding, Scarborough Centre, includes among its inhabitants—and I think this is somewhat indicative of the type of person who resides in the entire borough—that among my constituents is the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Not by choice, it just happened that way!

Mr. Drea: Well, I have a lot of suffering to do with the member, too.

Mr. Lewis: I want that understood.

Mr. Drea: We will come to the member; we will come to him.

I also have the honour to represent as a constituent the Minister without Portfolio (Mrs. Birch). I also have the honour to represent as a constituent the federal member of parliament for Scarborough East.

But I would just like to talk for a moment about Scarborough.

Mr. Deans: There are a lot of people who are disadvantaged around here.

Mr. Drea: You see, we in Scarborough are being portrayed as some kind of obscure suburbia. Nothing could be further from the truth. I think that we have an outstanding borough. I think in terms of the lifestyle in

Scarborough, and in terms of coping with the great many challenges and problems that confront us, I like to think that it is the finest of all the metropolitan boroughs and, indeed, probably the best community in this province in which to live, to work, and above all to raise a family. And I say that for a number of reasons.

In Scarborough over the years the people have literally had to raise themselves up by their own bootstraps because they do not think that, either in the beginning or right up to now, the borough receives its fair share of priorities from the Metropolitan Toronto government. In the field of transportation, certainly the western part of Metropolitan Toronto was serviced quicker and much more efficiently than Scarborough.

Indeed, I can say to my colleagues from eastern Ontario that it is getting to be my thought that eastern Ontario, in terms of priorities, somehow begins just east of Woodbine Ave. Because we in the eastern borough of Metropolitan Toronto have had to face in a great many ways exactly the same problems that they have had to face. All the development seems to be intended for the western section and we are somehow regarded as an afterthought.

But despite all of that, Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Scarborough and their elected representatives, particularly the people in the municipal council and on the school board, have worked very diligently to overcome many of the artificial barriers that were placed in their way. I know in my own particular riding that the aldermen long ago were the new breed of aldermen, in that they were people-oriented; they weren't programme-oriented, they were people-oriented.

In the schools, for instance, I think it has been indicated to the select committee studying the off-hours use of educational institutions, that Scarborough is the leader in this fiield; in that the recreational facilities where they exist in the secondary schools and in the primary schools are available to the general public. And I think in this way we have set an example for Ontario.

Our public utilities commission — and I don't just say this; this is common knowledge —is the most efficient and best-run in the entire province. And I think it is time that a member from Scarborough stood in this House and started extolling the virtues of the borough and its people. Because I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are very proud to reside in the borough. And we are getting a little bit tired of being looked at down the long noses of the editorial pundits who somehow believe that nothing is good to the east of Woodbine Ave., whether it be in Metropolitan Toronto or indeed throughout the province.

Having talked about my riding, I would like now to proceed into the main thrust of the remarks that I intend to make today.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the replies to the Speech from the Throne, I am struck by one particular argument that has been advanced, and that is by the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook). I'm probably struck by it because he advanced the same argument on at least two occasions in the last session. So I have become rather fascinated in looking at Throne Speeches, because if you were to listen to him, and indeed to his leader, they say Throne Speeches are remarkably sterile documents, that we do not seem to care for people and, above all, that we deliberately ignore what the member calls labour.

I don't think anything could be further from the truth, because in the particular Throne Speech that I am talking to today, immediately after the formal introductions this government takes on the most important thing as it pertains to people, particularly those who work for wages and salaries, because we immediately start talking about the economy and about jobs. I think if you look back in past Throne Speeches you will see that same attention paid to that most important area of labour, because what the people of Ontario want is economic security.

They don't want a planned economy. They don't want their lives tinkered with by social scientists who like to press buttons and somehow convey themselves into their living room. They don't want to be told what to do from the time they are teenagers until the time that they expire. They want some very basic rights. They want the right to have a job. They want the right to advance by virtue of their own hard work and their talents. Above all, they want an opportunity to fulfill the Canadian dream.

I know that at the moment things like that are usually reserved to the remarks from squares.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I am a square. I believe in the Canadian dream. I believe that this is the province of opportunity, where any man or woman who is endowed by God with reasonable health and with reasonable talents can prosper and can go on to the amount of success that is only dictated by their ability to persevere and

to employ their talents in a manner which is most remunerative to them.

I think that that type of attitude pervades the entire address to His Honour. I say that because we are talking about jobs, and part and parcel of jobs and the ability to get jobs is the health of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, since 1943 no province in the Dominion of Canada, no state in the United States of America, no country in Europe, and I think those are comparable jurisdictions, has either achieved the degree of opportunity for its citizens or been able to afford them the chance to achieve a standard of living or a quality of life that has happened in this province. I say to you it began in 1943, because this is when the Progressive Conservative Party took power in this province, and we have gone on ever since.

Mr. Deans: It gets more incredible with each second.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): He should sit down while he is ahead.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: This hasn't come about by accident, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Nor has it come about by hard work.

Mr. Drea: If the members opposite are going to sit there and argue it happened in spite of us, they'd better start right now, because I'm prepared to go on on that one. Even they won't argue.

Mr. Deans: Is that right? That's awfully intimidating. I'm worried half to death.

Mr. Drea: Oh, I'm sure it is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Drea: Pardon?

Mr. Deans: It's their own fault.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Deans: If one can't make it in this grand Province of Ontario it's because one is plain lazy, says he.

Mr. Drea: The member shouldn't even put words in my mouth.

Mr. Lewis: Believe me, that's not necessary.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member proceed.

Mr. Drea: As I was saying, this was not by accident, not by somehow looking up to the heavens and expecting it to come. It has been the very deliberate fabric of every policy of every Progressive Conservative government—and there have been five of them since 1943—to provide people with the stimulus, the means and the resources to achieve the Canadian dream. We in the Progressive Conservative Party believe, when it comes to people who work for wages and salaries, that nothing is too good for them and for 30 years we have carried that out.

Mr. Deans: And the Tories make sure they get nothing!

Mr. Lewis: The government has fulfilled that commitment.

Mr. Deans: They make sure they get nothing, too. Nothing is too good and the Tories make sure that is what they get.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): The members opposite haven't done too badly.

Mr. Drea: When the late Mr. Drew was the Premier of this province, as soon as the end of World War 2 permitted, there was the immediate policy that we would—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Remember when he got beaten in High Park?

Mr. Drea: Yes. I wasn't as old as the member but I was around.

Mr. Deans: The member acts as if he were the age of Methuselah.

Mr. Drea: Don't tell me the member is going to take up temperance at this late stage recalling that event?

As soon as the war was over, he embarked upon a very deliberate, a very innovative and, at the time, a frankly somewhat controversial programme of expanding not only the industrial and the resource base of this province; that government went to war-torn Europe and it invited people with skills and with occupational talents and, indeed, the professions. It brought them here and there began the tremendous expansion of the industrial base of this province.

At the same time, we didn't pay lip service to opening up this province. Indeed, the highway programme, the hydro-electric power programme, all became part and parcel of the fabric of the type of society that we were

trying to build. Again, through the governments of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Frost, we put electricity into the places where the candles used to burn. We put it there for one reason—because we were going to raise the standard of living in this province—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): There are places in northern Ontario that still don't have it after 30 years of Tory rule.

Mr. Drea: Does the member have a candle?

Mr. Lewis: The Tories also brought in the wheel, I understand.

Mr. Drea: Again, in the time of Mr. Robarts this government embarked upon a new course because we knew that the time had come when the former educational system was just not sufficient in the area of rapid technological and occupational change. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, no other jurisdiction on this continent switched over to the type of education and trade training with as much success as this province did under Mr. Robarts' government.

Furthermore, we did something else; we went into trade expansion because we knew that the future of Ontario and the prosperity of our citizens really lay in our ability to export to markets that, for one reason or another, had remained closed to us. The record of accomplishment in the field of trade expansion by Ontario industries, I think, is a barometer of our ability to overcome the challenges posed by industrial change, by certain trading agreements that are reached between nations, indeed by the challenge of being able to sell in a foreign market at a competitive price and not having it subsidized by the sweat of our own workers, because in Ontario we have many of the highest paid people on the continent and at the same time we are able to sell our goods outside of here.

Mr. Gisborn: No fault of this government!

Mr. Stokes: We are exporting the jobs with the resources!

Mr. Gisborn: The Tories had nothing to do with increasing the wages in this province!

Mr. Drea: Well, who did?

Mr. Lewis: The trade union movement largely.

Mr. Drea: And who allowed the trade union movement to prosper and grow? In terms of membership it went up by a third under this government. Nowhere else did that happen! When the unions started and Mackenzie King and the Liberals tried to run them out, it was this government that put in laws so that they could operate under the rule of law and not under those phony labour courts or under the rule of the truncheon at the plant gate. If we want to restrict it to union members, that is when labour in this province got its bill of rights and started to move forward—and it was a Conservative government that did it.

Mr. Gisborn: He's lost.

Mr. Drea: No, but I am losing the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: I hate to tell him, but the hon. member is losing some of his own members too.

Mr. Drea: Well, unlike some of my friend's, I don't have to ring the bell to bring them in.

Mr. Deans: They wouldn't come even if the hon. member did that. They are bored already.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): One word and they would all be here.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Look who's talking about boredom!

Mr. Drea: Again, in the tenure of our own Premier we have embarked on something else for the people who work for wages and salaries. We believe that bread alone does not make the full life, so we are embarking rather deliberately again on improving the quality of life around us.

I know it comes as a shock to some parts of this House that biblical quotations are occasionally used, but I come back to a favourite of mine: "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" I think that pertains to the quality of life. What does it matter if one gets $25 an hour, has five automobiles and everything imaginable when all around him is nothing but waste and desolation and pollution? There really isn't anything. Again, it is this government that is taking the lead in this province and in this country.

Mr. Deans: It is causing them.

Mr. Drea: The expressway era came to an abrupt end not because of anybody else but this government. Right here in this House we said goodbye to expressways. Tell me that is not correct! On the basis of that approach to urban life, the voters have responded in a very meaningful way. We can see it all

around in the municipal elections, particularly in this area.

The reformers don't seem to be those who want planning, tinkering, fooling and all kinds of things. I seem to bump into most of the reformers who hold elected office in the boroughs at meetings of the Progressive Conservative Party. I think that indicates not only the strength of this party and the type of thing we are talking about in the Throne Speech, but indeed that we have assumed the ideological leadership of all those people in Ontario, regardless of their party persuasion or lack of it, who are interested in the quality of life.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): They show great leadership in granting salary raises too. Some of them doubled their salaries. They are getting more money than the member gets paid.

Mr. Drea: Well, that wouldn't be very much, but I have never had a low-wage mentality. I don't believe that we should try to restrict a person by wages. I think he or she should be paid commensurate with his or her contribution to the community. I would much rather rest the case upon that than dollars and cents per hour.

Mr. Deans: The member should be careful or we'll starve. If they did that with him he'd starve.

Mr. Havrot: Look who's talking. He couldn't even put out a fire.

Mr. Drea: I will match my contribution with those of the member for Wentworth any day.

But you know in terms, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Stokes: Is the member for Scarborough Centre running out of gas?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the quality of life, and particularly in regard to some of the comments by the member for Sarnia, I'd like to go back to an old saying in the labour movement. He seems to want labour discussed in this House. I don't mind discussing it. If I belonged to his party I might be a little bit reticent. But in any event I don't mind discussing it.

You see, it is not only the growth of the organized labour movement that has come about because of the policies of this government. There is also an entirely new concept which somehow escapes those with the narrow, legalistic mind who think that the Labour Relations Act is the be-all and end-all for those who work. You see, although quite frankly I don't think it has been publicized enough, this government has deliberately changed the Minister of Labour from basically a technical and an industrial relations oriented ministry into indeed a socially oriented one.

The reason I say that is despite the growth of the organized labour movement, 70 per cent or thereabouts of the people who work remain outside it. I think realistically that means about 60 per cent, because I think we should point out that many who are listed in the work force are professional people, have their own associations, and therefore are outside the scope of what we call working people. But that other group are working people, and they are represented by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon), through our employment standards legislation.

Because our employment standards legislation is not only their measure of economic security, buti ndeed is their bill of rights, as working people. I don't happen to believe that just because you have the magic green-coloured or white-coloured card from a trade union—a great number of people somehow have difficulty these days getting into certain trade unions—that gives you a privileged status in society. I happen to agree with a gentleman named Phil Murray who, some years ago, said that the function of trade unions was not to set up an industrial elite, it was to build and fabricate a better society.

And so with the change in the Ministry of Labour we are now, in effect, the people who are setting the pace for those who work for wages and salaries and are outside the scope of the labour movement.

Mr. Gisborn: A buck eighty an hour—$1.80 an hour.

Mr. Drea: And this, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you is a very fundamental departure in society. Because up until a few brief years ago, those people were somehow considered an elite because they did not belong to the labour movement.

So today we have it that it is the Minister of Labour who will go and collect the wages, the actual wages owed, of a working man or woman who is not paid by the employer. I have never known a union to volunteer and go out there for the masses. Somehow when it comes to things like this I suppose that you have to take care of your members first.

The minister too has the power to ensure that there is equal wages for equal work between male and female, even though certain

union agreements in this province still allow discrimination and that gap. I think that is a tremendous step forward.

We've done something else too, because in many other jurisdictions before a female worker can try to get equal pay for equal work she has to lodge a complaint, and to many people this is a form of intimidation, because if you do lay a complaint against your employer, particularly in a small shop or a small office, you figure that there is going to be retribution. Unfortunately I think the record would show that that is not exactly fear without reason.

So in this province the ministry has the right to go in and spot check, and if you look at their collections every year—that little report they hand us; the newspapers write a couple of paragraphs about so many million were collected—I think sometimes it might be very interesting to just sit back for a moment and remember that the bulk of this money for equal pay for equal work was obtained on spot checks. Nobody had to make any complaints. Nobody had to put their job on the line. This was obtained by spot checks.

Mr. Gisborn: The Act licenses the employers to cheat on their employees, that's what it has done.

Mr. Drea: Oh come, come, come!

Mr. Gisborn: They pay a fine every time the board goes in, five per cent on the collection. The licence is to let them cheat their employees. Check the Act again.

Mr. Drea: There is one thing that I admire about the member's persistent stubbornness. He is living so far in the past that he somehow cannot come out into 1973.

Mr. Gisborn: That Act was brought in last year. That is the one the member is talking about.

Mr. Drea: Yes.

Mr. Gisborn: He is not quoting it correctly.

Mr. Drea: Well in view of the events of last Thursday I think members would have to agree that I somehow have as good a grasp of labour relations legislation as the self-proclaimed experts.

Mr. Gisborn: The member didn't throw any weight around here with his contribution to that.

Mr. Drea: Well, then, why was the member shaking?

Mr. Deans: Shaking? He was shaking with mirth. He was laughing at the member, if he wants to know.

Mr. Drea: Was he?

Mr. Deans: Yes. He thought the member was amusing and so did we.

Mr. Drea: Well, that is very good, because I felt very sorry for the member, abandoned by his leader. You know, it fascinates me, I wish he were here—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): After all, the member drove him out.

Mr. Drea: Well, then, maybe I'll bring him back with these remarks. Because you see I look over there—and we're talking about the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I'm keeping to the point. I looked in the paper to see what remarkable contributions the leader of the NDP had made in his reply—

Mr. Deans: Did the member ever consider being here when he was supposed to be?

Mr. Drea: —and I found it on page 2 of the Globe—and I think that is very significant. Page 2. Not page 1 any more, page 2. On the skids—on the skids! And to paraphrase the paraphrase he has used so often lately, and the member's party has used so often lately, about lying down for a while to bleed and then somehow rising again, well our swords are still sticking out of them from 1971, there are two lances in them from last month. But with the motto that prevails over there called "Et tu Brutu?"—

Mr. Givens: "Brute"!

Mr. Drea: —I can understand why their leader took sanctuary around the ides of March. I wouldn't have stayed around either.

Mr. MacDonald: The member's reasons may be different.

Mr. Drea: The member for York South is the living example of what I have just talked about.

Mr. MacDonald: He is, as ever, confusing. He is confusing.

Mr. Deans: The member for Scarborough Centre isn't an example of anything, that is the unfortunate part.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, to come back to the apparent paradox of a province and a provincial government that has been not only dedicated but determined to expand its in-

dustrial, its commercial, its resource and its other economic bases and yet have a government that supposedly does not mention labour or any aspects of it in a Speech from the Throne.

As I said when I started out, just by glancing at the Speech I see three or four paragraphs right away where we talk about jobs. Let's talk about what those jobs mean, because in Ontario, particularly in manufacturing—and that is supposedly the source of all the talent that prevails to the party of the left across the floor, the people who come out of manufacturing industries, the wage-slaves, the oppressed.

Mr. Speaker, in many cases Ontario manufacturing wages are higher than those of the United States. And what that means is that under a number of Progressive Conservative governments we have achieved in Ontario what used to be the dream of our forefathers; to get the same amount of money as people are paid in the United States. I think that that very simply states our case. In fact, it is very interesting. The average wage for employees in manufacturing in Ontario not only exceeds that of other Canadian provinces but also the average manufacturing wage being paid in the United States, including the State of New York.

Now, the State of New York is not some backwater part of a great industrial nation. The State of New York is as highly, if not more highly unionized than this province. The corporate wealth in New York State is many times greater than that of this province. They have a much broader market; they have a much larger population. And yet, under the stimulus provided by successive governments of this party, we have achieved something that people at the end of World War 2 in the Province of Ontario would not have believed possible; and it didn't come about from planning in the socialist sense. It didn't come about because of all kinds of manipulation by those who enjoy playing with statistics, rather than looking at what people want.

Mr. Deans: It came about by court manipulation.

Mr. Drea: It didn't come about because we closed our eyes and somehow God in his heaven ordained that Ontario would be better. It came about because this province has been fortunate enough to have a government that has only one aim: to provide opportunity for people. After that, it is up to the people themselves how far or how little they want to go. And I argue with you that there is no more a reasonable government can do than that; and that is precisely what we have been doing.

Mr. Deans: Very enthusiastic.

Mr. Drea: But in a great many areas we have affected the lifestyle of people.

Mr. Givens: Like the Indians.

Mr. Drea: And of course we keep hearing that only those who somehow belong to a special group have any interest in what happens to the little man.

Just in the last couple of years—three years—we have put through legislation by this government that you can no longer be refused a job or dismissed because you have a garnishee on your wages.

Mr. Stokes: We in this party don't think there are any little men around. Everybody is equal.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Oh, come on!

Mr. Drea: That's just a profundity from the north.

Then there is the Landlord and Tenant Act that removed the arbitrary rights of the landlord for those who chose to rent rather than own their own homes.

Mr. Deans: They were dragged in, kicking and screaming.

Mr. Drea: There was the removal of the right by bailiffs to seize for rent and other forms of debt. In what other jurisdiction are the bailiffs restricted only to commercial enterprises? Where? There are thriving bailiff businesses all over the place, but not in this province.

And again, in the field of education we have invested a great deal of the money provided us by the taxpayers in providing the type of education that would train people—whether they wanted to go into a profession, or technology or into other occupations—so that they could be entirely self-sufficient in this world and have gainful employment. I think the record of this government is first class in that regard.

Again, even in those areas where I sometimes wonder if really they are that effective—for instance, winter works. I am very fascinated about this in the borough of Scarborough. I had the report of the borough treasurer—and he reports to the council. It

was at their request. He reported to the council that dollar for dollar the best programmes around for a municipal council were the winter works programmes of this province, because they weren't shrouded in red tape. They didn't operate in a double-dealing manner where you never knew how much money you were going to get for the projects. In fact, it stimulated the municipality to do certain things. This is a matter of record. I think that, too, is very important.

Mr. Speaker, just to return to jobs, I think realistically we in this House must realize that Ontario does have certain natural and monetary advantages in these very critical times across the country. I am not trying in any way to say that it is easy for some of the "have not" provinces—or indeed for some of those that may have a little bit—to generate new jobs and new job opportunities. But, it seems to me, that is a measure of the success of a government when it can stimulate an economic climate that will produce 140,000 new jobs, which figure is just about roughly half of all the new jobs created in the Dominion of Canada.

Think about 140,000 new jobs. That's a very, very interesting figure, because here we have next to us in the Province of Quebec a province, with all due respect to its government, that is trying to do something. They are talking about 100,000 new jobs within the whole span of the government, within four years, and here we have, because of the policies of the Progressive Conservative government, 140,000 new jobs from year to year.

Then they say that there is nothing in the Throne Speech that pertains to labour, that pertains to working people. The reason why we aren't expanding even faster is the artificial limitations placed upon us by the Liberal Party's spiritual mentors in Ottawa.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): The member has to be kidding.

Mr. Drea: What is their track record, other than the worst unemployment since the last Liberal government was in power? If you look over everything from 1957 onwards in terms of the thing that means the most to people, the opportunity to have a job, the track record when a certain party is in Ottawa is not only dismal, it's enough to frighten the wits out of you.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to another area of the Speech from the Throne, and that is the continued determination of this government that it will preserve our ecological heritage. It's very easy to preserve a cultural heritage because in that regard you are dealing with books, you are dealing with buildings, you are dealing with material things. In fact, because of the advances of technology we can now conserve and save and preserve many of the ethereal parts of culture. But the great challenge in the 1970s, and indeed the '80s and the '90s and probably until the turn of the century, is can we preserve the ecological heritage?

In our own time we have seen a rather provincial city that wasn't even reckoned with as one of the major urban areas on the continent, Toronto, grow into a rather magnificent, sometimes controversial, sprawling mass that almost extends now from one end of the city line at Hamilton virtually to Oshawa, and which to the north, disregarding some of the artificial boundaries, threatens the very shores of Lake Simcoe. People are pouring into this province, not only from abroad but from within Canada.

This is the province where the action is. This is the province where you can make supposedly your most material success. Also the educational facilities are here. So people are coming here. This, of course, requires that they be sheltered, that they have recreational facilities and a great number of other things.

Of course, this puts a great pressure on the land. I think it has been a sudden shock to this province that it is no longer a place where there is a northern frontier. I think the day of the frontier in this province is gone. We have to be very special about how we treat land and it is very reassuring to me that the most priceless ecological heritage that this province possesses, the Niagara Escarpment, is now a priority matter for this government.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): At last!

Mr. Drea: I realize that it is going to cost a great deal of money to acquire but I think that the investment, measured by future generations, will be as much a hallmark of this government as was the rural electrification of the province by the Frost government, the highways programme of the Drew government and the education programmes of the Robarts government.

Again, this pertains to quality of life which I think is important to all of us.

Mrs. Campbell: I guess that's why the minister isn't in the House.

Mr. Drea: I'm sorry.

Mrs. Campbell: I said I guess that's why the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) isn't in the House.

Mr. Drea: Well, the Minister of Education talks to me line to line in Scarborough.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): There is somebody on the line for the member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The member for Peel South is going to report this to the cabinet.

Mr. Kennedy: Certainly!

Mr. Drea: They can hear me in the cabinet. They never have to have reported to them what I say.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The papers knew it.

Mr. Drea: That's right.

Mr. Speaker, on another part of the Speech from the Throne, I would like to talk about the proposed royal commission into certain aspects of a number of conditions that apply, in my view, to the entire construction industry of this province.

I do not quarrel; I certainly support the need for a royal commission but I think there are two things that should be made abundantly clear. The very creation of a royal commission indicates that the conventional forces of law and order—that is, the Crown with all its investigative agencies; the courts with their ability to hear the charges that are formally laid against people, to find them guilty or not guilty and to sentence them; the correctional institutions; and a great deal of money has been spent on these—that all of these somehow are unable to cope with a situation that has suddenly arisen.

I think that has very profound implications for our society because we like to think that certain things cannot happen here. I think it is a great tribute not only to this government —that would be a very narrow view—but to all the governments that there have been—not only in this province but in municipalities and those of the Dominion—that this kind of thing has not happened to this extent in our first 102 or 103 years. It only begins to emerge after that.

I think the implication that the conventional forces are no longer tactically able to cope with this has some very, very severe implications, particularly in the area of labour relations. Until now, and by deliberate design, industrial relations or labour relations or union-management affairs or what-have-you have been left sacrosanct and out in a special sphere. The authorities have deliberately handcuffed themselves and with good reason because we have seen the intervention of the state into industrial democracies in Latin America and in Europe with its very dire results. We have deliberately handcuffed and restrained these authorities.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this royal commission and the very fact that it has to be established, I do not think the day of that special sanctuary for labour relations or whatever we call it will exist very much longer in this province.

As a consequence, I would hope—in fact, I will go farther than hope; I will make an appeal—that a great many questions be answered by this royal commission, particularly with regard to what the hon. member for Thunder Bay says doesn't exist, the little man. It's all very well to read in the newspapers about criminals, extortionists, bomb-throwers, thugs, hoodlums and so on. But where that exists, there is exploitation; there is a ruthlessness against ordinary working people who ask no more and no less than to be able to work in peace and dignity.

It concerns me a great deal, Mr. Speaker, that somehow in all of this business about this royal commission that law enforcement agencies seem to have a vested interest. I haven't seen a law enforcement agency out there when the man doesn't get paid or gets cheated, or has to work the first hour and the last hour of the day for nothing to keep his job. It seems to me that the legalists have a very vested interest in this. Yet where were they when people got buried alive under the tons of concrete in the subway? Where were they?

Mr. Gisborn: It took this government 10 years to recognize that was going on. That was brought to their attention 10 years ago.

Mr. Drea: By whom, may I ask? By whom?

Mr. Gisborn: By members of the opposition!

Mr. Drea: Oh no! By whom?

Mr. Gisborn: By members of the opposition.

Mr. Drea: I would really like to take a bow but unless the hon. member will give me credit—and I think it's a matter of record.

Mr. Gisborn: It took 10 years to move on that question.

Mr. Drea: Well, let me throw out a hypothetical question—and it will drive the member—where has the trade union movement been to try to control the hoodlums masquerading under its name? Where has it been? Has there been any condemnation by the trade union movement when employers are bombed, their children are threatened or anything else? No, sir!

I don't believe it is the job of the hon. member's party to police them, any more than it is my job or anybody else's here. But what concerns me in all of this is that there are literally thousands of people whose quality of life will be affected by this commission. And to restrict it to the professional people in law enforcement, to specific areas and to specific industries, to me is akin to nothing more than trying to treat a very deep infection by putting a kind of ointment over the top of it so it will appear to be cured.

All that will happen is that the very tip of the iceberg will titillate. That's what is going to happen. People are going to be titillated for months by tales of derring-do and so on. In the meantime, those people are being exploited—and they are being exploited because they did not have the good fortune to be born in this country and they do not have the good fortune to speak English without an accent. That is going to go on.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to those who are responsible for drawing up the terms of reference not to restrict it to what the lawyers think will make a neat and tidy package, and not to restrict it to what certain segments of the industry or certain segments or organized labour—or indeed certain segments of this House—consider to be a neat and easy task.

For the past 14 years—and since other people like to make literary quotations—there has been in the words of John Steinbeck, "a sorrow beyond recall". That sorrow has been that the people who came to this country and to this province for that right to take part in all the good things that come from being in a province of opportunity, they have led dreadful lives.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, not on a political basis because certainly the civil service has to bear a lot of this, those people in the beginning came to us. They came to those who were here. They came to the institutions that we had and we spurned them. Then we wonder why they don't think it's so bad now if a thug goes out and gets them their wages. Well, the institutions that we had to help them weren't terribly interested when they didn't have any money.

What I am appealing for is that there be some consideration given, when this royal commission and its terms of references are established, that it embrace the whole of the construction industry. The commercial end of it will probably take about five minutes of the commission's time, but let's do the whole of it. The other parts of it—the speculative, the residential, particularly those parts of it using new technology and new products—may take quite a bit longer. I suggest to members that it would be more than worthwhile because I think we have to eradicate this cancer among us. If we don't—it isn't just for those people who are being affected now; it will go on with them—it will also spread because in any other place where it was allowed to fester it has spread out and taken over the very institutions that were set up to combat it.

For once, when all these things are investigated, I would like to see all of the doors opened up regardless of the consequences. I think the time has come for there to be a thorough airing of how any or all of this could happen in the Province of Ontario in the 1970s or in the Dominion of Canada in the 1970s. I say to the House that unless there is a modification or at least the broadest interpretation of the plastering, lathing and dry-walling sectors of the building industry in Metropolitan Toronto, the royal commission isn't worth the money that the first ad to announce its presence will cost.

Mr. Speaker, today I have ranged over a fair number of years in this province.

Mr. Sargent: Let's get back to the donations from the lathing industry to the government.

Mr. Drea: From the what?

Mr. Sargent: From the lathing industry.

Mr. Drea: From the lathing industry? I wouldn't know a lather if I saw him.

Mr. Sargent: They don't make donations to the party?

Mr. Drea: I have no idea about who makes donations to anybody in the party.

Mr. Sargent: That's why it's pretty safe to investigate those people?

Mr. Drea: No, I don't think it's pretty safe for us to investigate those people whom I don't know. I have enough confidence in this party that we wouldn't take a dime from the likes of the people I want investigated. We have never taken a dime from them and we never would! All we have is one ambition and that's to put them where they belong.

Mr. Sargent: How does the member know? Did the Premier (Mr. Davis) tell him all these things?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Even the Premier doesn't know, he says.

Mr. Drea: If the members want me to—I have today touched very briefly upon the outstanding role of the Liberal Party in the growth of the industrial establishment of this province—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us about Oshawa again.

Mr. Drea: What?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us about Oshawa again.

Mr. Drea: Would the member like to hear about it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes. Don't forget that we won it in the election of 1937; that was the one he was talking about.

Mr. Drea: Yes.

An hon. member: In 1937?

Mr. Drea: That's right. Does the member want it recorded that he is very proud of that? Not the winning of the election but the events subsequent to it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, but I don't really know what the member is going to achieve by repeating the story every time he gets up on his feet.

Mr. Drea: I'm trying to help the opposition labour critics, so help me get the history of labour in this province straight. I should send them a bill for education.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member sounds to me like a singer with one note.

Mr. Drea: No, he sits next to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Sargent: The member and his colleagues need all the help they can get themselves.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I have ranged over a number of topics today. I have by deliberate design put the thrust of my arguments and my comments on the Speech from the Throne upon economic matters, for I think it is a great fallacy to suggest that this government is not interested in that collective term "labour." I don't think there has been a government or a series of governments anywhere on this continent that has been more interested.

Certainly there are problems. Certainly in my view we have not provided organized labour with 100 per cent of the legislation that I would think it could use to operate in a very effective manner. I think we have come close. I think we have come close, and I think we are going to go much further, but I want to dispel the myth that we care not what happens in this province.

Because the very roots of this party are not inside of unions per se, they are not inside of management per se; the very roots of our party lie with people who are like me, the squares who still believe in the Canadian dream. That is why they come to this party, because we are not continentalists willing to peddle away.

We are the party that determined that the expansion of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission into the nuclear age would be done with Canadian technology, not by importing a two-bit licence from the United States. We gave our kids the right to show what they could do. And, Mr. Speaker, I say to you the record of accomplishment there is first class.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about Stephen Roman's uranium? Isn't he in the member's party?

Mr. Gisborn: What happened to natural gas in Ontario? The government made an awful switch there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If it weren't for the Liberals we would have sold uranium too.

Mr. Drea: If it weren't for whom?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Liberals. Trudeau stopped it single-handedly.

Mr. Drea: Well that must have been the first thing he ever did single-handedly. One way or the other.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He did it pretty effectively—so Roman decided he would run for the member's party.

Mr. Drea: We are also now embarking upon something that is very close to people who want a superior quality of life in this province, and that is mass urban transportation. Again, the cornerstone of this government's programme is that the research must be done in Canada. We are opening up jobs for research, not taking the continental approach that the kids can go get a job in Detroit if they want to experiment because somehow this isn't done in Canada.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought the government was buying its elevated trains in Germany with money borrowed from Germany?

Mr. Gisborn: They borrow the money from Germany and now they are going to buy the transit system.

Mr. Drea: And the research will be done in this province.

Mr. Sargent: And it won't happen in 20 years either.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I understand some Swiss company is building the buildings for them.

Mr. Drea: The first one is being built from my riding in Scarborough right down to here, and I'll let the Leader of the Opposition ring the bell when the first one moves because both of us will still be here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right up at the back row.

Mr. Drea: It is also very interesting, you know, that across the floor there is not only the low wage mentality but there is the low ambition mentality.

Mr. Sargent: He gave that same speech last year.

Mr. Drea: No I didn't; no sir. I gave it in the member's club, but not last year. There is the low ambition mentality.

I don't think that there is any challenge that the people of this province cannot overcome—

Mr. W. Hodgson: What is a low ambition mentality?

Mr. Ruston: That is the Tory rump.

Mr. Drea: Right over there. All of them in opposition.

Mr. Good: That is a great back row there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is the government that listens.

Mr. Drea: Oh, they listen to me.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not if they can help it. The member warned them about Fidinam, but they won't heed.

Mr. Deans: They heard he was going to speak and they left.

An hon. member: That a boy, the member is getting through to them.

Mr. Deans: That is how much they listen —not one single cabinet minister to hear him.

Mr. Drea: Oh they listen to me. They are listening to me. There is the member for Wentworth, stripped and alone on the front benches again. Surely it is not the ides of March again?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is a conspiracy.

Mr. Deans: No one can stand it for more than five minutes.

Mr. Drea: He's safe. The member's leader is safe. There is only one member there. There will be no knives in the back today. He is safe.

Mr. Deans: I am the only one who can stand this for more than five minutes at a stretch.

Mr. Drea: There you are! Well, why does the member stay then?

An hon. member: Where is the NDP's leader?

Mr. Drea: I certainly don't accuse the member of lack of ambition. He seems to persevere through all of this and I somehow think there is a little bit more to it than merely partaking in the dialogue of the House.

Mr. Deans: I am not partaking in the dialogue. I am trying to suffer it.

Mr. Drea: Well, I may make the member suffer a lot longer.

Mr. Deans: I don't doubt but what the hon. member will. That is the problem. That is what I fear.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): We have suffered at the hands of my hon. friend.

Mr. Deans: Oh, the member is going to suffer again.

Mr. Drea: This is called retribution—so sweat.

Mr. Deans: It certainly isn't called contribution.

Mr. Sargent: We have listened to the member's preamble for two hours.

Mr. Drea: Well, if the member had been in here all day instead of exercising himself somewhere else—and Mr. Speaker, I want that recorded in the Hansard. It is not the way I pronounce "exorcising." I think that that pertains to the member in that seat quite a bit.

Mr. Deans: Has the member finished his preamble?

Mr. Drea: No!

Mr. Deans: The member is not really down to the guts of the speech yet, is he?

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, when they are able to control themselves, I am prepared to continue.

Mr. Deans: Does the member mean to tell me that if we keep speaking he will shut up? It might be worth it, you know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: You see, they don't want to grasp what I have been saying—because they are going to have to go back home tonight and explain how it is that the kind of a government they say couldn't care less about anybody, doesn't listen, doesn't do anything, has produced a province and a style of life that is second to none anywhere on this continent—

Mr. Sargent: And is almost bankrupt; almost broke.

Mr. Drea: —whether you want to measure it in terms of dollars and cents or whether you want it measured in terms of quality life.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: They don't want to hear it; and the terrible part for them is that they know it's true.

Mr. Good: That is in spite of the government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: The what? Are they still there? The last I heard, they had moved.

Mr. Ruston: You bet they are. They will stay there too.

Mr. Sargent: And the government is cutting back on the caretakers in Ryerson.

Mr. Drea: Oh, didn't the member read the paper this morning, other than page 5? Did the member not read it?

Mr. Good: The member doesn't believe what he reads in the papers, does he?

Mr. Drea: Well, I certainly do in certain places.

Mr. Speaker, to come back—and I hope that they have rid themselves of whatever frustrations there are. I realize it must be terribly difficult, since 1943, going out time after time to the public saying: "Look at them, look at that Conservative government; look what they are doing to you, put us in and here's what we'll do." And what's left, a trail of carcasses—

Mr. Good: Especially in Huron and St. George.

Mr. Drea: A number of leaders all along the trail, dead, dying, wounded, retired, committed. There it is since 1943; and then they come to us this year and they say the Speech from the Throne is bankrupt, that we haven't touched upon the right things. We don't have to produce a book in this party or in this government any more. We have the book behind us. We have the record of accomplishment.

Mr. Good: They didn't think of that in St. George or Huron, though.

Mr. Drea: Do we really want to get into that? I have a few things to say there too. I was trying to save some time for the next speaker. He has been very long suffering; I promised him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We've gots lots of time.

Mr. Givens: I will relieve the member of his promise.

Mr. Drea: The member doesn't want to speak?

Mr. Sargent: The member is a good kid, but his skates are dull.

Mr. Drea: That really is the kind of an analogy that could only come from the part of the country which the member represents. Now think about that one for a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I am really about to conclude —and if you could control—no, I sympathize with you, Mr. Speaker.

What I have been attempting to point out, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargent: He is out of order.

An hon. member: Stay with them.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, what I have been trying to convey today is the very simple and elemental fact that this government is concerned about people who work for wages and salaries. It is so concerned that it has not only provided for an orderly and progressive growth of industrial relations in this province, it has gone far beyond that. It has recognized the fact that because of the nature of the service industries or the nature of the employment that a great many people will not become part of organized labour. The ministry has taken over as their social watchdog. It has done it remarkably well. I think that the true measure of a government is not the number of seats it has, not the number of years that it has been in office and not the number of commendations it has. I think the true measure is what it is doing for people.

I think if the members really read, instead of giving it this cursory examination, the first part of the Speech from the Throne, they will be impressed with the fact that, one, we are more than concerned about economic security and that we are more than meeting the challenge of unemployment in this province; and that, secondly, we are concerned with the ecological heritage of this province and we are certainly going to extraordinary steps and very innovative steps to preserve that.

Mr. Sargent: Where does the member get that "we" from?

Mr. Drea: They still have me. One never knows for how long, but I am still here.

Finally, we are coming to grips with our most intense social problem, which is the matter that will be studied by the royal commission. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that this Throne Speech is in the tradition of this party which rescued Ontario from a party that had fallen apart; and which rescued it from the calamity of almost being governed by those who like to plan and plan so well that their monument in Sweden now turns out to be the leading contender in a number of dubious categories. This party rescued the province from that.

It has since gone on to enjoy an ever larger and an ever more responsive position among the ordinary people. I think that is the measure of a government, because if it were not for the response from ordinary people we would not have been able to fill these benches for so long and to do the things that people wanted us to do when they wanted us to do them and in the manner they wanted them done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ruston: Now for the words of wisdom.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Move the adjournment. Now is the time.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to speak in the tradition of the Throne Speech and excoriate the ministers across the way. None of them is here to be excoriated anyway.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Not one.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): They are tuning in, though.

Mr. Givens: To be perfectly frank, I still don't know them well enough to be able to say in the terms of the leader of the NDP (Mr. Lewis) when he said yesterday—and he probably is an expert on it because he has been here longer than I—"You are a sorry lot, all you empty chairs."

I am not going to pour coals or fuel, any more than was already done on the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter), who is having a rough time of it.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The newly elected members are not even listening.

An hon. member: The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) is not around. She is sick of her party's members anyway.

Mr. Givens: I feel sorry for him, because I feel he is a good, kindly, honest, decent man, but he is in water far over his head and he has about a dozen tigers by the tail which he can't let go. Enough has been said about that.

I noticed this morning's paper said he made his first public appearance last night. There was a medical bulletin to say that he didn't look bad. I suppose we can expect in the newspapers every day that there will be a medical bulletin describing the condition of the Health minister. Apparently he isn't very healthy. I think that as an act of mercy he should probably be relieved of his duties so that this province can get back on the rails with respect to its health programme.

Mind you, having said that, I am of two minds with respect to some of the ministers.

Mr. Speaker, you may think that the action takes place here but it doesn't. This is just the dress rehearsal for what takes place on the other stage out there in front of the klieg lights.

I am amazed by the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde performance that takes place here every day in the question period. When members on our side of the House ask the ministers questions, they mumble and they fumble and they jumble; then, between the time they leave this chamber and go through the eastern corridor out into the lights they seem to blossom like my tulips do on a sunny day.

Somewhere along the route they are passed a note or their memories are jogged or they are able to think things over and they become master debaters and masters of coherence and logic and articulation. When one tunes in one's television set and radio at night one sees a completely different show from what takes place here in this august chamber. It is hard for me to make a decision as to some of the ministers because when one is preparing oneself for something, for making a speech like today, one has to go to the television set and to the press clippings to see what it is that they were supposed to have said in the chamber—and not what they actually said in the chamber and which is recorded in Hansard.

Until such time, Mr. Speaker, as television is permitted into this chamber so that the people of this province can watch—they are permitted to see men walking on the moon; they can see battle scenes in Viet Nam; they can see sports activities, God knows, in the Soviet Union on their television sets, but they aren't permitted to see the conduct of their members in this particular chamber to whom they pay salaries—until that is done, Mr. Speaker, this will continue the way it is. I'm sure that ministers, being as they are, will not permit the intrusion of television and the media into this House.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member would never get on with his grandstanding.

Mr. Givens: They would prefer to put on the show—the comedy show, the dramatic show—they put on out there for the academy awards every day. That is how they are judged by the voters and the people of this province.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Would the member like to inflict this on the population?

Mr. Givens: Yes, I would, particularly and especially the question period; that is the best fun we have day after day.

An hon. member: The comedy hour!

Mr. Givens: I want to speak, Mr. Speaker, on some of the items in the spectrum of provincial activities which interest me; others have been covered by other people very adequately. The first thing I want to speak about is the—

An hon. member: The Spadina!

Mr. Givens: —matter of the regional government which the government seems to be hell bent for leather on implementing without due evaluation. It is going like the charge of the light brigade into the valley of death with cannons to the left of it and cannons to the right of it, without really reassessing and re-evaluating what it has been doing. It is just like Oral Roberts in a tent—the government takes the victim who was sitting in a chair and forces its hand down on the victim and says "heal."

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member is one of 22 opinions.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): There is a good one to the north of him.

Mr. Givens: The victim is supposed to come out of the chair all cured and all healed.

I am, first of all, disconcerted with what was done with the ministry of urban affairs in this province. We have had a new manifestation—a minister who is a Treasurer, and a Minister of Economics and of Intergovernmental Affairs. An IGA sounds to me like a corner grocery store, but I don't think it is a good way for a minister of municipal affairs to perform.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: That's what the member was hoping would be done in Ottawa.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Urban affairs is a federal term, isn't it?

An hon. member: The member had better go back to Ottawa.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Trudeau wouldn't accept him.

Mr. Givens: We have a minister who looks after elementary students. We have a minister who looks after the cause of college and university students. We have a minister

who looks after convicts. We have a minister who looks after tourist operators, but we do not have a minister whose sole responsibility is to look after the operation and the functioning of all the municipalities in this province.

Metropolitan Toronto has a budget which is larger than the budgets of eight of the provinces of Canada. Metropolitan Toronto has a population which is larger than the populations of eight of the provinces of Canada. It is the full-time job of 23 people on the metropolitan council of 33 to look after the interests of Metropolitan Toronto. There is not one cabinet minister here at all who looks after the interests of Toronto, Ottawa, Windsor, London or the northern cities in this province. Hamilton should be thrown in there too; it is a large and important city.

How can one minister look after the Treasury and bring down the budget with all the responsibilities that are inherent therein; look after the economic affairs of the province and its fiscal policy with due regard to the monetary policy that comes down from the federal government; and still have time to deal with intergovernmental affairs, which involve dealing with the federal government and the governments of all the other provinces, as well as with the international situation, because even within the purview and jurisdiction of the province there are trade offices dispersed all over the world.

How can one minister do all that? When I asked about this last year, I was told that this job was designed for the hon. member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough); he was a bear for work, and he had a complete grasp of all these activities. He was to look after this, and he would do a great job. But that minister has now fallen from grace; he's gone to purgatory. Apparently he's in a shadowy position now where he's working himself back up but still hasn't entered the House as a minister again. Then we had a new minister and two members who were supposed to assist him, the hon. member for York East (Mr. Meen) and the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett). But the member for Ottawa South now has got his just reward; he has got a promotion.

Aside from that fact, we have a situation where the new minister, who is supposed to look after this tidy bundle, has indicated publicly that he will not be running again for public office in the election that probably will take place in 1975.

How does the government expect a man who has publicly committed himself not to run again to look after something that requires dedication and devotion over the next five or six years, particularly during the transition period of all these regional governments? How they expect a man to do that job, I don't know. I don't understand.

I think it's high time that the government recognized its responsibilities in this area. If students can have ministers, if convicts can have ministers and if tourist operators can have ministers, then to do justice to the municipalities of this province, there should be a minister looking after urban and municipal affairs.

An hon. member: Federally and provincially.

Mr. Givens: I think regional government—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: State your point of order.

Mr. Sargent: My point of order is that with such an important message as this I think we should ring the bells and get the members in the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has no point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Well it's a good idea.

An hon. member: We have a quorum.

Mr. Sargent: There isn't a cabinet minister in the House. You should be ashamed of yourself, Mr. Speaker, to let this kind of thing go on.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, I state categorically that the regional government system that the province has imposed in this arbitrary way, without consultation with the people, has been largely unsuccessful—and I'll give the reasons why. We still have the intricate provincial grants system; there is still a proliferation of boards, commissions and agencies; planning and development responsibility is still gravitated toward the province; and there has been absolutely no municipal tax reform, notwithstanding all the studies that have taken place.

The financial situation remains the same. Property taxes, which are taxes based on a fixed asset, are still the main basis of municipal financing. All this government has done with the financial system is spread it out over larger areas, the regional areas. The local governments are financially weak and

must rely on transfers from the province—and this will not only be in the transitional period. They are never going to be able to cut the umbilical cord, because that is the history of conditional grants given to municipalities.

Some benefits will accrue to the regional areas in their borrowings. They will be able to borrow at perhaps half of one per cent or a quarter of one per cent less interest, but their activities are still restricted. They are still subject to the decisions of the Ontario Municipal Board, which not only determines whether the municipalities can afford to borrow the money but goes into every fact and facet of their borrowings as to whether they are desirable or not. This, I think, is wrong—and I'll deal with the OMB later if I have the time.

The regional governments are also inefficient and too expensive—and people in the rural areas should be interested in this—because they don't reduce the staff or the number of commissioners. They duplicate them. In the two-tier system, if we have a works commissioner at the local level, we maintain that works commissioner and we get another works commissioner at the upper tier.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's right.

Mr. Givens: The same is true of the police, the firemen, the roads commissioners, the water commissioners and everybody else. There's duplication. And the commissioner at the lower tier says: "I can't deal with my counterpart of the upper tier unless I get the $35,000 a year that he gets." So there is a jack-up system at work here.

We will find, as we found in Metropolitan Toronto, that our expenses will double, triple and quadruple because of the proliferation that takes place. Parkinson's law goes into operation. Costs will rise and they are rising out of proportion to the services. The government is not going to tell me that in the rural areas where it already has regional governments the cost to the rural areas hasn't doubled and tripled, and the government has nothing to show for it.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Givens: Absolutely nothing to show for it! The government does not decrease its staff; the finances are still controlled by the province and municipalities need provincial approval for spending. They can hardly spend a dime. They cannot borrow one dollar for capital expenditures in any municipality without approval by the Ontario Municipal Board, and the OMB always refers to the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, especially when it has to do with large sums of money.

What happens with these conditional grants that the province gives is that these are generally a percentage of the projects. They are on a cost-sharing basis and the cost favours the rich areas, as those members who come from a little place know. If we are going to have subways, the government is going to contribute 75 per cent as they promised by and by. If we ever get to build another subway in Toronto, the people from outside Toronto are going to pay for it.

It's good for Toronto. We'll be able to build subways that way but others are going to have to pay for it. It's okay if one is in the subway business but it is different if one comes from any other city other than Metropolitan Toronto. The government is not likely to build subways in Hamilton or Windsor.

An hon. member: Or in London!

Mr. Givens: Or in London! So remember, when I'm talking about what some call Hogtown they're paying for it — the farmers and the miners and all the other people of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: We have always paid for it. That's is nothing new.

Mr. Givens: Now with respect to structural problems, the government talks about a two-tiered structure. It's incomprehensible, because what one actually has Mr. Speaker, is a three-tiered structure. There is the lower tier that looks after the hewing of wood and the drawing of water, police protection and fire protection and the collection of garbage. This is what the lower tier looks after. Then there is the upper tier and then a third tier—

An hon. member: It sounds rounded off.

Mr. Givens: —which is centralized in the Kremlin right here. No municipality can make a move without approval from the Kremlin up here, so when they talk about two-tiered government, they actually have three tiers.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The commissars never even come into the Legislature.

Mr. Givens: There is no clear definition between the two tiers. The new member for St. George will tell the House that in Toronto after 15 years there's still a vagueness in the

understanding. Certainly on the part of the public there is a complete misunderstanding as to where the division splits, as to what jurisdiction is Metro and what jurisdiction is local and what is the lower tier and what is the upper tier. The regional councils are selected by indirect election.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Why doesn't Metro amalgamate?

Mr. Givens: Why doesn't it amalgamate? —because the government won't permit us to amalgamate. We still have these indirect elections, where in Metropolitan Toronto we still don't know who is going to sit on the metropolitan council. In Ottawa-Carleton they aren't going to know because they come from the lower tier. The government has developed a new brand of democracy where all the chairmen, all the heads that it is appointing to these regional councils are appointed people and not elected people on the principle that in order for a guy to do an honest job in these regions he's got to be plucked out of somewhere and be appointed and shouldn't have to expose himself to public election. That's a principle of democracy which I don't understand.

In Hamilton, it will be interesting to see what's going to happen to Mayor Vic Copps here, when he comes down. He's going to say to the government, "we want one tier in Hamilton-Wentworth and we want an elected chairman." It will be interesting to see whether the government will give it to him or not.

An hon. member: No way!

Mr. Givens: What has been happening—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: —has been loss of representation. Do members know why there has been a proliferation of ratepayers' groups? There has been a proliferation of ratepayers' groups in these various regions and other places because people have been deprived of representation.

In Metropolitan Toronto, Forest Hill, which comprises about two-thirds of my constituency and which has about 25,000 people, used to have a council of five. It now has nothing looking after its interests. They were absorbed into Ward 11 which has two representatives, but for the most part they don't represent that particular area. They don't understand that area. Their prime concern is the other part of the ward.

Leaside had a council of seven but now has no representation; Long Branch a council of five, and also no representation; Mimico a council of seven; and New Toronto also had a council of seven. That mean 19 representatives from Long Branch, Mimico and New Toronto were completely absorbed into Etobicoke, and to all intents and purposes, these areas are not represented with respect to local matters.

Swansea was absorbed by Toronto. It had a council of five—no representation. The people have nobody to turn to in that particular area. The same thing happened in Weston. Weston had a council of seven. It has completely disappeared. There was a complement of 109 elected representatives and that has been reduced tremendously.

In the regional municipality of Niagara, prior to regional government there was a complement of 173 elected representatives. Now there are 120.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Nothing wrong with that.

An hon. member: That's cut them down.

Mr. Givens: In Ottawa-Carlton, 108 representatives—not too bad—now down to only 97. The regional municipality of Sudbury, effective Jan. 1, 1973, had 99 elected representatives looking after the same regional area where there are now 54.

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): He's got the figures wrong.

Mr. Givens: In the regional municipality of Waterloo there were 105 representatives; now they are down to 72.

Mr. Handleman: That's efficiency!

Mr. Givens: In the regional municipality of York, effective Jan. 1, 1971, there were 80 elected representatives; now they are down to 70, which isn't too bad.

And in the district municipality of Muskoka—is the member for Muskoka (Mr. Miller) here?—they had 133 elected representatives in this area, and now they are down to 49, about one-third.

An hon. member: What's the point? Isn't that good?

Mr. Givens: The point that I am trying to make is this—

Mr. Rhodes: What is wrong with that? What is wrong with it?

Mr. Givens: —that as far as regional integration is concerned, this has served the purposes of the provincial government, to reduce the number of people that they have to deal with. As far as the people that they are supposed to represent is concerned, as far as the care for the people that the preceding speaker was talking about is concerned, it takes away representatition from the people. They could turn to an elected representative and complain to him about some problem, and take up with him some problem that they had. They had somebody to discuss it with but now they don't have anyone to discuss it with. This is what it has accomplished.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Certainly not the cabinet.

Mr. Givens: As far as autonomy is concerned, the Throne Speech talks about:

> My government believes that a strong and reformed local government is in the best position to determine its own priorities, and proposes to transfer, to strengthen local governments, more authority and responsibility for many of the decisions that relate to local matters.

Everything that they have been doing is just the opposite. It has been taking away local autonomy, because the local tier loses autonomy within the regional government and the regional tier loses autonomy within the provincial government. The lower tier has inferior status and lacks authority to perform any functions at all. The urban-rural mix causes problems, because the rural people feel that the urban people are getting the benefit, and the urban people feel that the rural people are getting the benefit. There is a wedge driven in between them, and there is great alienation between the urban and the rural people, much greater than we have had before.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Name one thing that is taken away from them.

Mr. Givens: This close financial tie with the province causes centralization at the provincial level and completely detracts from the autonomy of the local areas. The local choice and options have been eliminated, and little integration of plans and policies can take place.

I am saying with great respect that what regional government is resulting in is crisis government and more complex government. The people are alienated because they were all supposed to be consulted with respect to regional government going into these various areas, and they were not consulted.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): They certainly were.

Mr. Givens: The politicians have been consulted, but not the local people. In addition, there has been a lack of integration of programmes.

I think, consequently, I agree with the remark that my leader made, that before plunging ahead pell-mell with implementation of other regional governments, we should evaluate those regions which have already gone into effect, for the reasons that I have indicated. Let's not have this myth and this fiction of local autonomy, because this is not what it is resulting in at all.

Then the government indicated in the Throne Speech that:

> As a result of its review of the report of the select committee on the Ontario Municipal Board, my government will place before you proposals to make the board a more effective vehicle for discharging its responsibilities.

I thought that the OMB was pretty effective up till now.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Where it reverses the decisions?

Mr. Givens: What that deals with, of course, is the role that the OMB has played. During the Depression the OMB was brought into force because it was to deal with the financial capabilities of the various municipalities, which at that time were frankly going broke. They weren't able to borrow on capital account, and when they did borrow there were defalcations. The role of the OMB at that time was to be the policeman with respect to the financial capacity of the various municipalities.

There has been a metamorphosis of that role and now the OMB barges in with respect to planning jurisdiction so that no municipality can make a move with respect to planning or zoning without the approval of the OMB. With respect to borrowing, not only does the OMB deal with the financial capability of any particular municipality—whether or not it has the ability to pay back or whether it has the ability to borrow—it goes into the merits of the particular case.

If the government is going to talk about local autonomy and if it is going to have something like the Ontario Municipal Board which is going to be the big brother who is

going to look over their shoulders, and if the government is going to elect people to municipal governments and is going to treat them like retarded children, they are going to continue to act and behave like retarded children. I don't think that in this day and age a city like Hamilton or Metropolitan Toronto or Windsor that has good professional staff, machines, computers, accounting advice and every other kind of advice available to it—again, these municipalities have populations and budgets, as I mentioned before, which are bigger than the populations and budgets of eight of the 10 provinces of Canada — should have to go through this humbling experience of having to go to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval on planning and rezoning or with respect to borrowing.

Yes, I believe that there should be an ultimate court of appeal. When you have gone through a whole series of meetings like we do in the city, with committee meetings and executive committee meetings, council meetings, and Metro meetings over a period of eight or nine months, and then you go to the Ontario Municipal Board and they start from the beginning— ad initio, right from the beginning of things as if nothing else has happened before—I don't think you can talk about local autonomy.

Another remark made during the time we had the hearings was on the question of corruption. Listen to this—on the question of corruption. We listened to witnesses like former Chief Justice McRuer and Jack Weir who said that one of the reasons for the OMB was the fact that it avoids corruption in the municipalities.

Then along came another minister who used to serve on this government, a man by the name of Bob Macaulay, and he said there was absolutely no corruption at all and he blew the whole case. We know, and I had beter be careful how I choose my words, that if there is such a thing as corruption—and probably there is, as there is among doctors and lawyers and accountans and ordinary people who steal things from chain stores and department stores—if there is corrupion, it isn't limited to the municipal field. It may appear in other fields. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce made a statement about the people he saw here on opening day. We were all permitted to have four tickets for the ceremony that takes place here on opening day.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Does the member mean he was scalping?

Mr. Givens: I was dying to bring one of my kids here and I couldn't get a fifth ticket. When I came here, I saw the judges here—okay; heads of boards and commissions—okay; heads of big associations and the trades union movement—okay. Then I saw what he saw—contractors, builders, developers; men whose claim to fame is the fact that they have made millions of dollars, a great deal of it from the public trough. I am sure they were not invited here by anybody on our side. I didn't see any friends here.

An hon. member: They were all in Ottawa.

Mr. Givens: Nor are they related by blood, consanguinity or marriage to anybody on that side. Bringing them into this chamber to shake the hands of the Lieutenant Governor is like taking Xaviera Hollander to meet mother at home, especially when mother's there!

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): The member should have checked with his leader.

Mr. Givens: We have a right to be suspicious, if nothing more, as to whether there is corruption at this level whether there is corruption at the federal level. It's not confined to one field. Who was overlooking what the provinces did? Who was overlooking what the federal government did?

Another factor is that many of the members who sit here, on all sides of the House, from all parties, are people who were formerly members of municipal councils. So they were corruptible when they were at the lower level, but they're not corruptible now. I too have a right to be as indignant as the Premier (Mr. Davis) was yesterday when he got up and he said, "I am proud of my party"; and "I don't do things that are wrong"; and "I do everything that's legal"; and so on and so on. Surely we have a right to be indignant too?

Mr. Drea: Well, doesn't the member?

Mr. Givens: And if there is a function to be performed in keeping local councillors in line, the builders and the developers who appear at the local level and at the provincial level; then there should be some other kind of organization which looks after corruption and not an organization like the Ontario Municipal Board.

I believe that there should be a court of appeal, of last resort and it should be on the record. If hearings at boards of inquiry or at committee meetings at local councils are properly being carried on; and if there's

a denial of natural justice, if citizens aren't being heard and the reports aren't being divulged and circulated, we should stiffen the strength of the legislation to see that at the local level these people are heard and that there is no such denial of natural justice.

Mr. Drea: Introduce it as a bill and I'll sell it.

Mr. Givens: But I don't think that the big municipalities of this province require that kind of policemanship from the Ontario Municipal Board. This is what I think we should watch when the legislation comes through. If we're going to talk about local autonomy and we're going to talk about municipalities looking after their own fate, then we should give them the jurisdiction and the powers to do it.

Now, on the question of transportation—

Mr. Drea: Here comes the elegy to the death of the expressway.

Mr. Givens: As far as my riding is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I feel that my people have been sadly betrayed by this government—and it talks about looking after people—and I'll tell the members why. People come to me and they ask, "Is the Spadina Expressway dead?"

Mr. Drea: Yes.

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: Except when the member revives it.

Mr. Givens: Maybe the members opposite are right. Certainly as long as this Premier is around as Premier there will probably not be a Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Rhodes: And others, and others.

Mr. Givens: Whether there will be others or not, let me say this—

Mr. Rhodes: On his side of the house.

Mr. Givens: If manufacturers are going to keep selling a million vehicles a year like we brag about in this Legislature, people are going to have to have some place to run them.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Right.

Mr. Givens: Motor vehicle registration in Metropolitan Toronto today is in a ratio of about two vehicles to three people. Now, it seems to me from the standpoint of logic, forgetting politics for the moment, that if we're going to have that many motor vehicles in this city and other cities—certainly in this city, as far as I'm concerned, where I reside—we're going to have to have some north-south thoroughfare between the Don Valley Parkway and Highway 27.

It just staggers the imagination to think that we can go on bringing the number of motor vehicles into this city and not allow for some kind of north-south thoroughfare. Now, whether it's going to be the Spadina or a continuation of Highway 400, somebody is going to have to come to grips with this situation in the future, and the sooner the better because there's no way around it.

Last November the Premier got up at the Science Centre and he said to the people of the northwest quadrant, "We will give you a dial-a-bus system."

Mr. Drea: And we have.

Mr. Givens: And when he made the promise it sounded as if the dial-a-bus system was going to be imminent. Now because of a question that I asked the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) the other day, he went out and waxed eloquent in front of the TV cameras—he didn't give the answer in the House—that next November, in time to compete with the snowploughs, there are going to be three pilot projects: two in Downsview, which is away north of my riding.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't know why they bothered with that one.

Mr. Givens: It's in the riding of my hon. friend in front of me. And one in the district of Don Mills, which is a two-car family area. This is going to be an experiment? It will take at least from November of 1973 to the fall of 1974 to draw up a report. This is the dial-a-bus system which the Premier has promised the people of northwest Toronto. I say that he has betrayed these people, because unless he was prepared—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Of course he has betrayed them.

Mr. Givens: —to deliver alternatives he shouldn't have cancelled out the subway which was supposed to run down the subway alignment of the Spadina Expressway. So no alternatives were provided.

Mr. Singer: Right!

Mr. Givens: And where are you going to take them from Downsview and York Mills

out to the York Mills station? All the residential streets now have signs on them which say "No thoroughfare" in the rush hour in the morning going south and the rush hour in the evening going north, so they're all being crowded into Bathurst St., and Yonge St. and Avenue Rd. If the members opposite just want to have an experience, let them go there sometime between the hours of 7 and 9 in the morning and see what a great miracle their leader has wrought by abandoning the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Singer: Don't confuse him with logic. He wouldn't understand, that fellow from Sault Ste. Marie; he wouldn't understand.

Mr. Rhodes: Now say something nasty about the north; go ahead.

Mr. Singer: No, just the member. The north is fine, but they have the member; that is too bad.

Mr. Givens: And then we have the monorail, which was promised in November—

Mr. Singer: I talk about it frequently; people change. The member knows all about that.

Mr. Drea: The member for St. George better look out for him.

Mr. Givens: And then the people have been looking forward to the monorail. This is going to be experimented with at the Canadian National Exhibition midway. I guess it's going to run around the periphery of the exhibition.

I think it is interesting to know that the two firms that are going to be competing are Hawker-Siddeley and Kraus-Maffei. Hawker-Siddeley is from near London and Kraus-Maffei from Munich. In both these countries —even though the one in Germany is supported by the federal government—they did not build the monorail. They are providing more conventional subways in Germany. So we are going to experiment probably for a year's period; because if they start at the exhibition, how are they going to simulate the conditions of snow and sleet that we get in Ontario. That will take about a year—

Mr. Foulds: Especially in the north.

Mr. Givens: —so there will be a report on that and there will be a report on the dial-a-bus system just ready for the election of 1975. In the meantime, the people of our area have no alternative transportation facilities. So they are not moving people, and they haven't improved the situation and provided alternatives; and whether it will take place in this century or next century, I don't know.

As far as the subway is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why—when the expressway was aborted—the government couldn't have made a decision at that time in June, 1971, and said: "Go ahead with the subway." Because now the subway route is still up in the air. It is a matter being appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board; and it will probably then be appealed from the Ontario Municipal Board to the cabinet. Labour costs are increasing and costs of materials have increased about 30 per cent since the last subway was started; and the cost of land is increasing. Until such time as the route is decided upon, no more acquisition of land can take place.

Mr. Foulds: Freeze all land.

Mr. Givens: All the people who come from the outside Toronto who cheered the decision are going to find that they are going to be contributing 75 per cent of the increased costs of the subway on which the government could have saved several millions of dollars if it had gone ahead in 1971; as it should have—because no new facts came to the fore at all.

This is the situation that government is in with the aborting of the subway. I say that the people have been betrayed because they had a right to expect better. What is ironic, Mr. Speaker, is that this coming Friday at 1:45, the subway extension from Eglinton to Finch is going to take place.

Mr. Singer: Just to York Mills.

Mr. Givens: Just to show you how long it takes to build a subway system, it's five miles from Eglinton to Finch and it was started in 1963 when I was still a member of the board of control in Toronto; it is just being finished now. And who are going to be the big shots who are going to strut their parts on the stage, and who is going to take all the bows?

Mr. Foulds: Strut their what?

Mr. Givens: Mayor Crombie, Mayor Lastman, people who weren't even around and who never even had an inkling of the decisions that had to be made in 1963 in order to build the extension, which is to run at about $35 million a mile. And the Premier and Mr. Campbell had little to do with the decision.

Ten years from now in 1983, there will be a new crop of people who will have to stand the blame for the terrible decisions that were made in 1971.

I want to deal with one more subject before 6 o'clock—and that has to do with housing. The minister responsible for housing (Mr. Grossman) has risen in the Legislature and he has said that one of the reasons he hasn't been able to provide for low-cost housing was because municipal councils, ratepayer groups and citizens have been blocking his way. We are awaiting imminently a statement from him as to the location of these developments that have been blocked. He was supposed to bring it in yesterday and today, and it hasn't been brought in. The minister has been accused by some mayors, Mayor Lastman of North York particularly, who says that the minister is creating ghettoes.

There was a lead editorial in the Star last night which stated that municipal politicians would be more receptive to low-cost, low-assessment housing generally if a fundamental reform of low taxation was brought in; that real estate taxes should be levied only for actual services to properties, such as sewage, local roads, sidewalks and garbage collection; and that services to the community generally, such as police, welfare and education, should be financed provincially on a more equitable basis related to ability to pay.

I think that was written out of naïveté. I believe that tax reform should take place—and representatives of the municipalities have been clamouring for this for years—because the real estate tax is neither fair nor equitable. Municipalities today are providing services which not only have to do with the administration of real estate but have to do with social services, which should be a provincial responsibility and sometimes can be a federal responsibility. But I think they are being naïve, because I don't think there is any question that there is an evil spirit in the community. I have dealt with some of these ratepayers' groups, and there is no question in my mind that some nice middle-class people practise discrimination and bigotry and even hatred with respect to people who are poor.

One of the things that the preceding speaker didn't mention was the Ontario Human Rights Code, which makes it illegal to discriminate against people on the basis of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin. Yet every day in the week, nice people are discriminating against people who want to live in low-cost housing.

Mr. Foulds: They're not nice people.

Mr. Givens: That isn't the reason they give, though; it is always, "Who is going to pay the taxes?" "We are going to overcrowd the schools." "We haven't enough recreation facilities." "It's going to generate too much traffic" and things of that nature. Yet the minister gets up in this chamber and says, "Why doesn't the NDP go to these meetings and straighten out the ratepayers' groups?" Or: "Why don't the Liberals go over and try to straighten out these ratepayers groups?" Well, I think that the responsibility is his.

I was about to recommend that perhaps the Ontario Human Rights Code should be amended by adding a provision which would not permit people to discriminate against people and practise bigotry against people because of their economic condition. Then I thought that there would be middle-class cronies of mine who wouldn't like this idea, because it would mean that they would be accused of practising bigotry, which is reprehensible and heinous and which everybody regards today as something which is unfair and un-Canadian.

I feel that there is an overwhelming demand today for low-cost housing. From a straight economic standpoint, if we don't provide people with housing they require, then we'll have to provide it in some other way: We will have to build bigger jails; vandalism will go up; the number of broken homes will increase, as will the number of homes where there are drinking problems. These are social conditions which arise out of the fact that people haven't got proper housing.

If there is this overriding and overwhelming public requirement for low-cost housing, then this government should have the guts to go ahead and amend the Housing Development Act to permit the establishment of a board of inquiry that will conduct hearings where ratepayers' groups and members of councils will be able to come down and present their views. And if in the opinion of the board, all criteria with respect to proper housing are met—as far as park space, services, sewers and water, schooling and so on are concerned—if all these qualifications are met, then the provincial government should take the bull by the horns and override the local councils and the ratepayers' groups and proceed with these housing developments.

If there is to be local autonomy, which I advocate, there cannot be local option with respect to prejudice and bigotry and discrimination on the basis of a person's economic condition. Consequently I challenge the government that instead of it throwing the challenge at us, this House should straighten out people in the Province of Ontario who practise this kind of discrimination and bigotry. This government has the power to do so and has done so in the past when it was more progressive than it was Conservative. I say that this evil spirit which persists in the community today—and I believe that it persists and I am sure the minister agrees that it exists—should be rooted out root and branch, the only way we are going to do it is legislatively.

Mr. Drea: Wait till this Hansard gets out.

Mr. Givens: One can say one can't legislate brotherhood and one can't legislate against discrimination and so on. I think 117 decent people, men and women, who sit in this chamber have a right to say to the people of the Province of Ontario, "What you are doing is anti-social and it is wrong." We should take the leadership in this.

This is part of the educational process. If the 117 decent men and women who sit in this chamber aren't prepared to say to the people of Ontario, "There is this overwhelming demand and requirement for public housing; there are 10,000 to 15,000 people on the list who require this kind of attention. If you don't pay for it one way you are going to pay for it double in another way"—unless members are prepared to do this they have no right to be sitting in the seats they sit in.

I challenge the members to take up the cudgels on behalf of the people who are discriminated against, because they are suffering from poverty in this great Province of Ontario that the government has talked about so fluently.

Mr. Drea: Does the member for Downsview approve of that?

Mr. Singer: I can't hear the member opposite.

Mr. Drea: Does he agree with that?

Mr. Singer: If the member has a message for me, let him send it to me.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Forget about it.

Mr. Young moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Before the adjournment of the House, I wonder if the House Leader could make a more effective attempt to indicate tomorrow what the business will be for next week so that we can prepare for what we might expect? I think if we could, as we start the session, try to have some idea of what the business is going to be—I suppose we will be critical and the minister will be defensive—but if we could start out that way, we'll try to co-operate in every way we can. What are we going to do tomorrow?

Mr. Singer: Something on the order paper.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I think it has been agreed that tomorrow we will be on item No. 1 and that the Premier will be speaking at the opening of the House I think that was agreed upon. Subsequently, on Friday, we will remain on the same debate. Because of the time element from now until budget day the rules governing debate, I will be more than receptive to having as many speakers participate in the debate as desire to. I agree very much with the Leader of the Opposition, and I'll endeavour to have a legislative programme announced. Certainly not later than Friday in each week, I'll tell him that. I also believe that we will be sitting probably two evenings next week; probably Tuesday and Thursday.

Mr. Deans: On one matter of importance, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the House leader could tell us whether it might be possible to have some cabinet ministers for tomorrow's debate?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would think that that would be assured.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It will be just like payday.

Hon. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 28, 1973

Grants for community centres, statement by Mr. Brunelle 261

Naming of townships in northern Ontario, statement by Mr. Bernier 261

Acid spill at Dunnville plant, statement by Mr. Auld 262

Ontario Hydro Head Office, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 262

Solid waste disposal, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Stokes 262

Recycling subsidies, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Germa 265

Solid waste disposal, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon 267

Highway litter signs, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis 268

Removal of aggregate from Lake Erie, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Paterson, Mr. Bullbrook 268

Increases in prices of houses, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Shulman, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Lewis 268

Residential tax rebate, question of Mr. White: Mr. Good 271

Great Lakes flood damage, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Deans 271

Suspension of Ottawa policeman, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Singer 271

Sudbury housing investigation, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Martel 272

Removal of books from circulation, questions of Mr. Kerr, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Singer, Mr. Drea, Mr. Renwick 272

Use of government aircraft, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Reid 274

Presenting report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Henderson 275

City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mr. J. R. Smith, first reading 275

Constitution Insurance Co. of Canada, bill respecting, Mr. Reilly, first reading 275

Borough of Scarborough, bill respecting, Mr. Drea, first reading 275

Bridge St. United Church Foundation, bill respecting, Mr. Rollins, first reading 275

Town of Orangeville, bill respecting, Mr. Downer, first reading 275

East York Foundation, bill respecting, Mr. Timbrell, first reading 276

Village of Glencoe, bill respecting, Mr. Eaton, first reading 276

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Burr, first reading 276

Aradco Management Ltd. and Oak Stamping Ltd., bill respecting, Mr. Burr, first reading 276

County of Bruce, bill respecting, Mr. Gaunt, first reading 276

Liability in respect of voluntary emergency medical and first aid services, bill for relief from, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 276

Establishment of safety committees, bill to provide for, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 276

County of Bruce, bill respecting, Mr. Gaunt, first reading 276

City of St. Thomas, bill respecting, Mr. McNeil, first reading 276

Forest Fires Prevention Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bernier, first reading 276

Simcoe and Erie General Insurance Co., bill respecting, Mr. Handleman, first reading 276

Fair practices in the sale of motor vehicle fuel, bill to provide for, Mr. Deacon, first reading 276

Reliable Life Insurance Co., bill respecting, Mr. Handleman, first reading 277

Tillson Spur Line Railway Co., bill respecting, Mr. Parrot, first reading 277

Town of Tillsonburg, bill respecting, Mr. Parrott, first reading 277

Town of Espanola, bill respecting, Mr. Lane, first reading 277

Etobicoke Board of Education, bill respecting, Mr. MacBeth, first reading 277

Crown Attorneys Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 277

Crown Witnesses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 277

Administration of Justice Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 277

Third readings 278

Arbitrations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 278

Proceedings against the Crown Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 281

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Drea, Mr. Givens 282

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Young, agreed to 305

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 305

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 9



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 29, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors today in the east gallery are students from the Adult Day School of the YMCA in Toronto, and in the west gallery, students from Allan A. Martin Sr. Public School of Mississauga.

Statements by the ministry.

PROVINCIAL AUDITOR'S REPORT

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, one day last week I made certain comments concerning OHSC premium collections, which included the phrase "grossly deficient" and which were dependent really on newspaper articles which were misleading, if not inaccurate. Now, in providing an explanation of these circumstances to the House, I think I owe Mr. Stan Martin, the Deputy Minister of Health, who was then the chairman of OHSC, and the officials connected with this administrative change, an apology. I offer that apology now and provide the following explanation to the members of the Legislature.

I undertook earlier this week to examine the Provincial Auditor's comments on the premium payment procedures which were adopted when the two provincial health care programmes were integrated on April 1, 1972. Although this question will be examined in detail by the public accounts committee, there has been some preliminary concern and misunderstanding—including my own—which I want to deal with.

As members know, the two parent plans—one covering hospital accommodation and the other medical care and treatment—presented the commission and the government with a serious administrative problem of integrating two different coverage periods and premium systems. Hospital insurance covered either individuals or families—a two-level system—with the premium collected three months in advance, while the medical plan covered individuals or couples or families who paid one month in advance—a three-level premium system. A decision was made to adopt the Ontario Hospital Insurance number and billing system. This decision was set out in a pamphlet which was distributed by mail to every resident in Ontario, a copy of which I have here with me, if anyone would like to look at it.

Integration of the two plans began with the payment of the first combined premiums in January, 1972. For the rest of that year and ever since, subscribers have paid monthly combined premiums. The effect of this was to give all subscribers of the plan three months' medical coverage for one month's premium. However, it did not affect cash flow as subscribers paid the combined premiums for all 12 months of the year.

The alternative to this would have been to require subscribers of the medical plan to have paid additional premiums in February and March, even though they commenced the combined premium payment in January. In essence, then, medical plan subscribers would have made 14 premium payments during the calendar year 1972. There was no loss or misappropriation involved.

The auditor has questioned only the right of the commission to make these changes without a specific authority from the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but the commission produced for him and for us the legal opinion supporting this action. The public accounts committee may want to look into this opinion, but I want to assure the House that the commission acted on considered advice in dealing with this administrative problem.

I must say, having proffered this apology to those concerned, I hope the media will give it the same coverage as they gave to my uninformed remarks. I invite the leader of the NDP to join me in the apology.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Not yet, my friend, not yet.

Hon. Mr. White: No.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you

have not called ministerial statements as yet, have you?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSAMERICA BUILDING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You have. Well, on a point of order, anyway, with your permission, sir, this morning on CFRB, Jack Dennett, a newscaster who is also a member of the board of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, was critical of a statement I was reported to have made. He said that I had indicated that that building, put up by the Transamerica Corp., was built by the proposal method for the communications authority. I have made no such statement. I said that the proposal method was associated with the building of the new headquarters for Ontario Hydro.

I was well aware that the Transamerica building had been built, and that the communications authority then rented the facility, because there is every indication, which we should verify through questions, that the building had to be modified considerably with the expenditure of a large sum of money in order to make it useful for educational television facilities, since it was built right on the subway track.

I want to make it clear, sir, that I did not say the Transamerica building had been built on a proposal basis.

Mr. Speaker: I believe this cannot constitute a point of order, but I do accept the words of the hon. Leader of the Opposition as a point of privilege at this time, in which he claims to have been erroneously reported in the press. I believe it to be a proper point of privilege.

WASAGA BEACH PARK COMMUNITY

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have written to the reeves of Wasaga Beach, Flos, Nottawasaga and Sunnidale to invite their councils to consider with my ministry the prospects for consolidation of parts of their municipalities.

For several years our government has been working with these municipalities in preparing plans for a multi-purpose recreational park, embracing Wasaga Beach and part of the three townships. The plans, which have been generally accepted by the councils, will form the basis of substantial provincial investments in roads, water, sewer and other services in the park development. However, the ultimate success of the park concept will depend in large measure on the active support and participation of local government with adequate resources and jurisdiction over the entire area.

In the coming weeks, my parliamentary assistant, the member for York East (Mr. Meen), will begin meeting municipal representatives to see how they feel our objective can best be accomplished.

DIAL-A-BUS SYSTEM FOR TORONTO

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement with regard to a proposed expansion of my ministry's activities in our efforts to improve public transit in the suburban areas of Metropolitan Toronto.

I think the announcement is particularly pertinent at this time because of the official opening tomorrow of the Yonge St. subway extension to York Mills, an event that will undoubtedly be of great benefit to transit users in northern areas of Metro.

At this moment officials of my ministry are meeting with the Toronto Transit Commission and are presenting a proposal under which the government would underwrite the cost of a new dial-a-bus demonstration in Metropolitan Toronto. The project, which would be financed by the province for a period of three years, was referred to originally in the new urban transportation policy announced last November by the Premier (Mr. Davis).

This proposal is a continuation of the province's development work in the dial-a-bus field which started with the experiment in Bay Ridges in 1970. The results of the initial experiment were used in the planning and design of the services in Stratford and Kingston and the proposed services in Ottawa and Bramalea. This proposal for Metropolitan Toronto is the next major step forward.

The demonstration plan has been developed by transit specialists representing Metro Toronto, the TTC and my ministry. It is now being considered by the TTC which has been asked to operate the service as agent for the province.

The project would complement existing fixed-route services by providing access to subway and regular bus routes for people

living in suburban areas where nearby transit is not convenient. In off-peak periods the system would be tested as a local transit service centred on some local traffic attraction such as a shopping complex.

The demonstration would also provide the opportunity to study the possibilities of dial-a-bus as a transit service for special groups in the community, such as the physically handicapped.

The selection of the seven areas to be involved in the demonstration was based on the fact that some areas across the top of Metro do not have convenient access to public transit and they also allow for the testing of a variety of service concepts.

Four areas have been selected in which dial-a-bus will operate as a feeder service to the subway terminus at York Mills and to other fixed-route systems. These areas are south Downsview, Armour Heights, York Mills and the south portion of east Willowdale.

Off-peak local service will also be provided to these four areas and to the three additional areas of north Downsview, central Willowdale, and the north portion of east Willowdale.

All seven are low-density residential areas and each presents different transit characteristics and service problems. During the demonstration period, different service techniques will be studied to establish the most suitable design of future systems in urban areas across the province.

The immediate proposal for Metro calls for a fleet of 25 to 30 radio-equipped, medium-capacity buses. During the demonstration it is hoped to test vehicles of several different designs, including electric-powered, pollution-free buses.

The extension of dial-a-bus operations in the Toronto area and elsewhere in Ontario is expected to have a considerable impact on the province's automotive industry and to encourage research and development in the search for pollution-free, quiet and more comfortable buses.

The new dial-a-bus demonstration would create about 70 job opportunities for new TTC bus crews and dispatchers, who will undergo extensive training to familiarize themselves with the new transit mode.

It is anticipated that this proposal will meet with a favourable reaction from the TTC. The starting date for the new service could be early next November. This is the earliest date by which new buses could be procured, crews trained and necessary planning completed.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

STRIKE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING STUDENTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence) and the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour.

In view of the failure of the Minister of Labour to solve the problem of the establishment of a French-language secondary school in Cornwall, and the students' refusal to accept the establishment of a linguistic commission within the next three months as a means toward decision, what immediate steps will the government now take to solve the problem?

Secondly, will a special commissioner be appointed to intervene in the crisis situation created by the government's failure to act on the commissioner's report, now in its hands for over a year?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, perhaps I should tell the House that last evening I did go to Cornwall. I felt it was my responsibility as a local member to take part at the meeting. I must say, first of all, that of course I did not take sides in the dispute; I was there only as a mediator by nature—and by office, as well.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): The minister should have taken sides.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Isn't he in favour of French-language education?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I can tell my hon. friend from Ottawa East, and this goes for my hon. friend from Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), that his contribution so far has not been very helpful either.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He's an instigator!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Isn't the minister in favour of government policy?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: As a matter of fact, if my hon. friend will read the local papers he'll find that even the NDP organization in Stormont is backing the present member.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the minister keeps going—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): They're smartening up.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister shouldn't be in a neutral position.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I presented the government's position at this point in time—

Mr. MacDonald: We'll have to look into our association.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I stated that the government had decided to introduce legislation within six to eight weeks to appoint a commission of language instruction. This was rejected by the student body. I was back here early this morning to report, and I propose to meet with some of my colleagues later on today to assess the situation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Is one of the outcomes of this reassessment liable to be a decision to fulfil the recommendation of the language commissioner's report a year ago, that a French-language secondary school be built without delay in Cornwall?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, it would be pretty difficult to tell my hon. friend what the discussions are going to be about at this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is one of the alternatives available.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East was on his feet.

Mr. A. J. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Premier's statement last week that a commitment for Cornwall would be premature at this time, and in view of the fact that the city is 53 per cent French, and since 2,000 people have been asking for this school since 1969, would the minister, as the member for that area, not agree that they are entitled to a French school for the fall of 1973?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I wish to tell him that I am very close to the people of Stormont. And I will repeat once again that I received 60 per cent of the popular vote.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What's that got to with it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The matter is, unfortunately—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Have a by-election and try it out!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): It's rough over there, isn't it?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Allan Lawrence had more than 60 per cent!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Now, Mr. Speaker, a public quarrel never settles these disputes. I know this.

Mr. Roy: Settle it here!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I'm working very seriously on it—don't worry.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: What's happening really is that there are more than two groups involved. Even the French Canadians are divided on this matter; that doesn't make it that much easier. But by putting all our heads together, I think eventually we will be able to find a solution to the problem. And I can assure my hon. friends that I'm working as hard as I can—it's all I needed after the strike of last week! Thank you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: They are so sensitive over there!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: I have two supplementaries, as it were. First, may I say to the minister that surely the views reflecting this party's position, as voiced by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre, that the demands of the community and the principles of the report received by this government require this school, is as honourable a position as the neutrality of the member who represents them.

Second, under the present circumstances, would the minister consider appointing Mr. Tom Symons—and I mean this in utmost seriousness—as a commissioner to provide a mediation attempt in view of the extremely

able service he performed prior to this in Ontario?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): And he gets an apology from the member for Ottawa Centre!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first question, I would like to record in this House that I've never said that a school for French-language students was not needed. I have never said that.

Mr. Roy: Well, say it again!

An hon. member: Oh, shut up!

An hon. member: Keep quiet long enough for the minister to answer!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: As a matter of fact, they have a French-language school now; only it's working on a shift system—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): If the members of the opposition would keep quiet long enough—

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —which I must admit, after three years is unacceptable to both parents and students. That's where the problem is. But the board has recognized a French-language school for a long time. It's a matter of facilities. As to the appointment of a mediator, this is one of the questions that perhaps might come up in our discussion today. We have a number of options that I would like to look at.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: In view of the minister's answer to my question, and his vacillation on this point—

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): He didn't vacillate.

Mr. Roy: —how can he reconcile this with his statement in the student publication where he is quoted as saying that it would be a crime for Cornwall not to have its own French school? Why can't the minister make a commitment as a matter of policy now and say they are entitled to a French-language school in Cornwall, not on a shift basis, by the fall of 1973?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: There is nothing wrong with my statement, Mr. Speaker, nothing wrong with my statement. I said it then and I say it again today. We are talking—

Mr. Lewis: Because the minister can't get cabinet support. There are still too many people in that cabinet who engage in innuendo, like the minister in charge of housing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We are talking about facilities. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to place on the record of this House that if there is one member in this Legislature who has worked for the Francophone minority in the last 15 years, it is the member for Stormont.

Mr. Lewis: We agree. But he hasn't succeeded because he doesn't have the support of the cabinet.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Why doesn't he get the support of the cabinet?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: The minister doesn't have the support of his cabinet, you know their social consciousness.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Lewis: He knows his colleagues on this issue. He throws up his hands in a Gallic gesture.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. members please come to order, a member wishes to raise a point of order.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to advise you that I am not satisfied with the minister's response and I intend to raise it at the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Lewis: That he is not satisfied with the answer?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Why doesn't the member run federally again?

Mr. Roy: That bothers that member, doesn't it? That really does.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What did the people of Ottawa do for the hon. member for Ottawa East at the last federal Liberal nomination meeting?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: I may say if the degree of exercise on the part of the cabinet is a measure of support for the member for Stormont—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a point of order or a supplementary question?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I also want to express on behalf of this party a lack of satisfaction in the answer of the minister, and we'll use the period available to raise it if possible.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

POPULATION OF MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In the absence of the Premier, a question of the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, and since his position was designated as the chief planner for Ontario by his immediate predecessor, will he comment on a statement apparently made by the Premier in interview with a reporter writing in Time magazine this week? I quote the Premier's word: "We will be saying to certain municipalities, 'Your ultimate population densities will be X number.' This means that development just won't occur on a certain amount of acreage." Is it the chief planner's programme to specifically limit the growth of municipalities by, let us say, designating X number as the ultimate population of any municipality in the province?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think in fairness to the Premier and the reporter, Bob Lewis, that the question about the quotation should be directed to the Premier. Certainly planning does involve imposing certain maximum population densities, whether that be X evolving to Y evolving to Z or something else. Nothing is forever. But I think it's essentially correct to express the idea in the terms used by the Leader of the Opposition, yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: If the Treasurer is saying that when the Premier said "we are going to say your population will be X," and the chief planner says, "It will be X evolving to Y evolving to Z," how are we going to know what the government policy is, if the chief planner does not say, essentially, the same thing as the Premier, the boss?

Mr. Lewis: Where do we stand on A,B,C?

Hon. Mr. White: I think that one might determine that by questioning the Premier on exactly what he did say.

I simply do not want to leave the idea in the minds of the members that a number determined today is going to last until the year 2000. Zoning and planning and land control is far too complicated for that rather simple answer; and so while it is perfectly true we do establish population densities as part of zoning and development, it must be said that implicit in any zoning is the flexibility to let these plans evolve over the times; the needs and the wishes of the community alter through time.

It might be too complicated for the member's simple mind.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Treasurer would repeat what he said. Did he in fact say: "Is that too much for the member's simple mind, maybe"? Is that the sort of thing he is prepared to contribute to this debate?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: When all else fails be a bit stupid!

Mr. Speaker: Those were the words I heard. I would ask the hon. minister to withdraw the statement.

Hon. Mr. White: In point of fact, the hon. member's mind is not often simple; and if he feels that it is not simple today I will certainly accede to the request with pleasure.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition accept the withdrawal?

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is burying himself even more.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the second apology today. That isn't a bad batting average.

Mr. Singer: The minister is not very smart, is he?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is one of the Treasurer's more gracious moments.

Mr. Lewis: It was the Treasurer's only gracious moment.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Scarborough West.

PROVINCIAL AUDITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Lewis: Yes; talking about simple and complicated minds, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the provincial Treasurer, before I tender an apology: Since he knows that the

Provincial Auditor's disagreement on the matter of authority was ancillary to his basic statement, which was that premier receipts for the year would have been increased by approximately $50 million if they hadn't provided 14 months of coverage on 12 months of premium, and also that there would have been an additional $5 million if there hadn't been the under-billing, the Treasurer saying that the Auditor made a $55 million error in his report; or that in fact the Auditor is right, and that additional money will never be billed?

Hon. Mr. White: I think the Auditor is not incorrect in that if we had—just a minute now, just a minute!

Mr. Lewis: My simple mind doesn't accept double negatives. I can't absorb that. I want to understand what that means in English.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: It is correct, but it ain't right! That's what it means.

Mr. Lewis: Now reconcile that for me.

Hon. Mr. White: And here is why it is correct and ain't right; because while it is technically correct if there had been no alteration on the premium schedule there would have been 14 premiums required of these people and additional amounts of money collected, at the same time it would be equally correct to say if we had billed six months in advance, or 12 months in advance, we would have had hundreds of millions of dollars additional.

Now the fact of the matter is we received 12 premium cheques from the people being covered, and only the time of advance coverage was altered. Therefore, the only way in which an advantage could accrue to the premium-payer would be to move out of the jurisdiction. There would be a similar alteration for the entire society in the event that the plan wound up, which I see as being highly unlikely, to put it mildly.

An hon. member: Shame, awful!

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: That's really specious claptrap and the minister knows it. He knows it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: And the member is attempting to mislead the people.

Mr. Lewis: Take off your shoe and pound it on the desk.

An hon. member: Sit down, Napoleon!

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister get another job?

Mr. Lewis: The minister is trying to bail his colleague out of trouble. Nonsense!

Mr. Singer: Bring back Charlie!

Mr. Lewis: Is the Provincial Auditor right when he says, to take another approach, it can be said that essentially—and I am going to interpolate essentially on the basis of the plan as it was then run, not on the basis of the minister's preposterous hypothesis—essentially, the OSIP premiums and the hospital services insurance portion of the OHIP premiums collected during the 12-month period from April, 1971, to March, 1972, provided health services insurance benefits for the 14-month period from May, 1971, through June, 1972. Surely that is correct and therefore he is correct.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, that is correct and it is exactly what I said—

An hon. member: Oh!

Hon. Mr. White: —that the cash flow was exactly the same as it would have been in the absence of this merger.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. White: That the amount of money collected monthly from individual premium payers and premium payers collectively was unaltered, that the period of coverage was changed and so there was a technical gift—a technical, not a practical gift—of two months premium coverage.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It is a real gift—$50 million. It won't influence—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This exchange is purely argumentative and is not proper under the question period.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No further supplementaries. The exchange is argumentative and we will not pursue the topic further.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not my exchange, surely?

Mr. Singer: There is no more simple, reasonable person—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Bailing them out again.

Mr. Lewis: This is a reasonable man, if I may say so. You want to afford him an opportunity now and again.

Mr. Singer: The member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) was pro-American but he knew what he was talking about.

An hon. member: When was that?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The minister is simple-minded.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: I'd like to address a question, Mr. Speaker, to one in the cabinet who is clearly not a simpleton, and that is the Minister of Revenue.

Interjections by hon. members.

PURCHASE OF HOME LOTS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask of the Minister of Revenue how citizens of the Province of Ontario find their way to the actual purchase of a HOME lot; how the builders choose among those who approach them for purchase of lots?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the builders will advertise. They have lots which are under our lot-lease programme and on which they are prepared to put up buildings for people who apply for them. What other way could there be?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: The government has therefore no way of control over those who may need a lot most. In fact, a builder can enter into all kinds of private arrangements on the recommendation of members of this House or with those who reach him first, or in any other way.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Or any friends.

Mr. Lewis: Or any friends. But in fact those who are most in need are by no means served. The minister hands it over to the builders to make the decision.

Mr. Deans: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the builders are asked to take the applications in the order in which they receive them.

Mr. Deans: How can the minister tell?

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister know it to be true?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know the question wasn't meant to be argumentative and I don't want to give an argumentative answer. I am trying to keep calm.

I was about to say that there is, of course, very limited control in that result. There is the matter of the amount of income these people have. There is a limit on the income, I believe, of those who purchase them. If there is an income limitation, it really doesn't make a good deal of difference insofar as providing housing stock for those who need it is concerned.

In addition to this, for the last two, three or four months we have had a new policy in which OHC, in fact, buys some of the buildings for its own purposes—I believe it is up to 10 per cent of the number of lots—so that we can put into those houses, under our rent supplement programme, people who have made application or are very badly in need of—

Mr. Lewis: But the minister really has no control over the ways in which the builders distribute those lots to friends or those who reach them, or those who have inside information. And the minister knows, doesn't he, that it is abused?

Mr. Stokes: Ask the member for Scarborough Centre.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know that it is abused. First let me say that I admit there are limitations to the control we have in respect of the matter which the hon. member has raised. There are limitations. We could, of course, enlarge our bureaucracy more and have people fill out more forms and have lists and all that.

However, I admit that there are some limitations in this respect. I have no evidence—certainly none has come to my attention—of any abuse in this respect. If the hon. member has any evidence of that I will be glad to investigate.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): No, the minister doesn't have to enlarge his bureaucracy. He has sufficient bureaucracy.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, of the minister: In view of the

fact that some Conservative members from the Scarborough area are boasting that they have clients or friends of theirs on the lists now—

Mr. F. Drea: (Scarborough Centre): The member had better name a name right now.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. I'll name the member for Scarborough Centre.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask a question of the minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for York South has the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: Have I got the floor?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre may rise, on a point of privilege, I believe.

Mr. Drea: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: Oh!

Mr. Drea: I have never got anybody on a list of any kind at any time at any place.

An hon. member: Speak up.

Mr. Drea: The member for York South just said that I did.

An hon. member: Is the member for Scarborough Centre that ineffectual?

Mr. Drea: I'm asking him to apologize to me right now.

Mr. MacDonald: May I now ask my question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Drea: I want an apology.

Mr. MacDonald: When I apologize to the member for Scarborough Centre, there will be a blue moon in the sky.

Mr. Drea: Well, let it be recorded then.

Mr. MacDonald: There are certain depths beyond which I don't sink.

Mr. Speaker, my question of the minister is this: In view of the boast of certain constituents of the hon. member for Scarborough Centre that they have been gotten on to a list through the builder, will the minister alter his procedures, namely, that applications should be made through the OHC, conceivably as of a given date, so that they are handled honestly and above board, rather than surreptitiously given preference behind the scenes?

Mr. Renwick: And that the criteria are public.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, first let me be very positive in this matter about people getting special consideration. In respect of the allegation that some Conservative members are bragging about getting people into these houses, I tell the hon. members on my honour as a member of this Legislature, as a member of the cabinet, that I cannot recall anyone attempting to use any influence in this manner at all.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): What's the next joke?

Mr. MacDonald: Will the minister answer my question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is my friend over there suggesting that I'm telling a lie to this House?

Mr. Lewis: The minister offers proposals.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not a joke at all. I will tell the hon. member this, that there have been — I can't remember too many of them—members from all sides of this House making inquiry at my office and—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —I have told them that there is a list of builders and they are to get in touch with the builders involved.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the minister answer my question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was the end of it.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the minister answer my question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will give him the answer. That is the first part.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the minister handle it through the OHC, above board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will give me a chance I will answer his question. I can't answer it while he is talking.

Mr. MacDonald: I am giving him a chance.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Insofar as the second part of the question is concerned, I remember

having quite a discussion on the matter of the method by which these homes are marketed. I think it arose from one of the first situations I was faced with when I became responsible for housing. I think it was the one in Hamilton—

Mr. Deans: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —where there was a lineup in very bad weather, and so on. We made some changes there. But the suggestion the hon. member made at that time was discarded after a great deal of discussion, because of its being impractical for some reason or other. I will consider the question the hon. member has raised today. I will come back to this Legislature with the reasons as to why it has not been accepted, if in fact it ever was considered.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is very uncertain about this, because he has no control.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Or perhaps if it appears to be a practical one I will make some changes in that respect.

Mr. MacDonald: That is fair enough for the time being.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: A question of privilege?

Mr. Lewis: Can it be done?

Mr. Speaker: Personal privilege.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is simply this, I did not believe in this House that the kind of thing that went on a moment ago could really go on.

An hon. member: Oh, go on!

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. Drea: Now I'm coming to something.

Mr. MacDonald: Pompous.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of record, and if you want to put me to the test I'm prepared to ask the minister a supplementary question, that at no time have I ever communicated with the minister, orally or in writing, on behalf of anybody.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Ask him anyway.

Mr. MacDonald: I didn't say that—with the builders.

Mr. Drea: Sit down. Mr. Speaker, a member has stood here today and accused me of trying to influence something.

Mr. Renwick: Ask a supplementary question of the builders.

Mr. MacDonald: Did the member ask the builders to put his friends on the list?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to put it to the test of this Legislature, if the members so wish. But I point out on a question of privilege that the minister has already, by implication, corroborated my position. I have never, and I repeat never, before I was in this House or in this House, ever tried to interfere with anything. I haven't put anything before it. And I want it cleared, right here and now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: I am not going to have my character assassinated in this House.

Mr. Foulds: The member is doing a good suicidal job himself.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Stand up and say just that I did that. Just go ahead!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Not one of them. Just stand up!

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, let him resign and put it to the people.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Let the leader of the NDP do the same thing at the same time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has raised a point of privilege in which he denies the allegations, apparently made by the hon. member—

Mr. Drea: They were made.

Mr. MacDonald: They weren't made.

Mr. Foulds: The member was asked to name one, and he named one!

Mr. Speaker: It appeared there were some remarks made by the hon. member for York South which offended the hon. member for Scarborough Centre. Now I must point out—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me there is actually no point of privilege. It's an argument, a point of position taken by two members. There is no point of privilege whatsoever. It took place in this House, and there are two different, opposing views as to what took place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: There can therefore be no point of privilege that has been abused.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a mild point of privilege, just so the record will be straight. I didn't accuse the hon. member of going to the minister, I accused him of going to the builders.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): There is a big difference.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Here we go again.

Mr. Lewis: Deny that.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I have just been accused of being a crook.

Mr. Speaker: If that accusation had been made I would have asked the hon. member to withdraw it. He made no such accusation.

Mr. Drea: I just resent the implication, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: There was no implication.

Mr. Drea: That is exactly the words that were used; that I am a crook who attempts to fix things.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not exactly the words that were used.

An hon. member: Get on with something useful.

Mr. Drea: I would like it withdrawn. Either I am or I'm not. If he's got evidence that I'm a crook he'd better say it here.

Mr. MacDonald: What I said is on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Now I make it perfectly clear; there is no way in which I can ask the hon. member for York South to withdraw anything he said.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear! I agree, I agree. Well, the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) isn't here, the Minister without Portfolio (Mrs. Birch) isn't here, and he wouldn't name me; so what has the member lost?

Interjections by hon. members.

HOME PLAN LOT LEASING

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I put a question to the Minister of Revenue: When did the minister revise the rules of the HOME plan so that it was not possible any longer for individuals in the Province of Ontario to lease a lot directly, but it is now possible for them to lease only through a builder?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this was done, I think—and again I don't want to give this as a positive statement, I don't remember the date—it was some time, I think, in 1970 or 1971.

Mr. Lewis: Oh come now!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is going to be in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member has a date let him give it.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it has to be the end of 1972.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, no; it was well before that.

Mr. Lewis: Late 1972.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was well before that.

In any case, the reason for that apparently was because OHC found in leasing the lots to individuals to provide their own building there was difficulty in getting the area built up. There was some difficulty as between builders.

Mr. Lewis: Sure!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One builder would have his own ideas, one purchaser would have his own ideas of what he would want for a house. It would be—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, make them supply it through a builder.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why doesn't the hon. member wait!

Mr. Lewis: Because the minister does everything for builders.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was some difficulty as between the levels of the two houses. There were complaints about the

water running from one lot into another after the houses were built.

Mr. Lewis: So the minister decided in favour of the builders, didn't he?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, most of the builders involved in these lot-lease programmes were all small builders. I should say, by and large, they were small builders. I'd better be careful, I don't know if there was a big one.

Most of them, I think, get anywhere from eight, 10 to 20 lots. So it was also a way of trying to keep the small builder in business.

I think, by and large, it has worked out very well. If the hon. member doesn't think it has worked out very well I refer him to a very good news article, starting on the front page of the Star, by one Mack Parliament, in which he points out how the HOME lot programme has worked so wonderfully in Malvern.

Mr. Lewis: Right, right; in Malvern! But let's talk about the other parts of the province.

Mr. Deans: I have a question.

Mr. Speaker: Order! There have been sufficient supplementary questions on this topic.

Mr. Deans: I have a question.

Mr. Speaker: There have been sufficient supplementaries. The hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener).

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There were no supplementary questions.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion there were supplementaries.

Mr. Deans: It was a new question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West asked the hon. minister supplementary questions.

Mr. Deans: He did not.

Mr. Lewis: I understand your anxiety at the time, Mr. Speaker, but it was a new question. It had nothing to do with the previous line of questioning.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was an old question repeated.

Mr. Speaker: It was all about the housing—

Mr. Lewis: It had to do with the situation in the Sudbury basin right now.

Mr. Speaker: I did not detect it to be a new question. I thought it was all about housing to the same minister—

Mr. Lewis: Well, I—

Mr. Speaker: —therefore it was all on the same topic.

Mr. Lewis: —admit that the minister—

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that we should accept the hon. member for St. David at the moment.

INCREASES IN PRICES OF HOUSES

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question of the Minister of Revenue. In view of today's discussion—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mrs. Scrivener: —and inasmuch as I was in attendance at a housing task force public hearing in Ottawa yesterday and consequently was absent from the House, I would like to ask the minister to clarify a point.

Is the headline in the two-star edition of today's Star correct in that it states that a price hike of 10 per cent in the HOME programme was kept a secret? Also, it has been my impression that the price of housing under the HOME plan was always controlled, but the newspaper reports the minister as saying the province does not have the power to impose ceilings under the HOME programme.

I'd be grateful if he could clarify this for me, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, to answer the last question first. The hon. member is quite right in that the province does have the power to impose ceilings, and she's quite right that the Star has stated in the article that the province does not have the power. In fact, it's supposed to be quoting me.

Mr. Stokes: The minister stated that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I stated yesterday that it does have the power. The Star was contacted today and the mistake was pointed out. It was apparently a typographical error.

Mr. Singer: The minister is apologizing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It wasn't important. Somebody just put "not" between two words.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did say we do have the power to control prices under the HOME plan. As far as the headline is concerned I was very concerned about it when it says that I admitted there was a secret price hike of 10 per cent in the HOME programme. There is no such thing, of course, as a secret hike.

As a matter of fact, there has always been a policy that, from time to time, it is necessary, to keep in line with increased costs, to increase the maximum amount for which a builder can sell a house under the HOME programme. Indeed, by and large, there hasn't been an increase, except in one or two instances in some particular areas, for five years.

The increase that I talked about yesterday runs somewhere between five and 10 per cent. I don't know how the headline writer could come to the conclusion that it was secret because I—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —mentioned it here in the House yesterday. It was just approved by the government. We are just in the process of getting a statement ready which probably would have been given on Monday or Tuesday. No one has been allowed the increase yet because we haven't had any new houses advertised in this programme. The new offer has not been advertised yet, as far as I can recall.

The point is, how can anybody claim it's a secret when the minister gets up in this House and tells everybody an increase is going to be allowed, and it was just approved by the government this week? I think that answers the hon. member.

As far as the amount is concerned, again I repeat that by and large there have been very few increases allowed since 1968. Prices were increased by between five and 10 per cent which I think, having regard for a five-year gap, is doing very well. The fact that the HOME houses go so well is evidence we are doing a good job.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

ASSISTANCE FOR NURSING HOME OPERATORS

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Does the minister plan to assist the small nursing home operators who are having trouble complying with regulations of the extended care programme introduced by his department last year, or does he plan to enforce the rigid regulations, which will reduce the income of nursing home operators and force many of the small nursing home operators out of business on account of a reduced number of beds?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, my staff have been instructed to co-operate as much as they can with the small nursing home operators. We must realize, of course, that there are standards of care that must be maintained. There is the odd small nursing home, and even the odd large one, where the standards are not up to what we think they should be; then we must insist that they be raised. But in the case of small nursing homes where they run into difficulties, we would be delighted if the hon. member would draw those to my attention because my staff are most anxious to co-operate with them as far as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

COST OF TRADE MISSIONS

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Regarding the 11 people who have been sent to Spain, the 12 people to Mexico, the eight people to New Orleans, as well as other junkets to Atlanta and Newark and another two junkets that are going to Italy in two stages, what proportion of the cost of these trips is underwritten from the public purse, and what does the minister hope to achieve as a result of this expenditure?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the cost underwritten by the government, the flight passage is paid by the government; the individual's costs while he is in the country he is visiting—for hotel accommodation and other out-of-pocket expenses—are entirely his responsibility. I say again, the government's only responsibility is supplying his air ticket to the particular country we are visiting.

What do we expect to accomplish? Mr. Speaker, quite often when we are entertaining a trade mission to a particular country, we review the situation very closely as to the type of suppliers in that country and the type of products that might be produced in Ontario. Then we try to match this with a manufacturer in the Province of Ontario who would be interested in visiting the country, and try to negotiate a licensing arrangement or some type of manufacturing connection between the two firms. We do an assessment, and we believe that the records in our ministry prove that it has been very profitable for this province and for the manufacturing industry in this province.

Mr. Stokes: Well, a supplementary: What direct benefits have flown from the junket to Ireland and the tourist junkets to Mexico and Italy—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Stokes: —which didn't involve any kind of products?

Mr. Lewis: Especially Ireland!

Mr. Singer: What about the skiing one?

Mr. Deans: Other than an increase in the price of—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, may I say that these particular trade missions the member speaks of have only come to a conclusion in recent days, and at this time I do not have before me in the ministry a report on these affairs—

Mr. Lewis: What about the Ireland one?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not had a chance to review the report on the Ireland mission, but it has been through my ministry, under the former minister (Mr. White). But I do say to the hon. member that we can get him some indications as to the areas where we were extremely successful. We are also prepared to supply him with the number of visits and calls made by our manufacturers and those that visited from Ontario with manufacturers and suppliers in the countries we visited.

Mr. Stokes: The minister makes that commitment?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

FLIGHT OPERATIONS OF TRANSAIR

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Realizing that this matter is not in his jurisdiction, would the minister use his good offices—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: He can probably handle it better.

Mr. Rhodes: Would the minister use his good offices to obtain the following information from the Canadian Transport Commission in regard to the flights between Toronto, Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay, Dryden and Winnipeg, as operated by the airline known as Transair:

1. The on-time performance of the flights as per the scheduled timetable—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: To continue:

2. The reason for scheduled flights to be cancelled or unduly late due to equipment being used for charter flights—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Why not write him a letter?

Mr. Rhodes: Also:

3. The reason for converting a 115-seat Boeing 737 to 76-seats by installing freight pallets.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: And:

4. The reason for using a 60-seat F-28 jet instead of a 737 on weekends.

5. Why it is necessary for the flights to be delayed while crews are taking required rest here in Toronto.

All of which affect the service to the communities mentioned.

Mr. Shulman: Great maiden speech!

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest that the question should properly be placed upon the order paper?

The hon. provincial Treasurer has the answer to questions previously asked.

Mr. Lewis: The last time I took a Transair flight from Toronto to the Soo, it landed in Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., by mistake.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have answers to—

Interjetctions by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Order, order. The Treasurer is speaking.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. provincial Treasurer.

QUARTERLY REPORT ON OHIP FINANCIAL STATUS

Hon. Mr. White: I have answers to two questions asked earlier in the week, the first by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the quarterly financial report, and more particularly the $14 million increase in OHIP premiums, the question being, "Why were OHIP premiums $14 million higher than expected?"

The answer is as follows: The 1972 budget estimated OHIP premiums at $498 million for the 1972-1973 fiscal year. Ontario's financial monitoring process indicates the final premium revenues for the 1972-1973 taxation year will be in the order of $512 million-$515 million. This $14 million change in increased yield is essentially a forecasting difference. The member will appreciate that at the time of the 1972 budget estimation of Ontario's OHIP premium yield, it was very different due to a number of factors:
1. The province made extensive changes in levels of premium costs effective Jan. 1, 1972, for pensioners, and April 1, 1972, for all our subscribers.

2. Premium assistance is based on taxable income and the federal government made a number of changes in exemptions and deductions which affected taxable income.

3. The separate premium collection operation of the OHSIP plan and the OHSC plan were merged into the comprehensive OHIP plan at this time.

TAX CREDIT FOR MACHINERY

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the NDP asked two questions relating to the tax credit on machinery, the first of which was, "What is the cost of the investment tax credit?"

The answer is that the total cost of the investment tax credit to Ontario from March, 1971, to March, 1973, is estimated to be $80 million to $90 million. The cost realized to the end of the fiscal year 1972-1973 is approximately $53,300,000; the remainder of the costs will fall in the fiscal year 1973-1974 due to the nature of payment streams under the Corporations Tax Act. This incentive was developed by Ontario to stimulate investment and create jobs. It is interesting to note that this type of incentive was later adopted by the federal government in the May, 1972, budget when the manufacturing processing incentives for Canada were introduced.

Clearly this type of incentive has been recognized as a way of promoting economic growth and placing Canada on a more competitive basis with the US.

Mr. Stokes: How many jobs?

Mr. Lewis: How many jobs?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Just listen!

Hon. Mr. White: The second question was how well did the credit perform in creating jobs? The answer is that there are no exact figures available and the nature of the job creation process makes it difficult to estimate.

However, information from two sources indicates that this incentive was effective in this respect. First of all, responses from major corporation which were surveyed by the Ministry of Revenue indicate that the credit has been used to increase employment. Secondly, unemployment performance in Ontario has been much better than the rest of Canada over the two-year period—

Mr. Lewis: That had nothing to do with the incentive.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —when Ontario was the only province which possessed such an incentive.

Mr. Lewis: The incentive was a gift to corporate profits.

Hon. Mr. White: In 1971, Canada's unemployment performance was 6.4 per cent and in 1972 6.3 per cent, in contrast to Ontario where we had 5.2 per cent unemployment in 1971 and 4.8 per cent unemployment in 1972—

Mr. Lewis: This has nothing to do with the question. The answer is out of order.

Hon. Mr. White: —and the labour force increased by 11 per cent a year during the two-year period.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, am I correct in assuming that the lengthy questions of privileges and points of order raised by the members are not deducted from the question period?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you are quite correct in assuming that. They are included in the question period.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports: 1971-1972 Public Accounts of Ontario, Volume 2, Financial Statements of Crown Corporations, Boards and Commissions; and Volume 3, Details of Expenditures.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, my predecessor presented volume 1 of the 1971-1972 public accounts on Nov. 30 last year.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

BANTING AND BEST MEDICAL RESEARCH ACT

Hon. Mr. Potter moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal the Banting and Best Medical Research Act, 1923.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, the Act repealed provides for payment of $10,000 annually from the consolidated revenue fund for the Banting and Best Research Foundation. The repeal removes the grant as a statutory item for inclusion in the estimates in the normal manner.

NURSES ACT

Hon. Mr. Potter moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Nurses Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, the Nurses Act, 1973, amends the Act so that membership in the College of Nurses of Ontario is widened to include registered nursing assistants. The composition of the council is changed to provide for the appointment of persons who are not registered nurses and also for the appointment of registered nurses' assistants.

NURSING HOMES ACT

Hon. Mr. Potter moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Nursing Homes Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, in this amendment there will be changes in the licensing of nursing homes. At the same time the purpose of section 2 is to re-enact section 14 to provide a clear prohibition against the charging of amounts in excess of the amounts prescribed for services or accommodation in a nursing home.

PRACTICE OF DENTAL PROSTHESIS ACT

Mr. R. F. Nixon moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Practice of Dental Prosthesis.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes the practice of denturists without the direct supervision of the dental profession. As well, it sets up the regulation of denturists.

LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. Paterson moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill is to prevent the ballots on a vote under subsection 4 of section 63 of the Act from going directly to union headquarters. The purpose of the amendment is to keep the decision-making process at the local union level.

HIGH LAKE LEVELS

Mr. Haggerty moves, under the legislative standing orders rule 30(a), that ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, mainly the crisis of the high lake levels that exist along the shoreline of Lake Huron, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie and Lake Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: I might say that proper notice of the intention to introduce this motion has been given to me. That is, the standing order requires that notice be given two hours prior to the sitting of the House and I have re-

ceived that notice. I believe the notice to be in order and if it's acceptable to the House we will proceed with the formalities under rule 30.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): With respect to the Premier's reply to the Throne debate this afternoon, I beg the consent of the House to deal with this motion following the Premier's address.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I had the motion from the hon. member for Welland South, which as I have said, in my opinion is acceptable. Now I understand that the consent of the House has been requested in order to proceed with the orders of the day and to revert to this motion at a specific time after the orders of the day have been entered upon. Is that correct?

Do I have that unanimous consent of the House to do so? Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, just before the orders of the day, I think the House would join me in extending our congratulations and our compliments to Sally Barnes and Jonathan Manthorpe for being two of five people who have won Southam Fellowship Awards to the University of Toronto. We congratulate them and wish them well.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day. The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate at 6 o'clock last evening. I understand that the Premier (Mr. Davis) wishes to enter the Throne debate at this particular time. I am quite willing to relinquish my place to the Premier at this moment, providing I have your assurance that I will be next in order.

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the hon. member if he catches my eye at the proper time.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, we are certainly prepared to accommodate the Premier.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It is too bad he is never prepared to accommodate us.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Yes, by being in attendance once in a while.

Mr. Deans: We will even listen to the Premier.

Clerk of the House: The second order: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, may I, at the outset extend my appreciation to the hon. member who wished to debate at this hour the very real problem in his riding and other areas bordering the Great Lakes. I do appreciate that accommodation and also that of the hon. member who was in the midst of his constructive presentation to the Throne debate.

I would not ordinarily, Mr. Speaker, suggest that this be done, but I was anxious to participate at this time because I know the members opposite were anxious to have some of my constructive views as to the opinions and questions that they presented to this House.

I do appreciate the opportunity to do it at this hour because I would assure the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) that I really am not following the example set by his national leader of wearing a rose to every sitting of this House, although I think it's a very excellent thing to do. I just would like to observe for the members of the House that this really is in honour of a birthday. Mr. Speaker, I must confess it is not my own, but later on today the Lieutenant-Governor and I are going to share the 100th anniversary of the town of Brampton. It is a rather long-standing commitment—one might say 100 years—and as a result it is somewhat necessary. I am sure the members opposite would understand this, that I join with the other citizens of that municipality to celebrate a very significant event.

I would of course be delighted to have any members, both on this side of the House and on the other side of the House, join us there this evening. They are entirely welcome—all of them. I certainly noticed the member from St. George (Mrs. Campbell) has already visited my riding. I appreciate that great interest and I will have some observations to make about her just a little later on in the course of my remarks.

I would also like to compliment you, Mr. Speaker, because I don't often get the opportunity on the way that you conduct the affairs of this House—with dignity and with complete impartiality—although there are oc-

casions when we wonder whether perhaps there is a slight tendency to look to the left rather than to the right; but this is not always a bad thing.

I am accused on occasion by some of my more conservative Conservative friends of going a little bit further to the left than the right in the philosophical sense; which of course is not true. But nonetheless, I do understand, Mr. Speaker. I am glad this happens.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Usually for Throne speeches there are more people on the Speaker's left than there are on the Speaker's right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, I would have been very charitable about just who was here and who wasn't here when His Honour the Lieutenant Governor delivered that very excellent address just a few days ago.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, before getting into what I hope will be accepted as non-controversial remarks, two or three matters have been raised very recently. I would just like to show the member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) how rapidly we react to some of the more constructive suggestions he makes. I am not sure that they were that constructive in his Throne Speech contribution in some aspects yesterday, and I will get to that a little later, but certainly there are occasions when he does—I say this quite sincerely, Mr. Speaker—bring to our attention matters that are important. I would just like to read a telegram that has been sent to his national leader:

THE GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO VIEWS WITH CONCERN THE POSSIBILITY OF US CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION PRE-CLEARANCE BEING TERMINATED AT MAJOR AIRPORTS IN CANADA. I URGE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO RECONSIDER SERIOUSLY THE UNILATERAL STEPS BEING TAKEN BY AIR CANADA. THE ARGUMENTS ATTRIBUTED TO AIR CANADA ARE WEAK AND NOT SUBSTANTIVE AND SUCH ACTIONS SEEM CERTAIN TO LEAD TO SIGNIFICANT INCONVENIENCE AND UNNECESSARY DELAYS TO TRAVELLERS TO THE UNITED STATES.

Just to illustrate how promptly we react to the member for York-Forest Hill—

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): I'm dying to hear the answer.

Mr. Lewis: That's more than Pierre Trudeau ever did for him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was going to say—really, the leader of the New Democratic Party is quite right. We probably have accommodated the member for York Forest-Hill here on this side of the House far more than his national leader did during his tenure in Ottawa.

An hon. member: And don't forget it!

Mr. Givens: I wish to express my deep appreciation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I appreciate that. I would also wish to advise the House, Mr. Speaker, on a matter that is of great importance as well. I am disappointed the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) is not here, because I did try to assure him—and I meant it most sincerely—that some of the observations that were made related to a part of the Throne Speech in which he had a particular interest.

What I tried to convey to him, so that he wouldn't need to delay us beyond the normal adjournment hour, was in respect to the terms of reference of the royal commission. I wish to read to the House, Mr. Speaker, the order in council establishing the royal commission on this matter; and it follows very simply:

> That his honour, Judge Harry Waisberg of the county court of the judicial district of York, has been appointed a royal commissioner with the following terms of reference—

And I see the hon. member is back. I shall read it slowly so that he can understand it and listen to it.

> To investigate and inquire into the activities, practices and conduct in the operations, relationships and commercial affairs of those persons, firms, corporations and organizations engaged in the plastering, lathing, drywalling, concrete forming and allied sectors of the building industry in Metropolitan Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, and such other areas as the commission may deem necessary as a result of this investigation, and to report to the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the possibility of any unlawful activities that may exist or may have taken place and to make such recommendations in regard to those matters as the commissioner may deem fit.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) wins again!

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): The member for Thunder Bay is a keen observer of the facts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to deal with some of the other matters in the Throne

Speech and the points raised by the members opposite, I must say that I listened very carefully, and I say this sincerely, to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon). There were some valid and constructive observations. There were some parts of the speech that I say very frankly, Mr. Speaker, are not worthy of a man of the calibre of the Leader of the Opposition, and I shall come to that in a few moments.

I sense, Mr. Speaker, and I know that we are in politics and it is a political process—

Mr. Stokes: Don't talk down to him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the hon. member that it is not a question of talking down, it is a question of trying to set in perspective certain matters where people and others are referred to in this House. I say with respect, Mr. Speaker, it is a practice that I personally think is very regrettable.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not listen, and I apologize, to the leader of the New Democratic Party, but I say this sincerely—

Mr. Stokes: There are a lot more here on this side listening to the Premier today than there were over there listening to the leaders here when they spoke.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say sincerely that I had really been anxious to listen to his contributions, but I did have matters of some significance. I can only assure him that I did hear a portion of it and I can also assure him, through you Mr. Speaker, that I have read very carefully the observations that he has made. I would just say in a general sense that really the leader of the New Democratic Party has come close to taking the place of a former member who, while he was difficult to deal with on occasion none the less I think many of us regarded as being something of a friend and colleague, the former member for Sudbury, who in his own inimitable fashion endeavoured to reorganize the Treasury benches of this province with the same singular lack of success.

But I do compliment the leader of the New Democratic Party. What the speech lacked in substance, certainly the style was there, the humour was there, and I thoroughly enjoyed those portions I listened to and those portions I read. But I would say to him, and I want to make this abundantly clear, that while it is part of the game to have a little fun with the ministers, to have fun with the Premier, this I expect, this we all understand and appreciate, just so there is no misunderstanding in his mind or anyone else's, I have great confidence in the capacity and the integrity of the executive council members of the Province of Ontario. They are performing a very valuable function and—

Mr. Lewis: I hope the Premier has—he appointed them!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —they are doing it in a totally relevant way.

I would say, as it relates to one particular minister, where the request has been made both by the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party—once again, I fully appreciate, with something of a partisan feeling—that he should bring himself to resign from the very difficult ministry that he has, I would say for the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter), Mr. Speaker, that he is a man who is completely committed to his responsibilities, who has had certain difficulties in a personal way with his own health in the past three to four months, has laboured under these personal disadvantages, has worked hard at his ministry, in an area that probably is as complex as any other area of government administration at this precise moment, and that he is doing it in a totally responsible way. And I want to say to the members opposite who have called for this minister's resignation, I have no intention of having him leave the Ministry of Health in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Ever?

Mr. Lewis: That was a startling affirmation.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The Premier was in on the error. What else could he do?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, ever is a long time. But if the hon. member who made the interjection really has some ambitions in that direction himself, I would just say that he really should restrain himself, because it will probably be before his great-grandchildren come into being that there is ever any likelihood that he would be a part of the executive council of the Province of Ontario. It will be a long, long time.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That's a high school gesture. That kind of comment is not worthy of the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I don't think it's unworthy. I would say to the hon. member for York South that I look upon it—and I hope that most of my presentation today will repre-

sent the same thing—I look upon it as a statement of fact.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): It's a snide remark—and the Premier knows it!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is another matter that I would like to refer to. I have long and copious notes and a great detailed speech here today, but I may ramble a little bit—I haven't really reached them yet. There is another matter, though, that I believe was raised by the leader of the New Democratic Party, a matter that is of concern to the government. I wish to inform the hon. members of the House about the proposed use of the land east of Bay St.

Mr. Speaker, there is some lengthy history as to the accumulation of this property by the Province of Ontario. Some two months ago, the Ministry of Government Services invited—and I want this clearly understood—invited five or six presentations of a conceptual nature related to the possible use of that particular piece of land. These were conceptual in nature; there was no determination by the government whether it would proceed, when it would proceed or how it would proceed.

I have viewed those conceptual drawings and models myself, along with the minister of that particular department, and I must say, Mr. Speaker—and this reflects no criticism, because I don't think this is the appropriate approach—but none of them is acceptable to the government of the Province of Ontario. There will be no development along the lines that were contained in the conceptual presentations made to the government.

We will reassess the position, and we shall do so in light of the planning developments taking place by the city of Toronto planning board in their midtown studies, which have been delayed because of their concentration of work, I would think, on the Eaton Centre and Metro Centre developments.

Whatever development and use is determined east of Bay St. in the future, Mr. Speaker, will be compatible with the desires of the city of Toronto and with the social and economic objectives of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: That's one result of the by-election!

Mr. Lewis: They learn slowly, but they learn. That is quite a retreat.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, if the leader of the New Democratic Party could put himself in the position—which he never shall—of Premier of this province, he would recognize the degree of flexibility and the degree of reaction to the change that has taken place.

Mr. Lewis: It's infinite. The Premier's flexibility is infinite.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is really what government is all about—

Mr. Foulds: His reaction is infinite, too!

Hon. Mr. Davis: And we, unlike his party, are not doctrinaire. We are a progressive party.

Mr. Lewis: Don't become partisan now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I won't become partisan—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Or political! Don't be political!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh no, I won't be political at all—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Just like the hon. member for Downsview.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are a progressive party, Mr. Speaker. We are not doctrinaire—

Mr. Lewis: They are more progressive than the Liberals, I will grant them that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —nor are we reactionary like the official opposition in the Province of Ontario is becoming. There's no question about that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): And they don't win many by-elections either.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I really had this in my notes, but I must say it now, because I'll be saying some things with which the Leader of the Opposition may not agree: I hope in his fairness—and he has always been a fair person until recently—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He loves losers!

Hon. Mr. Davis: In his fairness—I hope, in his fairness, that he will accept some of the things I'm going to say in the constructive way that they will be presented. But I do congratulate him on the success of his party in the two recent by-elections. To say that we are happy about it, Mr. Speaker, I would not be telling the truth. We are not happy; we're disappointed. We are not bitter—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): They're scared as hell, that's all!

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have learned a few lessons ourselves—

Mr. MacDonald: He sounds like Pierre Elliott Trudeau!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I think we may even put the lessons we have learned to appropriate use when perhaps another significant test takes place some time in 1975, 1976 or whenever that may be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Even this year, if the Premier insists.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the Leader of the Opposition, though, before he takes total credit for those two by-election wins himself—

Mr. Breithaupt: He never would.

Mr. Singer: He is far too modest.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that in spite of his modesty, perhaps he should consider that they were not necessarily a vote for him nor for the Liberal Party—there were other matters that led to the determination in these by-elections.

Mr. Singer: They were a vote against the Conservatives.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Downsview is saying, as I understand him to say, that this was a vote against myself and my party in the government, I say to him I'm a politician and I recognize that sometimes this is how election results are determined. But I think it should be very disappointing to him and his colleagues if that is the reason. Very frankly, I don't believe that to be the reason, but if it is, what a very negative way to achieve some degree of political success! What a very negative degree!

What the member for Downsview is saying, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is very relevant, is that the voters in St. George weren't voting for the policies of the Liberal Party, mainly because they didn't know what they were—

Mr. Lewis: How could they?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and if they did find out what they were, they were contradictory.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Davis: In fact, the successful candidate in St. George—

Mr. Singer: The Premier can talk as long as he wants; we still won them both.

An hon. member: The Premier's wonderful!

Hon. Mr. Davis: The successful candidate in St. George publicly disassociated herself from two rather significant policy positions taken by the leader of her own party. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't object to that. Perhaps she will have some determining—

Mr. MacDonald: That makes her a good Liberal.

Mr. Lewis: That was a blood test for entry into the party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious that the new member for St. George is already developing her leadership platform. I find this very intriguing and I think it is appropriate. Firstly, she is the first lady to represent the riding.

Mr. Singer: We won two by-elections; we are happy to listen to both other party leaders.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is quite appropriate that the first lady member, certainly in my memory, of that party is seated in the front benches. I think it is a tremendous idea. It must certainly sound a little note of concern for the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon), perhaps even for the members for Sarnia and Downsview, and the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). I just wonder how the member for York-Forest Hill feels.

Mr. Singer: We are all concerned!

Hon. Mr. Davis: If this is an indication as to how the Leader of the Opposition feels about his succession, Mr. Speaker, I just say to the members that I feel sorry that they have been disappointed and that the new member for St. George has been given a very prominent position on the front benches of that party.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): The member for Downsview should not leave. Why is the member for Downsview leaving?

Interjections by hon members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I regret the member for Downsview finds it necessary to leave, because there are other matters where I'm sure his own recommendations to his leader—and perhaps I shall have some obser-

vations on these—might be helpful, as we approach some of the mathematics that we're going to go through very shortly.

Mr Lewis: Why doesn't the Premier get to them? It is a little convoluted so far.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are going to get to the mathematics, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In fact, I think we will get to them very shortly.

Mr R. F. Nixon: The Premier must have something important to say.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Talk about the proposal system.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will come to that.

Mr. Bullbrook: Good!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition when he rose to his feet here. I guess he heard the news this morning when one of Ontario's I think very reputable newscasters, made certain observations about statements attributed to the Leader of the Opposition in the Toronto Globe and Mail. I read the report in the Globe and Mail. I think, while it may not have in fact stated verbatim what the Leader of the Opposition said, I say that in tenor, in innuendo and in the suggestions that he was making there is no question that the reference that he made to that particular organization and the people connected with it could be contained as part of the other suggestions that he was making.

For the Leader of the Opposition to get up in this House and try to explain his way around what he said, I say, Mr. Speaker, is not worthy of the man he is.

I have read Hansard. I have read the term "lease-back". I have read the fact that the Leader of the Opposition suggested that the ETV authority was the basis for the development of that building. That is what was stated in Hansard, Mr. Speaker. The fact remains that it was a rental arrangement in an existing facility determined specifically by an independent organization.

This is what Mr. Dennett made abundantly clear to the people of the Province of Ontario this morning. I say it ill behooves the Leader of the Opposition to try to back away from the general intent and the fact of the observations that he made which are recorded in Hansard.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Nonsense—just nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not nonsense; it is a fact.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since the Premier was good enough to bring this to the attention of the House, and since you will recall that he got up two or three times during my remarks in this regard, surely he sees the difference between the proposal method—which was specifically the criticism that I was levelling at him and his ministers in this regard—and something to do with rental and leasing. Is he also not aware of the criticism in the community that the educational TV authority perhaps should have selected some other building when they were looking for facilities, so that they would not have to spend $60,000 of extra money—even if it is on the builders' side—to make it useful for educational television? Why didn't they rent more specifically useful premises?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will read—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I didn't say that was on a proposal basis; I didn't intend to and I didn't say it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I just quote Hansard and I am saying this in the total context of what was said—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier and Mr. Dennett are overly sensitive and are both misinformed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: "Transortium Realty, which is the company that got the lease-back . . ." The Leader of the Opposition should ask the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) what that means. That is not a rental agreement, a lease-back is quite distinct—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is not a proposal. Why can't the government have tenders for lease-backs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition said "contract to build"; there is no contract to build.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, the Premier starts talking about proposals now—and his friends get them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a most—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —unfair reference to the ETV authority.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's just the Premier's sensitive, but Machiavellian approach to it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Who is sensitive today?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now, Mr. Speaker, let's move to the institute which has been the favourite subject of the member for Sarnia over the years.

Mr. Bullbrook: We know the Premier is afraid of this.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, let's just move through it very briefly. There are just three points to be made.

Firstly, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education is an institution governed by an independent board of governors upon which board are represented men and women of integrity and capacity. The decision to build the building—the decision as to who was to do it—was reached entirely under the direction of the board; in no way was it determined by the government of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's the Premier's baby and now he's stuck with it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Without any knowledge?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: As to the—

Mr. Bullbrook: It was the Premier's baby. Answer that! Without any knowledge?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I knew that they were doing it. Certainly I knew that they were doing it.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Premier certainly did know it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I also know this; that the then chairman of the institute board—who is now Mr. Justice Bora Laskin of the Supreme Court of Canada—is not the kind of man, nor the people who serve with him, who are going to make determinations—

Mr. Bullbrook: Nor do I.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Great Liberal, too!

Hon. Mr. Davis: But that is the implication. That's the innuendo.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was done completely independently and it wasn't done under my direction.

Mr. Bullbrook: It was the Premier's shadow of direction that did it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The criticism is directed to the Premier and no one else.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well of course, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says it's directed to me—but what are the implications?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The decision was made apart from government; and there is no question about this. I would say to the Leader of the Opposition, he can talk about proposals, or developers, or builder proposals—but take a look at the mathematics. I won't get into it in detail on the institute—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I say this, that the rate is competitive.

Mr. Sargent: Why didn't the government tender?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no question that the rate being paid at the institute today is $1 to $1.50 less than competitive space in the same geographic area—

Mr. Sargent: That's a lot of baloney and the Premier knows it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: And the title becomes available to the public at the end of the 30-year period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's deal with—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will be seated.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, let's deal with the Hydro building. And I assume, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has a copy of his own statement—I don't say his press statement; I'm not sure that he would want to carry it around with him—but I would think that he has. If he hasn't, then a copy of his mathematics. Does he have one, Mr. Speaker? Because if not, I will send him a copy so that we can follow it together.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are two or three points—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't.

Mr. Sargent: These are the Premier's figures.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, as to the competitive terms of the contract related to the market situation that exists; something that the Leader of the Opposition didn't refer to because he wished to capture some sort of global figure and I know he was hoping for some headline; somebody to make $85 million or $83 million profit.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think it was $180 million.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I'm just talking about Hydro. I think the figure was $83 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, it's not. It's $6 million a year for 30 years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know, and when I heard the Leader of the Opposition talking about educational matters the other day, I was in complete sympathy. When he talked about the need for a core curriculum I only regret that mathematics obviously was not a part of his core curriculum when he was a student in the school system.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at it.

Mr. Sargent: It's the Premier's kind of mathematics. What is a $5 billion debt?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have his documentation here. I have his calculation of what might be termed abridged financing.

I can't quarrel with some of these figures, Mr. Speaker. I'm not that sufficiently knowledgeable, but there are a couple of items which I think are relatively important.

When one is doing a calculation of these matters it really isn't sufficient to set out the total terms of the rent. It isn't sufficient to have just a part of the expense. If one looks at it very carefully, Mr. Speaker, one will find that in the calculations there are two significant items missing, two significant items. I think if the Leader of the Opposition knew he was doing this—I don't believe he knew it; I can't think that of him because it would be grossly unfair—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I would put it down to his complete lack of competence or the lack of competence of his staff. There are two items missing, Mr. Speaker; one is fairly basic and the degree might be arguable. There is an amount allocated here for janitorial and maintenance costs.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other areas, I think, which might come into some consideration of costs—such as fuel; such as heat; such as light; such as maintenance, cleaning, elevators, etc. I think it is fair to state—

Mr. Sargent: And payoffs to the party!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that an estimate—and it is only an estimate; I'm the first to admit it—but I think it is a relatively realistic one of probably something close to $1.45—and if the Leader of the Opposition wants to say it should be $1.30 or $1.50 I'm not going to quibble over the 10 cents a sq ft differential that some might build into it—that estimate comes out, Mr. Speaker—and I wish he would follow his calculations—on 1,124,500 sq ft to $1,630,525 per annum. If we subtract that from what the Leader of the Opposition and his great mathematics projected for us—$367,000—if we were to take that away from the amount, there is only a difference per annum of somewhere around $900,000 over a 30-year period. That's all, Mr. Speaker, but then let's move to another item.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let's move to another item.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It says janitorial services are included.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right. There isn't a cost—there's a cost—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am talking about fuel hikes—there is! If the Leader of the Opposition would like to check this with any—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It says maintenance costs are included; janitorial services—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —standard maintenance cost in any building, and use a figure, I will not debate the figure whether or not it is $1.45. This is an estimate, not mine, but it is an estimate that I think is relatively close. It comes out, as I say, to about $1 million—I was wrong; I'm sorry. He was out $1.3 million.

Mr. Sargent: What is the net figure?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the hon. member for Grey-Bruce please observe the common courtesies of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He doesn't know any better.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier has left the subject and gone on to the gardening costs or something. Is he aware that heat and light are provided in the contract by Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Davis: But it is part, Mr. Speaker, of the cost that is—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Hydro is paying for it! Why should the contractor have it included in his costs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is part of the cost calculated in the amount of rental that the Leader of the Opposition has used for the income derived. It is a total figure.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order. Could I ask the Premier a question, very briefly?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: So that we can understand it, is the Premier saying that the amount of money on an annual basis to pay for all the items he enumerated will add up to roughly $45 million over the term of the leaseback, at $1.5 million a year? Is that what he's saying?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm saying the rough estimate of the annual operating and maintenance cost is approximately $1,630,525—

Mr. Lewis: I see.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —which is, I think, related to that figure of $1.45. As I say some people could argue it should be $1.30 or—

Mr. Lewis: That's part of the lease-back arrangement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a part of the total figure that the Leader of the Opposition has used.

Now let's, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another question before the Premier proceeds, because he said a moment ago that no consideration was taken of the cost of certain items. Is the Premier aware that Hydro is taking the responsibility for heat and light? Therefore, why should it even be a part of the lease-back because the owner of the building isn't going to have to provide it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am relating it to the calculations that have been done by the Leader of the Opposition himself.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, we left it out because they were not payable by Canada Square.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Then let's use the same figures. I'm using the member's figures and his way of calculating. Mr. Speaker, let's move to the next item and it has here "Interest on the mortgage." I don't think there is anything improper in that and I won't quarrel with the calculations, but there is a very large single item that has not been calculated into this whole projection, and that is the cost of the building itself. The fact that there will be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $45 million by way of principle that has to be returned, that has to be deducted from his $83 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talks to us—my colleague who, I think, even with his double negative, presented the $55 million situation very well earlier today—the Leader of the Opposition talks about—

Mr. Singer: The Premier doesn't really believe that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —talks about these things. There has to be a calculation for the return of the cost of the building, and it is not here.

Mr. Sargent: What was the land cost?

Mr. Singer: It is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It isn't.

Mr. Bullbrook: Goodness gracious—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I am telling the hon. members—

Mr. Sargent: What was the land cost?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and in fact, if you take all of these—

Mr. Bullbrook: Who advised the Premier on this?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): It wasn't the member for Sarnia anyway.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If you take all of these, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and you come up with figures—

Mr. Bullbrook: Who has the Premier got advising him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, with great respect, check the calculations.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: Has he looked at the contracts?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: Has the Premier looked at them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Check the calculations. Let's present it in a very simple way, then, if we can—a very simple way.

The annual rental, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Bullbrook: Maybe the Premier's advisers are miscalculating.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. The annual rental, Mr. Speaker, is about $5,465,000 on the bulk of the accommodation; this is the office accommodation.

There is an annual mortgage payment, principle and interest, of approximately $3.9 million. The annual operating costs and maintenance costs, whichever way they are combined, are $1.63 million, for an approximate total figure of $5,544,015.

And those are approximate—I should put EOE, and I say with respect the Leader of the Opposition might have done the same on his.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier means they are losing money every year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is then the revenue from the commercial part, Mr. Speaker, of some 83,000 sq ft at an approximate figure of $6, which is $501,000. There is a cost of a rent payable or a sum payable to Hydro of some $50,000, or a net operating profit before taxes of somewhere around $380,000 to $400,000.

Mr. Speaker, I don't expect the Leader of the Opposition to present it in its best light—this is not his job, I guess—

Mr. Sargent: We thought the Premier would be better, though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I think, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to deal with it in equity, if we are going to deal with it fairly, that one might also include the fact that before one can say there is a net return. here is a small item that might be calculated in of corporation income taxes of some 50 per cent.

Mr. Bullbrook: We did calculate that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it doesn't show, and the corporation income tax of say $192,000 with a net cash flow of $192,000, then the balance per year—and Mr. Speaker, I am not too knowledgeable in these matters, but you do that over—

Mr. Sargent: He certainly isn't.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —a 30-year period, and it comes out to about $5,768,000. I am told that at present value at nine per cent, it represents about $2 million today.

I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there might even be—

Mr. Sargent: That is not bad.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —a closer reconciliation with his own figures, if he had been able to add up his own columns correctly. I think he will find if he looks at this, as some of these figures are transposed from column to column, that he is out several hundred thousand dollars, and I would say—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We'll have a look at the Premier's figures.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's fine; that's fine. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I could give him—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier will find the addition is all right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know, we just—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the Premier defending the proposal method? Is that what he is trying to do?

Mr. Bullbrook: This is getting impossible. It's a proposal—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just to check the figures, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Jumped too far on that one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Our figure comes out higher than his. It came out to $85,281,000. His was $83 million. I think it just demonstrates, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Bullbrook: We'd like to hear the Premier talk about the proposal method.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —how careful one might be.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron Bruce): Just being fair about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now, Mr. Speaker, let's relate—

Mr. Bullbrook: It was $183 million.

Mr. Lewis: It was $183 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was $183 million not—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. I assumed that he was coupling everything together. The net operating profit I have on the press release the Leader of the Opposition issued is $83,084,708, which I say is wrong in his own calculations—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I see. And the Premier is saying that the net isn't $83 million, it's $2 million plus?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm saying that, and I am not sure how they calculate these things related to present value. I think if you did it on the 30-year term you could use a figure of $5 million; if you do it related to present-day value at nine per cent, it would be perhaps around $2 million.

Mr. Lewis: But there is a discrepancy of $75 million to $80 million?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's about all!

Mr. Lewis: I don't trust either of them!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, they are the member's own calculations. But I would make a prediction—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would make a prediction that mine will be closer than those of the Leader of the Opposition.

But Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: I can't believe either of them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with just one other relevant aspect. There is one aspect that I think must be mentioned, and that is that the rough total rental or cost is somewhere around $6.50 a square foot—I may be wrong in that, but it's fairly close. I would like to point out that comparable buildings are, at 522 University, $8.50 to $9.50; 439 University, $8.50 to $8.75; 2 Bloor—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But that is rental cost. The land cost is not included.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's rental, certainly that's rental.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is rental cost. Why don't they build it on a tender?

Hon. Mr. Davis: First of all, those figures would be higher; and secondly, there is no equity left to the tenant of the building.

Mr. Sargent: Well, whose land are they on? Whose land are they on?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is all calculated in, Mr. Speaker. It's all calculated in.

Mr. Sargent: They use their own money too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No way. Mr. Speaker, the fact is very simply this, that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in this province is part—

Mr. Sargent: The Premier is defending the developers!

Mr. Foulds: Say, what else is new?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Utter nonsense: —is part of the agreement whereby, at a rate that is somewhat lower than competitive rentals, all things being considered equal it is paying less and ending up with little to the building at the end of the 30-year period. That is what in fact is happening.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Will the Premier permit a question at this stage? If he is so concerned about the relative cheapness of the price of the accommodation, then why did he not make this a part of a tender instead of a proposal? And in support of his contention here, will he table the four other proposals that were given to Hydro so that we can examine those? We would be glad to sit down with the mathematicians who are advising him so that our figures will at least be within a ballpark figure of each other, because we really want to find out what is going on as far as these costs are concerned.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted—

Mr. Lewis: They should let us add the calculations, because we are clearly the only independent arbiters around here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then nobody could trust anybody.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Leaving the mathematical lesson aside for a moment, I might—

Mr. Sargent: Better leave that one, that is a bad one. Got something better than that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well I think, with respect, Mr. Speaker, it is not a bad one; in fact if you go to the rentals in Commerce Court and TD Centre of $10-plus a square foot—

Mr. Bullbrook: One can't use that as an analogy at all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, with great respect, you are talking about a competitive position in the marketplace.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If he thinks that is so bad, the Minister of Labour is paying $11.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The point is that Hydro is paying much less and getting title to the building.

Mr. Nixon: Well they could have done even better if they had had a competition—

Mr. Bullbrook: The government is paying the interest for them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on!

Mr. Bullbrook: They are! Surely the Premier must know that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no question as to the economics whatsoever, and I say to the Leader of the Opposition, take the mathematics and rework it. And if the mathematics that I have delivered to the House today is substantially in error I will be the first one to apologize, I assure him.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Givens: What about the other proposals?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can we have the other proposals?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I told the Leader of the Opposition I would discuss it with the chairman of Hydro. I have not had the opportunity, and very frankly I don't think I will have today.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, can we have the Premier's figures too, please, so we can have a look at those?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will try and get some figures to the Leader of the Opposition. I thought he was making a note of them; sort of digesting them all and putting them into the computer and agreeing with us.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): It wasn't that good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, moving to a number of other items, and I must confess that I have taken a little longer with this—

Mr. Bullbrook: Well that one fell flat, I'll tell the Premier; that didn't mesmerize us at all. We thought we were going to get something and the fact is the Premier doesn't understand it himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the figures used by the Leader of the Opposition are just completely inaccurate.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the Premier has said they are out by $75 million. He has said he is out $75 or $80 million. That is quite a charge.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, close. Mr. Speaker, I think I should make one correction. I think the Leader of the Opposition is right that Hydro does pay the light. I think it does—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is darn right they do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but that is not in the $1.45 figure. Now, Mr. Speaker, let's move on to two or three other issues—and I now see I have to select two or three of those that I can deal with in the limited amount of time available. I will just reply to the leader

of the New Democratic Party on the matter of energy, where he feels that Ontario has abdicated its position—

Mr. Sargent: This is one of the Premier's best speeches.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —to the Province of Alberta. I would only say to him that this is not the case. I visited the Premier of Alberta several weeks ago along with my parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Lewis: Cap in hand.

Mr. Foulds: Hand in hand!

Hon. Mr. Davis: There were no determinations made. The visit was made on the basis of determining the government of Alberta's feelings and position. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty important to point out that the fact that the Premier of Ontario would in fact go to the Province of Alberta, register his concern and also recognize the concern of that province, is not a bad thing within the type of federated structure we have in this country. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was really very encouraged last night to hear over the news that the Leader of the Opposition in the Province of Alberta had said publicly that he will give me his seat in the Legislature next Tuesday afternoon to explain Ontario's position to the government of the province of Alberta—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I hear the Premier of Alberta won't let the Premier of Ontario in.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but in that the Premier of the province, over the radio, felt that there should be pro quo and in that the Leader of the Opposition here might not be as magnanimous as the Leader of the Opposition in Alberta, I doubt that I will take a seat in the Alberta Legislature on Tuesday afternoon to explain our feelings as they related to the energy situation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I would give him my own.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only point out, Mr. Speaker, that we recognize the seriousness of it. It's not just related to gas and it's not just related to oil as it relates to Alberta; it relates to the whole question of energy over the next X number of years in this province and this country. As I said a few days ago, we anticipate something—not a definitive statement nor a statement with all the answers—but some indication of the direction the province is moving in the field of energy policy.

I want to move to regional government, Mr. Speaker. This is an area in which the Leader of the Opposition has, in this case in his perhaps helpful way, suggested to the government that regional government is one of the reasons we had some difficulty in the great riding of Huron.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government is going to have a lot more difficulty, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't really determine whether, in fact, this was the case in the county of Huron. If it was it is regrettable. It is regrettable because regional government should not have been an issue in the county of Huron. There was no plan for regional government. There was no determination by the province that there would be regional government in the county of Huron—

Mr. Sargent: There is none in Queen's Park either.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say, if it was an issue, it was unfortunate. If the hon. member for Huron wishes to hear me say it, I shall say it now. The government of this province is not in the process of imposing regional government on all sections of the Province of Ontario. It is not in the process of imposition in the terms used by the Leader of the Opposition on the other parts of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why didn't the Premier tell his candidate about that? The candidate certainly said it was an issue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition surely must recognize is that we cannot move ahead with some of the existing municipal structures that are available to us. I won't go east of Metro, I won't go into some of the areas, but I'll deal with one specifically because I think it demonstrates the problem.

That is in the county of Peel which is faced with the same difficulties in regional government as many other areas. It's fine for the hon. member for St. George—as I say, she's welcome to come to the county of Peel, to the town of Streetsville—to say to the very excellent citizens of that community, "The government is imposing. Why don't you get together with the other communities, etc.?" I would just inform the hon. member for St. George, through you, Mr. Speaker, that the

municipalities in the county of Peel—and this is true of many other areas where we are dealing with regional government—have been discussing this issue now for five, six, seven and eight years.

The proposal from the Province of Ontario to the county of Peel represents something very close to the proposal submitted to us as a government from the county council of that great area of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: McMurtry said it couldn't have been better if he had written it himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm sympathetic to the problems of the people of Streetsville. I know the concern of some of the people in the city of Hamilton. I have had some very ample demonstrations of the concern of the people in Port Hope and Cobourg. The government has indicated its desire to accept other suggestions. We will be flexible.

I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that any attempt by him to construe the regional government proposals as an imposition, or to create the concern in the balance of the Province of Ontario that regional government is going to be imposed overnight, tomorrow or even five years hence, is not a statement of fact because it will not be the case.

I say to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that I have said—and I've said it not just in Huron but in other parts of the Province of Ontario—in my view the county structure of government and the county boundaries and councils represent, to a certain extent, a form of regional government as they presently exist. I would go one step further, Mr. Speaker. I think it is important in some areas that a greater strength or responsibility be given perhaps to the county council.

It's fine to say regional government isn't working as the member for York-Forest Hill said, and that we shouldn't do it. The Leader of the Opposition says back away from it, it isn't working elsewhere. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to calculate the cost we've already incurred, in a social and economic sense, in some areas of the Province of Ontario, because we do not have regional government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about the costs where we do have it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Can you tell me—I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Leader of the Opposition: Please sit down and calculate the duplication in service; the lack of planning cohesion; the kind of urban growth that has taken place; the kind of disorganization that relates to transportation—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier is listening to his own propaganda.

Hon. Mr. Davis —the kind of densities that have occurred right within the county of Peel —and I represent it—which would not have occurred if there had been regional government in that area five or 10 years ago.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Premier mean the Bramalea pipeline and things like that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, perhaps. I know of the political difficulties imposed on the members who represent some of these areas, and I happen to have them. I know that the people from the town of Streetsville are less than delighted with the proposal that has been made. I also know the cost to that general area in general terms, looking at it five or 10 years ahead, if we do not move ahead with some form of municipal restructuring.

It's fine for the member for York-Forest Hill to say we should have a single tier and that regional governments are too expensive, et cetera. I only say to him to turn it around—and I ask him to do this most sincerely and most constructively—and calculate the cost to the public of the Province of Ontario in general terms in those areas of urban growth over the past 10 years because of the fact that we have not done some of the things that should have been done, because we have not had the intestinal fortitude, I say very frankly, to do some of the tough things. I just ask him to calculate what might have been the cost. I guess this is not calculable and perhaps I shouldn't suggest it; but I say it is relevant and it has to be considered.

The member for York-Forest Hill makes light of the Toronto-centred region plan. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this is another tough thing the government is doing. Does the House think it is very easy for my colleagues who are affected, and some of the members, to be there when we say to the municipal councils and the people with rather natural ambitions for economic and commercial growth that as a matter of policy there must be density limitations in population. Let's use my own community as an example—a very appropriate time to do it on its 100th birthday. It now has 45,000 people. It would like to be larger—at least some of its people would. It is right next door to a community, Chinguacousy, wherein there is a very large

urban centre, called Bramalea, of some 35,000. There are official plan amendments prepared and presented to the government of this province—and these were done with planners, with sincerity—that would have envisaged a total population in excess of half a million people in those two municipalities. This was done knowing that there were many people with investments and many people with natural ambitions for growth. We are saying to them in the Toronto-centred region plan, "We regret it, but your population densities are restricted to 300,000."

Do you think that makes it any easier? It doesn't, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, but we believe it's the right thing to do. I have said in my own riding, and I will say it here in the House—

Mr. Givens: But the government hasn't changed the financial basis. It hasn't touched the financial basis of any of these.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as long as I am Premier of this province, as long as I have the responsibility, we are not going to see asphalt and concrete, with great respect to the member for York-Forest Hill, from Queen's Park to 61 Main Street South. That is not the way we are going to see development take place.

An hon. member: Sit down! The Premier has made a fool of himself.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The member should not add to his superciliousness.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do you know what I find most interesting in all of this discussion, Mr. Speaker, and I know the problems—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is 61 Main Street South? Is that the "White House"?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier why doesn't he stay here and mind his own business and let the people of Ontario run their own affairs?

An hon. member: Don't answer that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I won't really answer the member for Grey-Bruce, but I will say that perhaps in some respects what he is suggesting is representative of the contradiction that exists in the Liberal Party in this province today. On the one hand they are saying to us give the municipalities greater autonomy, let them make their own determination, and don't impose things from Queen's Park. But when the crunch comes, where is the buck then passed. Right here to Queen's Park, to the government; and we are expected to resolve the problems.

Mr. Sargent: And we know what kind of a mess the government made of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As we should! As we should, Mr. Speaker!

I won't get into Hamilton-Wentworth. I know the problems there. I know the problems east of Metro.

Mr. Singer: What about North Pickering?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not too many—pardon?

Mr. Singer: North Pickering?

Hon. Mr. Davis: North Pickering?

Mr. Singer: You know, no asphalt—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Very significant, Mr. Speaker!

We don't minimize them but at the same time we are not going to adopt the reactionary policies of the Liberal Party in this province.

When the Leader of the Opposition first came into this House—I think back to one of his first elections—I can recall coming into the House—I didn't bring the pamphlet with me today because I thought it would be a bit repetitious—but I remember that great pamphlet and the great Liberal commitment to county school boards, regional government reform, and all the great things the Liberal Party was going to do for the Province of Ontario. I remember, Mr. Speaker!

And do you know what we have seen happen here? It's politics, and I guess we live with it; but what we have seen happen here is the Liberal Party of the Province of Ontario becoming reactionaries, becoming unprepared to do the tough things that are necessary in a province like ours in the 1970s. They are unprepared.

Sure it's easy to tell the people what they want. It's easy to say, "Yes, we will do this." It is fine for the member for St. George—and I'm not unsympathetic to the things she said in Streetsville—to convey some of that message, but I would say to her with respect—

Mr. Singer: She bothers the Premier, doesn't she?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, she doesn't. I think she made a very excellent run—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am delighted to see her on the front bench. I would say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would just say, very casually, she's probably disturbing the members for Downsview and York-Forest Hill. I don't know about the member for Sarnia—I don't know yet; I haven't decided—and the member for York Centre. She is disturbing them far more than she is disturbing us.

Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: The Premier has referred to her speech 15 times now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have referred to it I think four times.

Moving on from the non-controversial subject of regional government, I want to deal very briefly with the escarpment and the parkway belt and to refer to the Throne Speech in which the commitment of the government was to bring before the members of this House some rationale for the escarpment and a recognition—here I was encouraged by the Leader of the Opposition representing, as he does, a rural area—of the need for land-use planning. I can only say to him that the escarpment policy and the parkway belt policies will be available in the not too far distant future for consideration by the members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, let's not minimize it. I know members will be delighted because they will happen to be, some thought, somewhat difficult. It is not easy for us to do and I am sure that will delight members, but I would hope that perhaps the reactionary swing we sense may not be demonstrated when those pieces of legislation come before us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal very briefly with the opposition's remarks on federal-provincial financial matters. It is referred to by the Leader of the Opposition in some of his remarks. I feel somehow, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition and his party really haven't yet understood it, not just the complexity but the importance—not just in financial terms but in terms of the future of this country as it relates to the fiscal arrangements between the federal and the provincial governments.

Mr. Speaker, it is fine to be critical of us. It is fine to say to the Treasurer (Mr. White), "Don't threaten Ottawa because of certain tax situations." We are not threatening anybody. We are saying, as a matter of fact, that the present fiscal arrangements do not permit the provincial governments—this one in particular—to administer the affairs of the provinces in an appropriate fashion.

The federal government has not yet recognized that if the fabric of Confederation is to be preserved, if we are going to have the kind of country that I would think we all want to see here in Canada, there has to be a recognition that the provinces must have more room to discharge their responsibilities. This isn't a threat. This isn't blackmail. It is a statement of fact. While we support the tax cuts in the recent federal budget, we are not going to be hypocrites. At the same time that the Leader of the Opposition construes this as a solution to the major considerations we have to undertake here in this province, I say he is very seriously mistaken because they do not help us in those determinations. And I say with respect I don't think it helps other provincial jurisdictions either.

I think it is important for all of us to recognize that we must come to grips with this issue. There must be a solution. We are faced with municipalities on our doorsteps—and properly so—for a greater share every day of the week. We want to be able to respond.

We want to have them with a greater financial resource. But we have to do this from a broader tax base. They say that to us. We say it to Ottawa. We agree with them. We just wish the federal government would see the light and recognize the implications as well.

I can't help but feel in those observations by the Leader of the Opposition on the fiscal matters—and the suggestion that we are trying to threaten Ottawa is ridiculous—that he doesn't have an appreciation of the complexity of the problem or the serious nature of it. I feel that he is acting as an apologist for his federal counterparts in Ottawa. I don't think there is any question about it.

Mr. Singer: Is the Premier going to grab back the tax reduction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as we travel on to a number of other matters—and I would like to deal with transportation because this is a subject dear to the heart of the hon. member for Downsview—

Mr. Singer: Yes indeed, let's talk about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and the hon. member for York-Forest Hill. I would only report—

Mr. Givens: Let the Premier tell us about how many people he has moved.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only like to report a degree of progress—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): We have moved two out for him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and that is that the proposals with respect to the CNE projects are very near final evaluation.

Mr. Singer: Does the Premier think it is going to attract as many as Disneyland?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you if it attracts as many as Disneyland then I can say to the hon. member for Downsview we have it made.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member for Downsview must know that Disneyland happens to represent a very successful situation, and if the intermediate capacity carrier here is as successful as that, I say to him, I shall be delighted and I think all of us will.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: And we have great faith in the Premier. We look at Ontario Place.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I say, Mr. Speaker, that while I understand the concern of the member for York-Forest Hill and of the member for Downsview—

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Ceintre): The member for York-Forest Hill knows he won't get down to the front row, so why does he bother?

An hon. member: It is a different illustration than Disneyland.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We know there are transportation problems for motor vehicles.

Mr. Singer: Really?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We know that there are some people upset. We know that there are some people who disagree with us. But, Mr. Speaker, once again—and I'm surprised that the great party of reform, the Liberal Party in Ontario, doesn't recognize this. Or is that being unkind?

Mr. Lewis: Very!

Hon. Mr. Davis: That the Liberal Party in this province—

An hon. member: The same party that has Ben Grys in it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But we have to recognize that we must be prepared to take very different steps in the field of transportation. We have to. I would say to the member for Downsview, even if the decision had been taken to build Spadina, within five to six years the transportation problems in downtown Toronto would not have been one bit better than they are today.

Mr. Givens: Why couldn't the government build the subway?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are building the subway.

Mr. Givens: Two years ago!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, here we are with the member for York-Forest Hill who talks to us about municipal autonomy and responsibility. We did not delay the location of the subway for the last number of months.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on. The Premier decided to hold back. He postponed the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We didn't!

Mr. Givens: He ruined it all.

Mr. Singer: He overruled the municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We didn't!

Mr. Givens: He does anyway. Why didn't he go all the way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, so that this discussion doesn't get—

Mr. Givens: The government is going to pay 75 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right. We are very generous.

Mr. Givens: All the increased cost.

Mr. Singer: Whatever happened to Buckminster Fuller?

Mr. Givens: Yes, what did happen to Buckminster Fuller?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Buckminster Fuller is alive and well. He is doing very well!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other matters that I would like to raise.

Mr. Singer: Now that we have solved the transportation problems.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps I will have some occasion in the future to do so.

Mr. Sargent: He should be on the Johnny Carson Show.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But, as I say, I do have to wind up my very brief remarks. I won't refer to the specific items in the amendments that were made. I have looked at them all very carefully. I have reasoned them out.

Mr. Singer: He is going to support them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I must say, Mr. Speaker, when the time comes to vote on those weighty amendments, I shall be forced to cast my vote against them.

I would say to the members opposite as we move ahead with the session, I expect there will be other proposals put before them that are somewhat controversial. I expect we will meet them with enthusiasm, with constructive criticism. But I just reiterate what I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker; we know there are difficulties in what we are doing, but this government is committed to serving the interests of the people of this province.

We know that it's not simple; we are not going to become reactionary; we will be providing leadership. But I say with respect, Mr. Speaker, the contributions that were made by the leaders of the other parties in this province represent, in my view, the conclusions that were drawn some many months ago—that this government is best able to administer the affairs of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. members have agreed unanimously to revert to the motion introduced by the hon. member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty). That was a motion under the provisions of standing order 30, in which the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a special matter of urgent public importance; in this case, namely the high lake levels that exist along the shorelines of lakes Huron, St. Clair, Erie and Ontario.

As I indicated earlier, the motion itself does meet the requirement as far as being in order is concerned. At this particular point in time, the mover of the motion may speak to the motion for five minutes; and a representative from the other sides may make a similar presentation after the hon. member for Welland South.

HIGH LAKE LEVELS

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In recommending the motion to the members of the Legislature this afternoon, I urge their full support in accepting the crisis of the high lake levels that exist along the shorelines of our Great Lakes system as a matter of importance and urgent public interest.

The problem concerns the communities bordering on lakes St. Clair, Huron, Erie and Ontario. They are most adversely affected by the present conditions. The highest levels of all time—the records go back to the year 1860—are predicted for 1973. This will be a critical year for high levels of water in the Great Lakes basin.

My main concern, Mr. Speaker, is the condition of Lake Erie at the present time. The hydrology of Lake Erie is such that it doesn't take too much of a wind to whip up a good storm on the lake. As I recall, in just a matter of an hour the winds can shift on Lake Erie and the water can be raised as high as seven to 14 feet at one end of the lake. It is called a tilting lake.

The input of rainfall in Lake Erie and the output by evaporation, I guess one would call it, pretty well equalizes the level. But last year there were adverse weather conditions in the Lake Erie basin. I believe there were five inches of rainfall above normal and this has certainly created one of the problems.

But I believe there are two or three other culprits in this matter which are also causing problems. I think one is Ontario Hydro and another is the St. Lawrence Seaway—and perhaps the International Joint Commission. The matter that comes to my mind at the present time is the Hudson Bay watershed where we have the diversion, I guess it is, of the Albany River. The course of the river is changed and it flows down to Lake Superior. This no doubt has caused some of the problems of the high water levels. Perhaps others are the Ontario Hydro projects at Queenston and the control weir on the Niagara River. The two generating stations—one that belongs to the Ontario government; the other that belongs to the New York State Power Authority—I believe bear some fault, along with the control weir there, in the high level of the

water in that particular area. We have the location of the generating station down in the St. Lawrence River, the Eisenhower locks and so forth, where man-made devices have been installed, I think these have caused some of the problems of high water levels. I don't think they can be ruled out.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am terribly sorry, but do I understand that you have accepted the motion? That you are not now hearing debate on its legitimacy, and we are launched into the subject?

Mr. Speaker: I merely indicated to the House that the motion was in proper order and that a member of each party could speak for five minutes before I rule whether or not it is of sufficient public importance.

Mr. Lewis: I see. I am sorry.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a few of these things. I can recall a press release in 1969 put out by this government that the people in the Province of Ontario, particularly on the Lake Ontario water basin, were complaining of the low water levels. This is the kind of thing I can't relate to the present situation, where there is a substantial increase in water levels in the Lake Ontario basin.

I believe that steps should be taken at once by all levels of government to provide some degree of relief and to lower the water levels. I would suggest to the House this afternoon that the government should take action immediately to call a joint meeting with the members of the Ontario Legislature whose ridings are affected, along with members of the different state assemblies on the American side, federal members and the International Joint Commission, to deal with the problem.

I consider that this is an immediate problem, and that disaster is no doubt facing all the constituencies within the Great Lakes basin. But the problem perhaps could have been looked after earlier. I refer to the 1953 report of the select committee then dealing with the levels of the Great Lakes. And I just can't grasp why this government hasn't taken any action or followed some of the steps or guidelines that were set out in that report. One recommendation in particular concerns the problem of zoning, and I stress that the government should have taken some action to control the building of cottages and so forth along the lakeshores where there are hazardous conditions.

In the Niagara region official plan that has come out, Mr. Speaker—I notice that this is the first time in any official plan that any municipality has designated the shorelines of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario as hazardous areas.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Haggerty: I appreciate the opportunity to bring this motion to the House this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the government in all sincerity will get on with the problem of the high levels on the Great Lakes.

Mr. Speaker: The New Democratic Party member now has five minutes.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the five minutes. I believe the hon. member for Welland South is entirely within his rights to bring the motion. I think he is right to judge it a matter of urgent public importance. There are people affected in the Great Lakes who have called the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr); they are still building their barriers. They are even now still looking for further government support as they build their defences.

The question of negotiation about funding with the federal government is clearly important to this debate. It is not something that has thus far been discussed in the Throne Speech debate, and it is perhaps not appropriate that it be relegated to the Throne Speech debate, because there should be some exchange amongst the members of this House.

On every front we think it's a matter of urgent public importance and urge you, Mr. Speaker, to allow the debate to continue after you have heard from a government member.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a member from the government side who will make a contribution?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, the government accepts entirely the attitude expressed by the leader of the New Democratic Party. There is no question, and we feel that by our actions and responses alone that we have demonstrated our acceptance of the point made by both speakers that there can be nothing much greater and of more immediate concern to a particular group of people in this province than the destruction of their lands and their homes and

buildings by the disastrous conditions on the Great Lakes.

As a member of the government, as someone who has been involved for at least a year in the problems arising out of the lake levels, I think I can fairly say that we have worked steadily for months and, as the members have mentioned, we in the Province of Ontario have worked off and on for I suppose 70 or 80 years, along with the federal government, along with the American Corps of Engineers, along with the International Joint Commission, in our commitment of concern in relation to the problem of levels. The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), who is down now working in the areas affected so that his resources may be made immediately available, so that his presence will underline the government's concern, is there today, has been there before, and undoubtedly will be there tomorrow.

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, I don't for one moment accuse the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development of misleading the House, but his colleague the Minister of Natural Resources is in my area today on a preordained meeting that was arranged long before the tragedy affecting my people and other people. He is tonight addressing the Lambton Conservation Club, is meeting with the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) and flying over the area with members of the St. Clair Parkway Committee. So I just want to point out that his main purpose in being there today is in connection with a commitment of long standing.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Well, his commitment, and the government's commitment, Mr. Speaker, is not limited to the Sarnia area. During his visit there I know he's had requests—and I think he has been able to respond to them—to visit other than the member for Sarnia's constituency. I'm sure he will.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that we look forward to the debate. We have been addressing ourselves to the question of solutions as long as I've been acquainted with the problem, and that goes back at least 10 years. This has been accentuated, of course, by the disastrous levels of 1972-1973 and perhaps 1973-1974, and the government entirely supports the motion and the support, if received, from the New Democratic Party.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): May I make an observation on this?

Mr. Speaker: No, not at this moment.

I should inform the members now that in accordance with the provisions of standing order 30 (a), a representative of each party has now explained his party's position on the motion and it remains for Mr. Speaker then to rule on whether the motion is in fact in order and of urgent public importance. I would refer the hon. members to rule 28 (b) and rule 28 (c) in which the conditions are set forth.

An hon. member: Section 30.

Mr. Speaker: Section 30, I should say. First of all, the matter proposed for discussion must relate to a genuine emergency calling for immediate and urgent consideration. Now, it has been deemed in the past that matters of urgent public importance are matters that have taken place almost very, very recently, and I can't help but recall that this matter has been one that has been a continuing matter of importance. At the same time, the nature, the importance of the whole topic is such that, in spite of the fact I do have some doubts that it qualifies under the rule, I'm going to permit the question as qualifying.

Now that I have ruled the motion to be in order and meeting the qualifications, the question then at this moment is, shall the debate proceed?

Those in favour of proceeding please say "aye."

Those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

The hon. member for—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Is there a time limit now placed upon each?

Mr. Speaker: Ten minutes, for debate.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Until all members have spoken or until 6 o'clock, whichever comes first.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It's a rule, Mr. Minister.

An hon. member: Good ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your considering our debate today and I will say that it is very urgent at this time. I did notice in your re-

marks that you wondered if it was an ongoing thing, but having spent last Saturday from 9 in the morning until 6 at night viewing about 35 miles of Lake St. Clair shoreline, I am personally convinced that this is an emergency now.

However, I would probably agree that it has been coming over the past year but I'm not convinced that anyone could stop it. I don't think that man himself can stop the rising lake levels when we have high precipitation in the previous year or two. In 1972, as some people will remember, we had, I think, the least amount of sunshine in about 20 years in western Ontario. Now that covered probably all Ontario, and this has a great deal to do with the evaporation from our lakes.

It is a really serious problem now. I have here about 10 sheets of pictures taken by some of the newspapers showing the high water over roads, cottages and so forth.

I can recall in 1934 when the lakes were so low that if one had a boat I guess one had to push it half a mile to get it going. In 1952, which was about 18 years later, we had high water. Members may recall that in 1963 and 1964 there was low water. We had very low water. In fact, a number of people complained that Chicago was stealing our water. That was the great Chicago steal!

I even attended meetings as head of one of the municipalities in Essex county. We had a meeting in Leamington at which some engineer was trying to figure out a way to divert water from St. James Bay and bring it down into the Great Lakes system. I understand the engineer's name was Kierans.

That was considered at that time because we felt we needed more water in the Great Lakes system. Thank goodness he didn't go ahead with his project because I'm afraid we would have been mired in our area.

However, it's just nine or 10 years later and we are back up to the high levels again. The last 10 years' average for high levels in the Lake St. Clair area is 573.7 ft above sea level. The high water for 1969 was 575.3 ft. and the 1934 all-time low was 530 ft. Just imagine—it was 65 in. lower than it was on March 16 of this year. It is rather hard to believe but that is the way it was.

In Lake Erie it was 572 ft above sea level and this is 59 in. different from the 1934 level. Lake Erie went up 14 in. in the past year so we are really having a great problem with this. Some people also claim that high water cycles can be caused by the axis of the earth moving. I'm no expert and don't pretend to be; I only read and people have mentioned this sometimes. It may have moved but the problem is I don't think that is quite so because it comes every so many years, but the high water cycle seems to vary; sometimes it runs in 20-year and sometimes in 30-year cycles. We are not sure whether that really has anything to do with it.

Of course, with the high water the way it is, it's great for the St. Lawrence Seaway and the shipping companies. Some people claim that because the shipping companies like this—they can load a third more on their boats than when the water is low—probably they have something to do with trying to get the water levels up. In all the studies and so forth that just doesn't seem to show up. One can't seem to find that.

I talked to the secretary of the International Joint Comission and he said that if they stopped up Lake Superior and raised it an inch and a quarter it would lower Lake Erie about an inch in two years' time. That kind of throws that out and there are so many different opinions.

My own opinion is that 90 per cent of it is caused by natural causes. Probably five per cent could be controlled under the controls we have now, if they were put into effect at the right time. I suppose one inch counts a lot if your house has water underneath it and it is coming up to the floor. Then it comes up one more inch, you've got it all over your house. I guess that's when every inch counts.

The real problem in our area from the last storm was the wave action that did so much damage. I visited a number of homes where the foundations were completely taken out. I visited one two-storey home where the front porch had gone. The floor of the porch was underneath the house next to it; it knocked the blocks out from underneath there. The whole walls of the front of the house were right out; chesterfields and everything were all out.

That person with his wife and two children moved out at 7:30 on Saturday morning, March 17. I asked him what it was like on Friday night and he said, "Well, it was blowing, but we never thought it would get so high." So they didn't really have much of an opportunity to do much.

You might recall that on that particular day it was snowing and blowing. We had about 30 mph wind. I think that was the first day I had ever seen anyone using boats at the same time as they used snowmobiles.

I had seen people being evacuated with boats from the lake areas, and on that evening there were about 25 snowmobiles going down by my place because we had had about four inches of snow during the day. So it was quite a sight. It wasn't very pleasant, however, but this is what happened on that particular day.

There are a number of different ways to solve this. I suppose something along the shoreline to defeat the wave action is probably the most important. I had three different suggestions, and I thought of them myself. The first is that we dike the whole county, but that spoils the whole lakefront area. I also had suggested, and I thought of it myself, that we'd go out about 200 feet from the shoreline and build a big rock area to stop the wave action from coming in. There again you have a permanent dike which really spoils your whole view, and so forth.

Another suggestion, which may be much more adaptable, would be to make sure that every property owner has a proper breakwall in front of his own property. You may have a good breakwall in front of your own, but if your neighbour has no breakwall, then your property is going to go because the water just comes up on to the bare land and washes around your own. So it is a case where everybody is going to have a breakwall of some form or we just cannot survive.

I think that it's going to have be the responsibility of all three levels of government. I think we should sit down fast and figure out the best way to work on it. I think we should have some weirs, maybe out in the water, to break the wave action. We could probably protect our homes then if we had the wave action stopped. We could probably dike up around, even with sand bags, plastic, and so forth. If the water did pour in at least we would have some control of the wave action which does so much damage to the property.

I know that the member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) mentioned a report in 1953, and I think the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) will be dwelling on that, so I don't want to mention anything there. I am very concerned about some of the recommendations in the report. One of the recommendations I am thinking about, having travelled and lived in the area all my life, is that we are going to take a very close look at the level of any future building, and where it is going to be built, and not only where it is going to be built, but the level compared to the high water mark for the last 50 or 100 years. If we are talking of 575.5 ft above sea level, at which the water is now, then we should be talking probably of at least five or six feet above that for the basis of a home, even if it's back half a mile or a quarter of a mile. I think that is something that we have to consider.

I suppose we should talk about flood insurance. I have looked into the flood insurance they have in the United States and it is very cumbersome and doesn't really work that well.

Mr. Speaker: The member has about 30 seconds left.

Mr. Ruston: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just close at that. I want to stress to everyone here that it is a real problem and it is going to take really quick action at the provincial-federal level of government especially, in co-operation with the municipal councils. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, what I have to say will include some remarks that my colleague, the member for Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall), would probably have made had he been able to get into the discussion. If time permits, he may still be able to do so.

As a member whose riding was one of those damaged badly by the Nov. 14, 1972, storm, and damaged even worse by the March 17, 1973, storm, I have been deeply involved in trying to get guidance and leadership and initiative from the two senior governments. I began writing to Prime Minister Trudeau and Premier Davis in January of this year. Perhaps in the Throne debate I may have a chance to recount some of my frustrations.

However, today, suffice to say that after five weeks the Premier wrote announcing that he had decided that the Provincial Secretary of Resources Development was the proper person to worry about the flooding around the Great Lakes. And on March 7 that provincial secretary announced that all that could be done was to compensate the victims. He was quoted in the Windsor Star as saying: "Any useful work on diking and shore protection would come too late for this year."

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this is true at all, because lake dwellers in my riding have been working in the last few weeks to strengthen their defences; they are still

working in the two or three good days that we are going to have this week. In fact, they have run out of sandbags and want to know where they can get more. Some of them are learning valuable lessons on how to improve their defences against the storms that inevitably will follow throughout 1973.

The provincial secretary has announced also that the Ontario and federal governments are planning to spend between $100 million and $200 million over the next 20 or 30 years to protect our shoreline. The time to start was last fall—early last fall—when Professor Paul Vandall of the University of Windsor began to warn that lake levels would be unusually high and that preventive measures should be taken. Professor Vandall has been uttering warnings regularly ever since then and has recommended that Hans New of the Bedford Oceanographic Institute at Bedford, Nova Scotia, should be co-opted by the Ontario government to act as an adviser in this crisis. Hans New is the only wave expert in Canada.

The first recommendation of the 1953 select committee on the levels of the Great Lakes, with which the Minister of Natural Resources showed that he was quite unfamiliar yesterday during the question period, was that a study of lake currents be made, since an understanding of these currents is of fundamental importance to sound beach protective measures. Our lake dwellers desperately need expert advice and they need it fast.

The time to start, as I said, was last fall. The time to finish is, I would say, about 1980, not in 30 years as the provincial secretary suggested, which is the year 2003; not in 20 years, which was the minimum time he mentioned, which is 1993; but before the next high level period, which may well occur by 1983. We should have our defences completed before that time.

How different, Mr. Speaker, is the action of our governments and the action of the United States Army Corps of Engineers. On Dec. 26, 1972—the day after Christmas—the latter issued through its north central division at Chicago, a statement headed "Operation Foresight":

> Major General Ernest Graves, division engineer, north central division, United States Army Corps of Engineers, today announced a programme of advance emergency measures to provide temporary protection against flooding to low-lying areas on the shores of the Great Lakes. Known as Operation Foresight, the programme will help local interests to build temporary dikes where flooding is expected to accompany severe storms. In 1969 and 1971 Operation Foresight prevented over $110 million worth of flood damage along the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries.
>
> Previous studies of the Great Lakes shoreline and recent storm experience [they were referring to Nov. 14, of course] indicate the possibility of providing this type of flood protection to a number of areas along the Great Lakes. These areas are subject to flooding from storms during the current period of extremely high lake levels. The programme will begin with field surveys of potential flood areas, and meetings with local authorities to reach agreement on joint flood protection measures.
>
> Guidelines for Operation Foresight, which comes under Public Law 84-99, emphasize that the primary effort must be by the local people. [And that, of course, Mr. Speaker, is what we hope for here]. However, the Corps of Engineers may provide technical assistance, loan of supplies and equipment not readily available from state and local authorities, construction work beyond state and local capabilities, and control and direction of emergency work if requested by local officials.
>
> Public Law 84-99 pertains specifically to flooding and does not cover prevention of shore or beach erosion.

That's the kind of leadership and guidance we expected from our governments and it is the kind that we didn't get.

The Corps of Engineers has all kinds of publications. Here is one: "Shore Protection Guidelines." Another one: "Recommended Field Practices and Construction Methods for Flood Emergency." Here's another: "Introduction to Floodproofing."

The scope of Operation Foresight is to provide protection against (1) rising lake waters from expected spring runoff; (2) storm-driven high waters from spring and fall storms; (3) high waters in rivers backed up because of high lake levels. Its authorized projects are mainly to provide protection to prevent flooding of homes and other buildings, not to protect lawns and beaches.

The federal programme provides technical assistance, if required, and the execution and supervision of necessary construction. It also provides the loan of supplies and equipment not readily available, such as lumber, sandbags, pumps and all the rest, all of which are accountable.

Where flood control projects cannot be carried out because of lack of co-operation, lack of feasibility or other reasons, the Corps of Engineers also gives advice on floodproofing. Floodproofing is any means of reducing damage if floodwaters do reach buildings. Floodproofing includes window shields of metal or plywood; door shields of the same kind; the waterproofing of machinery; the disconnecting or raising of electrical circuits.

Individual homeowners are urged to prepare ahead of time careful plans for removing or raising of furniture. Low protection walls can be built around furnaces, air conditioners or other valuable basement equipment. In some homes backup valves in sewer pipes would be very useful. Auxiliary generators can help. Extra pumps can reduce damage considerably. In some houses the permanent sealing of basement openings no longer used, such as coal chutes, would be of great help. The raising or relocation of hot water heaters, washers, dryers, furnaces, freezers, refrigerators—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have about 15 seconds left.

Mr. Burr: —and any other equipment which might be damaged by flooding, would be feasible in some homes.

To summarize, if flood control is not possible, floodproofing can reduce damage and flood insurance could offer some compensation.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that governments are created to allow the people to do collectively what they cannot do individually. Lakeshore protection is a very good example of the need for government action, especially in the most threatened areas—co-ordinated and supervised, and perhaps subsidized action—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Your time has expired.

Mr. Burr: —is the only satisfactory answer.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

The member for Ontario South.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Just speaking briefly to the problems we are faced with—and of course I am referring basically to Lake Ontario—a great deal of the shorelines in my area have been very badly affected by the high water.

First, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Province of Ontario for taking the initiative in coming forward with a programme to meet our immediate need—our immediate problem as far as diking and some protection is concerned. This is more than I can say for our counterparts in Ottawa, with their flood disaster relief fund which says we must pay the first $8.5 million. But they'll only pay after the fact, not before. It's too bad. Well, they have been co-operative insofar as ARDA agreements are concerned.

However, they have not come forward at this time to help carry the immediate costs of the immediate problems we are faced with of those people, and many of them are in my area—and I assume in many other areas of the province—who stand to lose their homes because of the bad high water problems we are having. All we need are two or three bad storms right now to wipe out about 30 homes in the riding that I represent. And I do congratulate the province on this matter.

One of the things I would like to know when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) does get up to speak, is the limitation on this 80-20 fund? How far can it go; how many millions is it going to cost? I am sure he doesn't know at this time, but how do we go about getting these funds? How do we get on with it immediately?

I have been talking to the subsidies branch of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs and applications must go there. But perhaps the minister could clear up how we could move on this very quickly, as far as the municipalities are concerned, at the present time.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I think is very important—and the former speaker was talking about it—is assistance. I do know that the Ministry of Natural Resources has at its disposal certain staff who will come out and give their advice to individuals and home owners on how they may protect their homes in the area.

I just feel that the need is for long-term solutions. We talked about this, if I remember correctly, when the water was high in 1952. We talked about long-term solutions at that time. I am quite sure once the crisis has passed, hopefully, within the next year, that we will not forget the long-term solutions we are now talking about and the sharing with the federal people in providing a long-term solution.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say again, congratulations to our government for taking speedy action to help the people in our area who really needed the help.

Mr. MacDonald: Pretty pathetic.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I am going to join the member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) in congratulating the government of Ontario in assisting us, within its limitations of talent and finance, in meeting the problems that arose as a result of the storm. We got co-operation in that respect.

For example, I should record in the House that next Wednesday, the mayor of my community, together with the reeves of another community, will have the opportunity of discussing further the formula for compensation and assistance as elicited from the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence) on March 21 in his statement. He is going to meet with them next Wednesday.

But I really think nothing is served by chastising the federal government in this connection. And nothing is really served in unduly complimenting the provincial government. I for one didn't intend to rise to take issue unduly with this particular minister. Suffice it to say that I have before me a letter that I wrote on Jan. 5 to the minister that expressed my deep concern about the imminence of the danger.

It didn't really require the US Corps of Engineers—and if I might digress, that is a tragedy in itself. It's a federal and provincial tragedy that on this side of the border we have to rely upon the US Corps of Engineers to dictate to us what it views as an appropriate "Operation Foresight," and what it views as the impending danger levels on the Great Lakes.

Surely to goodness we have to have some direction on the federal level; some direction on the provincial level; some community of effort between those two levels of government so that the people of Canada and, more importantly as far as our responsibility is concerned, the people of Ontario recognize what the situation is.

I pointed out in that letter of Jan. 5 to the provincial secretary that I was vitally concerned on behalf of one named constituent, a Mrs. Maxine Guthrie, whose only source of income were 10 cabins located at an address on Lakeshore Rd. I pointed out to the minister that her very address was a ludicrous one, because the road had fallen in. She had no access; she had no egress.

I don't say that the secretary or the minister could wave a magic wand and solve all the problems that face my constituents. I have had the opportunity, albeit in an informal fashion, as I said in my letter, of talking to the provincial secretary previously in the House, and he informed me that it was the intention of the government to establish a task force in this connection.

I pointed out in that letter also that the problem with the task force that was anticipated was that the damage would be done by the time this task force reported. I want to superimpose upon this that I thought it was almost frightening for the Minister of Natural Resources, in response to my question yesterday, to say that he would take under advisement the question of the recommendations of the select committee in 1953. I must say I got the feeling that the minister didn't even know about the recommendations in 1953.

I must say also that there was express concern by me when the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis) reportedly said in Goderich during that election, in response to a question in connection with erosion and lake levels, let us say, that it was federal responsibility. We're not going to get anywhere, firstly, if the provincial politicians say it is a federal responsibility and the federal politicians say it is a provincial responsibility.

I think the time has come that we in this Legislature have to voice our concern to the government and, if need be, to ask our federal colleagues to voice concern to that level of government that the International Joint Commission has to become an effective voice. They have no powers whatever; all they can do is make recommendations. It is almost platitudinous to have them meet each year. It is almost trite to have the heads of the governments abutting the Great Lakes meet each year over cocktails and caviare to decide that something must be done.

The fact is that the American federal jurisdiction, the American state jurisdictions, the Canadian provincial jurisdictions and the federal government of Canada unilaterally are going to have to give up some of their constitutional prerogatives to the International Joint Commission if anything is ever going to be effected. It is not the kind of problem where we can stand in this House and expect the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development to solve it. He can't solve it. It's impossible for him so to do. All he can do is reciprocate to these tragic situations that continue to arise, be it by act of God or otherwise.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Like the IJC, they can only recommend.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. I am not going to say, as some people have said, that the higher levels in the Great Lakes are for the benefit of Ontario Hydro. I really don't know that. All I know is that on Saturday morning when I went out and tried to view the storm, it wasn't Ontario Hydro that was to blame. It was the forces of nature that were adversely affecting my constituents.

The fact of the matter also—and I want to say this to my colleagues, through the Speaker—that it is absolutely essential that Mr. Herter and Mr. Robichaud and their colleagues on the International Joint Commission be given power. And to give them power we have to recognize that we have to give up parts of our power for the common good of all the people who live in that great basin. This has to be done.

That basically is the thrust of my remarks. I was going to be somewhat partisan and talk about the recommendations in 1953. It really is a sad commentary on the inertia of government that those recommendations, falling within the provincial jurisdiction, were followed up in only a very slight fashion.

I don't think programmes like ARDA—and I hope the Minister of Agriculture and Food recognizes this when he gets up—can be the instruments of compensating these people, let alone effectually remedying the situation and protecting their interests. ARDA can't be it. We just can't restrict it in that fashion. It must be much more all-embracing. I say this to you—there has been inertia on the part of the government but there is no advantage to be gained by us by spelling that out in line and paragraph.

Paragraph 6 of that report talks about the nature of provincial participation. There should have been greater provincial participation. If there was inertia on the part of the federal government we needed ministers who would try to point out to them that something had to be done. Members will recognize that in January this year 36 members of the Congress of the United States, en masse, went to President Nixon and asked him to do what I am asking that we in this Legislature do. That is, to give up to the International Joint Commission some of the responsibilities that are inherent in the federal government of the United States.

I think this has got to be the answer. What we want to see is some direction now. We appreciate what is being done at the present time. We say that frankly we would like to become more involved. One of my colleagues has made the comment that we in the Legislature sometimes, and with great justification, feel left out.

I am not certain that a task force is the entire answer. If there is the appointment of a task force I would exhort, through the Speaker to the Provincial Secretary, for Resources Development, that we who are involved in our riding responsibilities be apprised of what they are doing, where they are going, what recommendations they have.

I will close in saying this: The answer doesn't lie within this chamber. The answer doesn't lie on Parliament Hill. The answer lies really in a recognition that this huge problem, monumentally significant, astronomically costly, has to be given over to a body that really can assess it on a full-time basis and that is given the powers to meet the problem.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not going to address myself to the technicalities of this problem and how we can cope with it but rather to the overall policy and particularly the means of financing that policy. I think our problem, notwithstanding the rather fulsome praise of the provincial government by the hon. member for Ontario South, is that we have had an absence of effective policy at the provincial level. That absence isn't going to be removed, that vacuum isn't going to be filled by once again engaging in that rather childish pursuit of blaming Ottawa.

The minister in charge of resources in this province was quoted the other day as saying that the potential loss from flooding and these storms in the Province of Ontario might be in the range of $200 million. He said that that was beyond the capacity of the Treasury of the Province of Ontario to cope with. If that is the case let's recall the policy framework within which this government has operated in coping with disasters until now.

If we had a flood, if we had a hailstorm or if we had a hurricane, or something of that nature, the government policy was that if a local group got together and raised money it would match it dollar for dollar. I can think of nothing more fatuously ineffective than that. The government is saying to the local area, which has faced disaster and has all the consequences flowing from the disaster, that the people have got to go out and raise a dollar before it will match it with a dollar.

That has been the general policy up until now. With recent disasters, the government has become mildly more generous. It has got on to an 80-20 basis and, to quote from the minister, "with those municipalities affected which wish to participate, for dike repairs, pumping off flood waters, temporary diking and road repairs."

The rest of the minister's comments tended to chastise Ottawa. I am not going to defend Ottawa—God knows the inadequacies of the policies there are painfully obvious—but I think it is well for the Legislature to acknowledge at least what Ottawa is offering, and then see what this government might do to come up jointly with a programme which might anticipate the repetition of this kind of a disaster.

I want to quote briefly for the record, Mr. Speaker, two or three paragraphs from a statement by the federal minister, Mr. Davis, as reported in the House of Commons minutes of proceedings and evidence of the standing committee on miscellaneous estimates on Wednesday, March 14, 1973. He was being queried by the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore. Mr. Davis' reply was:

> Perhaps I can put it this way. There are programmes in several provinces of the kind that Ontario might be interested in. One programme in which the ministers from Ontario showed considerable interest was the one on the Fraser River in British Columbia. Floods are an annual event there, and because of the dikes having been built as long ago as 100 years these dikes have been raised and raised and there have been very serious floods running into hundreds of millions of dollars, with the federal government getting hooked for some part of the compensation. So after a long period of time a joint federal-provincial scheme to build protective works has developed.
>
> The current scheme calls for a development costing in the order of $80 million, spread over a dozen years, for diking along that river whose flow might fluctuate from 1 to 30 or 40. This is a tremendous range in flow. In contrast, in the Great Lakes a flood occurs within once every 40 years or so.
>
> So, until the population really accumulates around the Great Lakes or the flood situation gets to its present state, there is no great outcry for the kind of protection which has been annual in British Columbia. Nevertheless, there are programmes for a 50-50 sharing of protective works and if the Province of Ontario wants to develop a long-term scheme [I repeat, Mr. Speaker] if the Province of Ontario wants to develop a long-term scheme jointly with our engineers, for which it is prepared to put up a dollar, I think the federal government has to put up a matching dollar.

Another query was put to the minister and I'll read it. It was from Mr. Grier, the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore:

> Has the compensation to which you referred earlier in respect to the Fraser, largely been paid to people whose livelihood has been affected by flooding, or has it gone so far as to compensate people whose homes or residences have been affected?

Mr. Davis' reply:

> Property is included. There is a sliding scale which has been in effect now for a couple of years and is applied to flooding, not only in British Columbia but in several other provinces. It works something like this: The province pays the first dollar per capita. In Ontario's case the flood would have to exceed approximately $8 million damage to property and individuals' livelihood before the federal government begins to make an contribution. On the next $2 the federal government puts up 50 per cent. On the next $2 75 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Fifty per cent of the increment.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, 50 per cent of the $2, right.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: No, on the—

Mr. MacDonald: The first dollar is paid by the province; on the next $2 they pay half; on the next $2 they pay 75 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: It is 50-50 at $40 million.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay—and beyond that they pay 90 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. What does it mean, Mr. Speaker? Here is this minister and his colleagues behind him bleating that the federal government won't do anything.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: That is compensation.

Mr. MacDonald: Just listen for a moment. If the hon. minister in charge of resources in this province is at all accurate when he

says there is a potential loss of $200 million, what does it mean? The Province of Ontario has to pay the first $8 million. On the next $16 million it's split 50-50. On the next $16 million it's split 12-4, with the $12 million being paid by the federal government, and on any other millions beyond that–they have not set a ceiling, though I presume this is open to negotiation in each given year–the federal government pays 90 cents on the dollar.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: That is compensation.

Mr. MacDonald: Compensation for loss of livelihood or for loss of property.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Not property.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. I am sorry–

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Not all property. You must–

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, I suppose I could let the minister read the record in view of the limited amount of time.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: No. Just to get the facts right, Mr. Speaker–

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute. The question was:

> Has the compensation to which you referred earlier in respect to the Fraser largely been paid to people whose livelihood has been affected by flooding or has it gone so far as to compensate people whose homes or residences have been affected?

The federal minister's reply: "Property is included."

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: But he is not answering that in an accurate sense. I mean–it is written out so I am not arguing with you–it is quite clear in the terms of the federal offer–

Mr. Speaker: We are intruding in the time–

Mr. MacDonald: That is okay. Fine.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I thought at this point you might–

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, fine.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: It doesn't apply to recreational land. It doesn't apply to commercial and industrial property or property that is capable of being insured and so that wipes out a vast amount of damage. So I don't think anyone could comprehend that when you've taken out all those forms of property and you are limited to permanent residences and personal firms–

Mr. Burr: Farmhouses.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: –which are uninsurable basically; it has got to be uninsurable–that you would ever get into the hundreds of balmy millions in this province or any other province. Whereas in the Fraser Valley you are dealing with market gardeners and you are dealing with intensive farming and you are dealing with permanent residences where they start off at a much lower base and it's just great.

Mr. MacDonald: The only thing that I find a little strange is, I'm not in a poistion to dispute the minister's listing of exemptions in a deal that the federal government would make, but here is the federal minister speaking here and he makes none of these exceptions.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Well, it is all in print. It is all in print.

Mr. MacDonald: He says that it is available to other provinces. He says it is available to other provinces. It has been made available to British Columbia and other provinces in recent years. All I'm saying is that even if the minister has got to operate only on the basis of residential property, private firms, farmland and things of this nature, it seems to me that beyond the first $8 million, which in terms of the $200 million figure that the hon. Minister of Natural Resources has mentioned, $8 million is a small amount. You've got $192 million beyond that. Beyond that, the federal government is meeting 50-50, and at least on personal properties and private firms and farmlands, 75-25 and then 90-10.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: If you get up to a gross of $100 million.

Mr. MacDonald: What does the minister mean, if you get up to a gross of $100 million?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: They pay nothing until $8 million, as the member points out.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: This is not for works, this is compensation. I notice in some of the remarks that have been made that people one moment talk about the cost of works–which I would expect the Minister of Na-

tional Resources meant when he said $200 million, and that is a sensible sort of figure for the kind of programme that has been discussed here this afternoon—

Mr. Speaker: You have about 30 seconds left.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: If the member is talking about compensation, then it is not until you get a fund of damage suffered by this isolated group, at $40 million for example, that the figure becomes 20-20, or up to $100 million approximately until it becomes 75-25, and great!—at $200 million it may be 90. But does the member honestly think that the personal property compensation, with those limitations in Ontario, would ever be in those ranges?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make this comment. I haven't seen the details of the proposal that the federal government—

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I am getting a copy for the member.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. I shall be glad to take a look at it and we will have an opportunity later in the session to come back to it again. But on the basis of this, on the next $2 the federal government puts up 50 cents; on the next $2, 75, and on the next two, 90. So beyond a $40 million total, where there is a 50-50, the federal will carry 90 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: Time has expired.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Well, I interrupted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: I have nothing more to say. I can sum it up in 30 seconds. I think there is more opportunity to work out a programme that will meet the needs and forestall the kinds of disaster and loss we've had in the Province of Ontario. I think the obligation is on this government to sit down with Ottawa and work it out within what they are now offering, get it more generous if it can, but not waste time blaming them. Let's get a programme, because up until now we have had a farcical programme.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: It is not a question of blame.

Mr. Speaker: The member for—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Glengarry.

Mr. Speaker: Glengarry.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, I feel perhaps I should say something on this subject. I do want to sympathize with any of the members who have people who are directly affected along the shorelines of the Great Lakes. I was a member of that lake levels committee in 1952, and travelled along the shorelines from Lake St. Clair to Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. I can assure the members that I have every sympathy for the people who are directly affected.

However, it must not be forgotten that the power of mankind cannot interfere with, nor has it found an answer to the changing levels of these lakes. It has been estimated by qualified people, professionals, who have made tests, that Lake Erie in a favourable season, a dry summer, can be lowered by as much as two feet or more just through evaporation. Last year, as has been pointed out, was a year of excessive precipitation and, therefore, one can understand that weather conditions were beyond the control of man. This does not happen overnight because tests have been made indicating water coming down from Lake Superior to Lake Ontario takes 22 months in its journey. Therefore, a combination of factors causes this problem.

It appears that we have cycles of low levels and also cycles of high levels. We can't blame any one government because the laws of nature are such that erosion is a world-wide problem. Certainly, when the level is high, depending on the soil along the shoreline, the situation is greatly aggravated and far more excessive than when it's lower or at a normal level.

At that time, as I recall, coming from Lake Superior right down through to the St. Lawrence River, on the Ontario shoreline alone we have almost 3,000 miles of shoreline. The state of Indiana, as I recall at that time, has a total of 45 miles along Lake Michigan. Not one of those states actually assumes responsibility in the way of putting out public money for private property.

As I'm trying to paint the picture, it's a gigantic programme. I realize that the people and the members are conscientious enough to bring these problems to the fore and to the attention of governments; but it's one thing to talk and another thing to remedy it because, after all, basically, no one knows, the amount of money that it would require. I think it's beyond the capacity of governments to do in a short-term pull.

We have received much of that information from the United States Army Corps of Engineers. They are set up, and possibly more advanced than we are in this country, but the Great Lakes basin is navigable water for which a great deal of research should come at the federal level. Studies of currents and such like are very vague but they do show that they have an influence on the erosion problem in particular.

In 1853, the Toronto Islands were supposed to have been a peninsula, solid land right to the main shore, but builders at that time with equipment, sandsuckers and such like, used that material for construction and building. As a result, with the rise in water and the currents along the shoreline, this opened up the gap. You people are much more familiar with it than I am. The east gap to the Toronto harbour has to be dredged every now and again because of this floating material which they seem to feel comes in the neighbourhood of Scarborough Bluffs.

As I recall it, at that time the St. Lawrence power project was in the making and this report was held back a year — not through my efforts but the International Joint Commission was having meetings in Rochester on the American side because the same complaint was raised there.

People had damage done to their property along the lakefront and as a result there was quite a controversy over the duct dam which was in existence just below Prescott on the St. Lawrence River. It held back the waters through that narrow channel; as you know the precambrian rock is there and a range comes across there. For navigation purposes, it was possible to have that dam in the channel; and it was needed at that time.

What many people failed to realize was that there is only a two-foot drop on the St. Lawrence River from Kingston to 55 miles east. The real drop comes from that point to the Saunders Dam where the river fell at that time by 92 ft. The face of that dam at its greatest height is 85 ft.

There are problems which are not within the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario connected with the flow that goes through that power dam. When the Ottawa River flows into Montreal harbour, which is in the latter part of May or the early part of June, it affects the level of the river at Montreal harbour and that has to be controlled.

Therefore, if it so happens that the high water levels coincide and the St. Lawrence is running through at full capacity and the Ottawa River is exceptionally high, the water level has to be controlled at a certain level in order to meet those requirements of Montreal harbour. That's a navigation problem which is at the federal level and which is beyond any jurisdiction that the Province of Ontario may have.

Mr. Speaker, the same problems which existed then exist now. I recall going out to Saltfleet township where people had built homes without going to the council to receive permits. The result was there was quite a controversy between two individuals and the reeve at that time because these people were not allowed to move into their homes. The council offered them free land—a free site—so they could transport the houses they had built without permission to a higher level. But that controversy wasn't in very respectable language, I can tell you, human nature being what it is.

Mr. Speaker: Thirty seconds left.

Mr. Villeneuve: If we had known of a lot of these problems years ago, perhaps restrictions could have been made to help. On the other hand how can you judge a 50 mile an hour wind? They have records of this in 1948 where the west end of Lake Erie was 13.4 ft lower than it was at Buffalo! I just point these out because it is not an easy problem to resolve.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I concur with the remarks of the member for Glengarry; he and I have talked about this serious problem on several occasions. I preface my remarks, by saying I've been involved in erosion problems for the past eight years in my particular riding so this is nothing new to me.

I must say, to be fair to the provincial departments, that certainly the Department of Lands and Forests, as it was called, and its engineering staff, have been very fair with people in my riding over the past eight years. I think this has been heightened with the tragic storm that hit my particular area and that of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence) last November.

I express this on behalf of the people in my riding, that we appreciate the work done by the Ministry of Natural Resources, the ARDA branch of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, and the Department of highways, as it used to be. I think there is a feeling of mutual agreement among our provincial Minister of Agriculture and Food, who looks after our ARDA projects, the federal Min-

ister of Agriculture, and the federal minister responsible for DREE.

However, yesterday, I and the residents in my riding were very disturbed and very disappointed at the announcement that the licences regarding sandsuckers had again been renewed by the Ministry of Natural Resources. This particular work is going on less than a mile away from where the province has expended some $300,000 on experimental erosion control work on private lands, to try to come up with a five-year study to see what methods are best.

Even that programme itself, Mr. Speaker, has foundered, in that they ran out of funds a year or two ago to have the research people look at the area and make necessary repairs where these erosion control structures were breaking down.

I refer to the recommendations of the select committee of 1953, on which the member for Glengarry served and of which the former member for Essex South, Mr. Murdoch, was a part, I believe. Recommendations 6 and 7—I'll read those into the record, if I may, Mr. Speaker—are very pertinent to this subject, and I quote; first, No. 6:

> That wherever, on the shoreline of the Great Lakes in Ontario, land is subject to such erosion or inundation as, in the judgement of the Minister of Planning and Development, makes it unsuitable for private development, the minister be empowered to restrict or prohibit the use of such land until suitable protective works have been installed.

And 7:

> That wherever, on the shoreline of the Great Lakes in Ontario, the use of land is restricted or prohibited because of the threat of erosion or inundation, the municipality or the valley conservation authority, if such has been established in the area in which such land is situate, be empowered to acquire these lands for park, recreation or protective purposes.

I think that in the past 20 years we have been remiss, at the provincial level, the county level and the local municipal level. Possibly we should have accepted that recommendation and acted on it in a good many cases.

In my experience, Mr. Speaker, the township of Mersea did refuse to allow one subdivision to go in a year or two ago because of the low-lying nature of the land. I believe this was on recommendation of the county health unit, and I commend them for this.

But I think this is where we have been remiss over the past few years, and might have alleviated much of the problem that has occurred in the past few weeks.

The other point I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that legislation regarding conservation authorities should be changed. I had the privilege of serving on that select committee a few years ago, and again currently on the select committee on drainage. These are areas of concern in regard to the Great Lakes levels, as they have an interplay. I feel that the conservation authorities must somehow have the jurisdiction to do some sort of erosion control work, and thus be the mechanical means whereby the two levels of government can be approached in an orderly manner for financial assistance under a basic policy.

I was quite shocked a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, at our select committee on drainage when we had four representatives of the Ministry of Natural Resources, one of whom is on the Great Lakes study group. At the conclusion of that meeting, I asked him if they were going to make any changes in their policy on erosion control. I am sorry to report, Mr. Speaker, that they were not even aware that their engineering branch did have a policy on erosion control at that time. It is an eight-point programme that was developed in July, 1972, and first enunciated in my particular riding.

In the county of Essex we have suffered tremendously at the north shore of the county, as well as in my particular riding. Our county council has endorsed a resolution asking for flood insurance similar to crop insurance. I have replied to county council in this regard, based on my knowledge of the workings of crop insurance. In the folder outlining the details of that programme, they specifically indicate that crop insurance will not be given where there is low-lying land that is subject to normal flooding. Similarly, they will not extend that coverage where in their judgement there is poor management. And I have asked county council if this was what they meant by the type of flood insurance they wished. I don't feel it is practical; I don't think the people who have built in these low-lying areas could afford the premiums.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, I agree with many of the remarks here today. Certainly we could go into all the recommendations of the Great Lakes water resources conference

held by the Engineering Institute of Canada a few years ago—but that would not solve the problem at hand. Surely we can act on the recommendations of the select committee report of 1953 and the engineering studies that have been done since, and come up with some sort of a comprehensive programme, worked out mutually by the Ottawa government, the province, the counties, the regional governments and the local municipalities. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I think all we can do is pray for no winds and plenty of sunshine.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join the hon. member in his prayer because I think it is going to be absolutely necessary, judging from the actions of the provincial government to date.

I want to say also, in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for Sarnia, that I appeared before the International Joint Commission in 1969, I believe, and I made just such a recommendation, that they be given additional powers to deal with matters of concern in the Great Lakes. The then Minister of Energy and Resources Management, I believe he was then called, the member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr), was in the audience and he claimed that wasn't such a good idea. Nevertheless, this is a different matter, and perhaps in this particular matter he would agree with us that there is a need to have a body that has jurisdiction on both sides of the border. So the member for Sarnia is right on in what he is saying in that regard.

I also want to say that I consider the federal government's attitude toward this particular problem to be wrong. I don't believe that they should be sitting back and waiting until the Province of Ontario has expended about $8 million before they start to assist. But, by the same token, I consider the attitude of the provincial government also to be wrong: I don't believe that they should be requesting municipalities that are already hard-pressed, with very limited tax sources, to raise even 20 per cent of the cost of the work that has to be done at this point.

I really worry about the attitude that has been evident over the last two years. I can recall attending a meeting at the Beacon Motor Hotel in the Niagara Peninsula about 9 or 10 months ago. It was the last of a number of meetings that had been held there to discuss this particular problem as well as the fears and concerns of the people who live along the shoreline of Lake Ontario, from Burlington on the one end to Niagara-on-the-Lake on the other. They were expressing their concern then that this year was going to be a year in which they were about to suffer considerable loss; and that message was relayed to the government.

As a result of that meeting and subsequent meetings with other constituents of mine, I contacted the appropriate department, sending to them maps and, in addition to that, an agreement which had at one point been signed by the government in regard to the building of groynes in the area of Saltfleet township and Hamilton that is on the lakefront. We were asking for assistance, because we feared there were going to be problems this coming winter and in the spring breakup. We didn't get much of an answer to that either, quite frankly.

I then wrote to the Premier about five weeks ago and asked him, in view of those things and of the fact that many people were already suffering and many more likely would suffer considerably greater damage, if he could inform me who was in charge. I rereceived no answer.

I then followed up with another letter to the Premier and, referring to my first letter, I asked if he could please answer it, because many of my constituents were knee-deep in water and waiting for his help and I got no answer. Finally, out of the back rooms of the government party came the declaration that it was finally going to become involved but its involvement was conditional on municipal involvement. I think that that approach is wrong.

I raised yesterday with the minister another twist in the whole matter—that perhaps it might be possible to make that involvement conditional, if the government wished, on the involvement of the individual citizen who may be suffering damage and may be able to raise the 20 per cent on his own, and who wants to proceed with work. Frankly I think that there are are citizens who live along the lakefront who are prepared to involve themselves to some extent financially and who are prepared to get work done if they think the work will be of a lasting nature. I believe that that kind of change in the policy of this government is essential and should be enunciated here as quickly as possible in order that these people can proceed.

I'm also worried because frankly I think that in the overall picture even that isn't likely to have much of a lasting effect. I'm

concerned that some citizens will be able financially to do it while their neighbours will not. We all know the consequences of building a breakwater or a groyne in one area. It simply means that the currents and winds come around behind it and eventually that is torn out and it has served no useful purpose, but considerable funds will have been expended.

What I want to suggest to the government is this: That the responsibility for the maintenance of the shorelines of the Province of Ontario is, in fact, a joint responsibility but until such time as the federal government recognizes the requirement of its involvement, this government has to assume full responsibility and to move in. Further to that, the preservation of the shorelines, until such time as the International Joint Commission is given the kind of power that has been suggested, should be assumed by this government. It should take advantage of whatever is available federally but it ought to proceed immediately with the plans and the development along the shoreline.

Then, having once assumed the responsibility for the shoreline, it should go one step further in a matter perhaps slightly unrelated but nevertheless important. It should say then that since it's the government's responsibility, access to all of the shoreline is available to all citizens since all citizens are paying for it. I suggest that that's something which has to be considered in the overall picture.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Definitely.

Mr. Deans: I want to tell members something else. My colleague from Sandwich-Riverside, who spoke earlier has been concerned about this matter for some months and he's written to various levels of government.

My colleague from Sandwich-Riverside wrote to the federal government and—this is not verbatim—he urged that technical guidance for the lakeshore residents should be provided. He asked, should they sandbag; should they build metal breakwalls; should they use gabion baskets; or what should they be doing?

I'm going to show you the extent of the federal government's reply because this would be quite amusing if it weren't so serious. The federal government says, "So far as technical advice is concerned this is available in my department for any individual, community or agency who requires data on lake level fluctuations—" and then comes the ringer; this is the hooker—not "The Happy Hooker"—"so that shoreline developments can be properly—"

Mr. Foulds: That's the unhappy hooker!

Mr. Deans: "—and safely located outside the zone which is subject to damage."

That is absolutely ridiculous as an answer! I want the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, convey to the federal government that we don't need it to tell us what to do now for future times in regard to development along the shoreline. I think, in fact, we are all aware of the kind of restrictions which have to be placed on development along the shorelines for future use.

I want the minister to tell the federal government that it's time it came to grips with developing some kind of a programme in which we can participate; that will guarantee that citizens who come with a legitimate complaint, who come to government at any level with fears for their safety and the safety of their belongings, can be treated with expeditiously and fairly. This hasn't occurred.

Frankly, I charge this government with neglect. I recognize that it may, in the cabinet room, have been concerned about the problem but the problem has been obviously growing. It has been recognized not only by the citizens but by many other people right across the province as being a problem which was going to create chaos this coming spring. In fact, that action had to be taken some months ago—and this government didn't take it. We could have taken precautionary measures, and we can't rely on municipal involvement. And therefore I challenge the government to set out a programme that will clearly define what it is capable and willing to do.

Mr. Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Deans: And the result will be that we won't be faced with this cyclical problem in the future.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, first of all let me express words of sympathy and appreciation for what has been said today.

I completely agree with the position put by the member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston) who summed it up historically, and I think exceedingly well, and I am sure expressed

on behalf of all of us here in the House the great concern that all of us have for the very unfortunate situation in which a very great many farm people certainly, and many other people who have sought recreational sites along the Great Lakes, and their tributaries, find themselves today.

I am indebted to my friend and colleague, the member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil), for having drawn to my attention repeatedly in these last few weeks the very great concern which he has for the people of the constituency of Elgin which he represents, and those in the area of Norfolk; particularly bringing to our attention the concern expressed to him in no uncertain terms by the Houghton township erosion control committee.

All of us who are at all familiar with the Lake Erie north shoreline situation recognize full well the magnificent cliffs that border that shoreline. But we also recognize the fact that they sit on quicksand. With the high water levels being what they are, those high cliffs become subject to very definite erosion and are propelled into the water.

As my friend, the former chairman of the select committee that was established in 1952 to deal with the subject that is of such concern to us today said so well: there is very little that can be done to halt the massive effects of nature when nature takes over.

Now what can we do? I find really that an article written in the Globe and Mail by Peter Whelan summed it up extremely well. I don't have the date it appeared but it was just recently. And obviously there is so very little that can be done.

My friend mentioned the fact that the IJC should have complete control. Insofar as I know, the IJC does have complete control where the lake levels are concerned. But what else can be done really? The IJC has opened all the possible opportunities there are to draw water out of the Great Lakes—to the extent even—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh yes it has—even to the extent that the flow has been restricted in recent weeks because of the excessive water that was going into the St. Lawrence River.

There's no one to blame for this; it's just simply a phenomenon of nature that takes place in—well, a 20-year cycle right now.

There's nothing in all the history of the Great Lakes that indicates the regular periodical ebb and flow of the Great Lakes' levels. The levels in 1952 were high; in 1962 and in 1964 they were extremely low. Many of us recall—in fact the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) would if he were here— recall the great complaint regarding the low water level in Georgian Bay area.

Now what have we been able to accomplish, really? Through ARDA we have been able to negotiate arrangements with the federal government—that were signed this very day in Ottawa—to assist in providing on a 45 per cent federal, 45 per cent provincial, and 10 per cent local contribution with the townships of Mersea, Harwich and Pelee, to re-establish and rebuild the dikes; and to, I hope, establish a more permanent type of water level control than there has been in the past.

Now admittedly there are much wider areas than that to deal with. The federal government, through its auspices, has been making a study of the area. This is now under consideration at Ottawa. Our ministry, with others within our policy field, has also been making a study of what we can do to protect agricultural lands that are adversely and could be adversely affected by the higher water levels and by any future storms which we hope just won't take place.

Mr. Speaker: You have sixty seconds left.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let me say this—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. I apologize. You have another five minutes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the sharing arrangements that have been offered by the federal government, we felt, and I think the chairman of our policy field committee, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development felt hopeful, in the statement he made a few days ago, making available funds on an 80-20 costs-sharing basis to the affected municipalities for participating in dike repair, pumping off of flood waters, temporary diking and road repair, that the federal government will come in with us. But we have to spend the next $8 million, before there is anything coming from the federal government in this regard.

With reference to the permanent type of installation. This is where I think we have to accept some responsibility, and we as government are prepared to look at this very seriously. We feel that with the offer that has been made by the federal government on a 50-50 basis for any efforts that we make with

regard to establishing permanent flood control measures, they will participate with us. We think, quite frankly, that the local municipalities should be involved. We think that perhaps in the long-term negotiations—and as late as Monday I discussed with the federal Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa this very situation—that perhaps we can come up with some type of an agreement.

Now they don't have the money—

Mr. Deans: They don't have the money?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They don't have the money today, but we are talking about a long-term agreement. I am not going to argue with my hon. friend. He thinks that we ought to put up 100 per cent, and perhaps we should in some respects, but the local people want some input into this thing, according to the statements they have given to us.

Mr. Ruston: They have got to put some in.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Exactly. My hon. friends who are involved in this thing at the level where the problem really exists appreciate the concern and the necessity of their contribution.

Mr. Ruston. They will be glad to help.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Right. So we think that this is the way we should proceed. We are prepared as soon as our plans are ready, and as soon as the federal plans are ready to discuss them together. Perhaps on a long-term basis we can work out something that will be of immeasurable help.

We have done as much as we possibly can, I feel, to assist in working out arrangements of a short-term nature. We are concerned with the agricultural community—very much so. We are concerned with the shore levels themselves and the erosion problems, and we are very much concerned with the tributaries to the Great Lakes, particularly the Thames, the Sydenham and the Chenal Ecarté—there may be others—where this water can back up and flood out over that valuable farmland that has been diked on both sides. With great respect, Mr. Speaker, we have tried for years to get federal participation in repairing the dikes on the lower Thames and on the lower Sydenham without success.

I feel, with the offer that has now been made by the federal government, recognizing the problem that exists today, our government should move in and use this offer. This is what we intend to do.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Even if it is parsimonious?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in this debate. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) for bringing about this debate. Also I wish to say thank you to the Minister of Natural Resources, who is not in his seat, to the Minister of Agriculture for the grants through ARDA, which are helping a considerable number in the riding that I represent, and also to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development for his statement the other night with regard to offering 80-20 grants for protection of farmland in the Province of Ontario.

I might say that there has been a great deal said. I hate to rehash all that was said, but we know this high-level water in the Great Lakes is of great concern to the people of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time we read articles in the paper saying that the International Joint Commission has been letting water go from Lake Ontario down the St. Lawrence River. At the limited volume that it can let go, it is very hard to blame the IJC for this high level of water in the Great Lakes.

We have been told many times that it is lack of sunshine; it is the heavy rains, the amount of drainage that is taking place in this province; the amount of paving that we are doing, and the fact that more homes are being built. We are said to be rushing water into the Great Lakes faster than we ever did in history. One of the things blamed last year was the lack of sunshine. The water that falls on the Great Lakes in general is evaporated by the sun, but in this last year the sunshine didn't occur.

However, I must say, Mr. Speaker, the great concern is not only what has happened up to now. Last Saturday morning I was invited to view the shores of Lake St. Clair and the north shores of Lake Erie. I had a very close look at the erosion and the damage that is already done. It is a very serious situation, because of the land that was inundated with water and the cottages and homes that were threatened.

The time is limited and I know there are many others who want to speak. But we are informed that the water level in the

Great Lakes will be higher in May and June than it is at the present time. I think we should do everything possible, although it is an act of God, I know.

I know the government here has shown good faith and it is trying to do something for those who are threatened with losing everything they have, or their land, or their homes. I think the Minister of Agriculture and Food has indicated that the federal government isn't bearing with us. I think we should make every effort to inform the federal government and to see that it will cooperate with the provincial government and the municipalities, so that something can be done to protect the land, the homes and the interests of the people of this province before June.

I expect the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development will be speaking, and maybe he will inform us whether the waters of the Great Lakes will be higher in June. We hear so many rumours. But I do say that some plan has to be made before this happens again.

I think we lagged after 1953 when we had this high water level before. I think we all are to blame. We didn't make an effort to build the dikes higher, or to prepare for the worst. I think now, with the loss to many people, that we will have to have a programme or make some plans—do something that will protect our shorelines. I don't know whether there is enough money in this province or not, but something has to be done, or some plan drawn up, in order to protect this great Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South and the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development have mentioned to the House the very narrow way in which the federal government will give its support for compensation—only on the formula that was developed particularly for the Fraser River, where they are involved only with permanent residences and farmland. I say to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development that if he hasn't already, he should be urging the federal government to recognize that the situation in Ontario is markedly different from the Fraser Valley and the formula which Ottawa has worked out for that particular situation. It is not at all applicable here, and a new formula in granting should be made.

I say this because, with residential property excluded from that federal type of compensation, it is working considerable hardship on people in this province. There should be a means whereby assistance can be extended, perhaps on a selected basis, to some cottage owners—specifically those who are retirees and have their life savings invested in their cottages and who now cannot even afford to clean up the debris, let alone build again. Some way must be found so that the recreational landowners and cottage-owners, under these circumstances particularly can be aided.

The particular need at the moment is for further protection. The municipalities and the lakeshore owners' associations need immediate advice, scientific help and advice, on protective means and on ways and means of reducing further damage. This is most important since most of the lake defences are now gone.

There is going to be a higher water level, at least in May, than we have now. The only sort of thing that we can hope for is that we don't suffer major storms in May. This would be the pattern but we can't count on that; the defences are already gone.

Even by next November the water level will not have decreased sufficiently to allow any protection against the November storms and the waves that are going to wreak the same damage if not more than that done last November. This government, at the moment —it has been warned since last September of the damage that is going to occur—needs to involve itself very heavily in proposing to municipalities and cottage-owners ways of further protection which can be done immediately.

The last recommendation, No. 12, in the report of the select committee of the Legislature in 1953—which the member for Glengarry, presently in the House, chaired—spoke to that specifically. It said:

> The minister of planning and development should consider a survey and preparation of a plan and report indicating the type of protection required and the approximate cost involved.

If that had been done at that time and continually updated, particularly with the warnings the government had last September, we wouldn't be in as bad a situation at the moment.

In terms of protection, here is a lot of material available. The US Army Corps of Engineers has a publication out which it will

supply to anyone—it was first produced in 1969 and revised in May, 1972—on Great Lake shoreline damage, causes and protective measures. And protective measures! In this report it outlines all the various means of protective measures which can be taken, one of the most interesting technically being the gabion basket method of protection of our shorelines and dikes.

We have heard that in Japan some really innovative, original thinking has been done in the area of diking materials. This has occurred where use was made of the flooding problem to help solve the problems. Plastic bags, sort of a Japanese gabion basket, filled with water—the most readily available resource in time of flooding— were used. This is very cheap; it makes an excellent barrier provided enough are used and they are bound together by netting.

The government should investigate this very cheap technique with its easily-filled, easily-disposable bags for building dikes, and advise municipalities and property owners whether this would be an applicable means for dikes on this whole shoreline. I suspect it is on the cost side, and the technical aspects could be investigated.

I was very interested to hear the former chairman of this 1953 select committee report talk about the damage to the Scarborough Bluffs that the Toronto city harbour has caused. I want to dwell on that. That same report in 1953 mentions that any structure which goes beyond six feet in depth, protruding into our lakes, causes current flows to be interrupted and the sand and gravel that was formerly deposited on the shoreline is deposited on the bottom, never getting there. That is the reason why Point Pelee is eroding away.

If he wants some more facts to talk to the federal government about—they, without any advice on the environmental or current or sand gravel deposits, were the ones who built the harbour at Wheatley which is having a major effect on the erosion of Pelee Island and preventing any further buildup of sand and gravel on Pelee Island. The harbour at Leamington has had the same effect.

So the federal government bears a direct responsibility for the erosion situation that is occurring around this province, because of its non-consideration of the sand and gravel buildups when it produces those piers and harbours. The same situation, I suspect, is what is causing the problems in the Ipperwash area, due to the Grand Bend harbour.

I'll mention again just briefly, Mr. Speaker, that what is needed is technical help and advice right now, with very quick dissemination to the people who are involved. I refer again to the fact that various people around this province, as far back as last summer, particularly in the Windsor area last September, were saying that the high levels were coming, and no action or preventive measures were being proposed to help those land and residential and cottage owners, let alone those who are trying to make their living off the farmlands adjacent to and abutting our Great Lakes system.

The one proposal which the professor of geography at the University of Windsor has been making—the one who pointed it out last September—was that Hans New, the only wave-damage expert in Canada, at the Bedford Oceanographic Institute, be immediately co-opted to help in the preparation of the advice which should go out. I urge that the provincial government co-opt this man, or at least talk to this man very quickly if it hasn't, and see what he can give to the government in the way of advice that should be tendered to the cottage and residence owners and farmers who abut the Great Lakes system.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. provincial secretary.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the time available would be adequate to deal specifically with the half dozen or more speeches that have been made by members.

I may say, to record it, that apart from those who have spoken, there is not, to my knowledge, a member along the Great Lakes in one party or another who hasn't been in touch with us over the last months. My friend, the member for Peel South (Mr. Kennedy) has been very vigorous, for instance, in relation to those whom he's concerned with who have had devastating losses in relation to private property. Others have dealt with commercial property or industrial property.

I do think that despite the criticisms that were present in the House today, the House is consistent in its concern for the people injured and affected, and in the desire of the government for virtually—totally, this afternoon—constructive advice and criticism from the other parties to move, and at least to study in depth the recommendations that have been made.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that as the weeks go by the kind of positive response we want to make, and the kind of constructive criticism that has been aired this afternoon, will be ultimately for the welfare of those who have been injured.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 29, 1973

Provincial Auditor's report, statement by Mr. White 311

Construction of Transamerica Building, point of privilege by Mr. R. F. Nixon 312

Wasaga Beach park community, statement by Mr. White 312

Dial-a-bus system for Toronto, statement by Mr. Carton 312

Strike of French-speaking students, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy, Mr. Lewis 313

Population of municipalities, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon 316

Provincial Auditor's report, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 316

Purchase of HOME lots, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald 318

HOME plan lot leasing, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis 321

Increase in prices of houses, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mrs. Scrivener 322

Assistance for nursing home operators, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Spence 323

Cost of trade missions, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Stokes 323

Flight operations of Transair, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Rhodes 324

Quarterly report on OHIP financial status, question of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon 325

Tax credit for machinery, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 325

Tabling reports, public accounts, Mr. White 326

Banting and Best Medical Research Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Potter, first reading 326

Nurses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Potter, first reading 326

Nursing Homes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Potter, first reading 326

Practice of Dental Prosthesis Act, bill to provide for, Mr. R. F. Nixon, first reading 326

Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Paterson, first reading 326

High lake levels, motion for special debate, Mr. Haggerty 326

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Davis 327

Debate adjournment 344

High lake levels crisis, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Burr, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Villeneuve, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Deans, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Spence, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Lawrence 344

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 364

No. 10



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, March 30, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 1973

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again we are pleased to have visitors with us. In the east gallery we have students from Mimico High School in Mimico and from Don Head Secondary School at Richmond Hill; in the west gallery students from St. Mary's High School in Welland; and at 12 noon in the west gallery we will be favoured with girls from the 1st, 3rd and 4th Girl Guide Companies in Burlington.

Statements by the ministry.

STRIKE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING STUDENTS

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier (Mr. Davis), I would like to make a statement concerning the Cornwall school question.

Early yesterday and last evening I spoke to many of the people involved in the problem, and I have received assurances that with the appointment of a mediator the students will return to school as soon as possible. I have been in touch with my colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells)—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Where is the minister?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Where did the minister find him?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —and he agreed to appoint Mr. Thomas Symons, author of the Symons report, to meet with all parties in an attempt to solve the problem. I wish to make it quite clear that the appointment of Mr. Symons is conditional upon the return to classes by the students. I feel that they should return to school as quickly as possible in order to avoid any problem of lost study time.

Monsieur le Président, en l'absence du Premier Ministre (M. Davis), je voudrais ce matin annoncer aux honorables députés de cette chambre que depuis hier et durant une bonne partie de la nuit j'ai communiqué avec plusieurs personnes qui sont impliquées dans la question de l'école de Cornwall. J'ai communiqué également avec mon collègue, le Ministre de l'Education (M. Wells), et il a consenti à nommer M. Symons, l'auteur du rapport Symons, pour rencontrer les parties à la présente dispute. Je voudrais insister pour dire que la nomination de M. Symons est sujette naturellement à une condition: que les élèves retournent en classe le plus tôt possible.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

STRIKE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING STUDENTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour further to his statement. Has he any reason to believe that Mr. Symons' recommendation as a result of this special appointment will be any different than it was a year ago when he said that the community should be served with a French-language secondary school without delay?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, in reply, I can only say that Prof. Symons has been appointed to mediate.

Mr. S. Lewis: (Scarborough West): That is an excellent appointment.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you.

An hon. member: Hard, isn't it?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Try to find a minister.

ELIZABETH GARDENS PROJECT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think I will ask the minister in charge of housing—

Mr. Lewis: Of course.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —if he would care to report to the House on the visit of the housing inspectors to the Elizabeth Gardens development in Windsor?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): I thought I gave an answer to the question that was raised earlier this week.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did that include the inspector's report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not too sure. It seems to me, I have answered so many questions on housing this week.

Mr. Deans: I wonder why.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I answered the question of the hon. member for —

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): That was a question I asked the minister earlier in the week, and he made mention that he would have two inspectors down on the 27th. They did not arrive on the 27th. They were there on the 28th. They spent only 20 minutes visiting the project. They visited only four homes of the 25 complainants, and the visit and inspection were only cursory. I certainly think it would be in the best interests of the department and those who have purchased the project that there be an on-site inspector, and that the government conduct a full probe into the whole development of Elizabeth Gardens in the city.

Mr. Speaker: We thank you for the clarification.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, do I take it that is the question that the hon. Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Lewis: Does that come off the time of the question period?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, could I answer questions asked earlier in the week?

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Is the minister aware that the same contractor that built Elizabeth Gardens has got OHC approval to construct a second set of similar units on Union Blvd. on the west side of Windsor? Would the minister ensure that the same design faults and the same construction faults are not going to occur in that project, if indeed he allows it to go ahead?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will investigate the matters raised by the hon. members this morning, although I have been handed a note in respect of the previous question that inspectors were there 24 hours.

Mr. Sargent: Did they hold the taxi?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There apparently is a difference of opinion as to what happened. I promise the two members that I will bring back a report to this Legislature on the situation after investigation.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville on a supplementary. The New Democratic Party did have a supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman: In reply to my original question the minister made mention in his statement that the type of complaints were those normally found in Ontario Housing projects. Does the minister really consider that the following types of complaints are normally found in Ontario Housing projects: That support posts are substantially out of plumb, that head and foot plates of jacks are missing, that wall grating vents were placed over solid walls with no openings whatsoever, that carpets were placed over large holes and openings in the floor, and that the city inspector had ordered the tearing down—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has raised the question and I promise to investigate it. If he wants to carry out the investigation at this particular time it would be rather unfair to me. I don't have any material. I don't have the report.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is concerned. He wants to be sure the minister knows what to look for.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I promise to report back to this House. I've given the hon. members an undertaking that I will have the whole matter investigated and report back to this House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All the minister will tell us is that his inspectors were there for 24 hours.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister indicate to the House what inspections are actually carried out by Ontario Housing Corp. of the properties that are developed under the HOME programme to ensure quality building?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, these questions were answered the other day.

Mr. Deans: No they weren't.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I'll read the answer again. It's their time.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville gave the impression that I had said the deficiencies found are normal for projects of this kind. I actually said that during that time a number of deficiencies as normally found in a project of this kind were noted. That doesn't mean that if there were other deficiencies which were not found they are necessarily normal to that kind of project. There's a bit of difference there.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Standard reply!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And in reply to the hon. member's question, I said the Ontario Housing Corp., as second mortgagee, has the responsibility for inspections relating to the release of mortgage funds. In addition to the inspections of foundations, plumbing, electrical installations, framing, roofing and insulation carried out by the municipality, Ontario Housing Corp. has been carrying out regular inspections of these units as construction proceeded.

That's when I pointed out that a number of deficiencies had been found, the developer had been informed of these deficiencies and at that time was in the process of correcting them. I also pointed out that in that case Ontario Housing is holding back $345,000 in mortgage funds and will continue to hold them back until the deficiencies are corrected to the satisfaction of OHC. So, I don't know what better protection the public needs if we hold back the funds which the builder is going to need until he corrects any deficiencies.

Mr. Sargent: The minister knows they had no such intention in Owen Sound. He knows that.

Mr. Deans: Just one final question: Are the same protections available under the HOME programme as are available under the development for public housing? If they are—or even if they're not—will the minister order an investigation into the construction of the properties which is being carried out by Benton Construction in Hamilton on Garth St.?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we have some responsibility there, of course we shall. If the member feels there is something wrong, of course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes. In reading the statement of the minister, he makes mention that during that time a number of deficiencies as normally found in a project of this kind were noted. In my question to the minister this morning I had asked him if the series of deficiencies that I made mention of were normal deficiencies in the eyes of Ontario Housing Corp.?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would think not.

Mr. B. Newman: And those are such that the building inspector is requiring the complete tearing down of a masonry wall, basements being continuously wet, carpets placed over openings—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously that is not normal.

Mr. B. Newman: These deficiencies are abnormal?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those deficiencies are not normal deficiencies. I would hope not.

Mr. Deans: I am not sure that is true. That's what worries me.

Mr. B. Newman: Will the minister then conduct a complete probe into the whole Elizabeth Gardens housing project?

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Will the minister advise what steps he has taken or will take to prevent a repeat of the situation in Owen Sound where a contractor collected deposits from people, never even started the project and the people couldn't get their money back for a long time? What steps is he taking to protect people like that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will give me the name of the project I will find out whether OHC is involved.

Mr. Sargent: The minister has a file that thick.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Quite often, Mr. Speaker, questions have been raised and we have had letters from people complaining about certain developments—

Mr. Sargent: There are 30 people involved.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —with which Ontario Housing Corp. has no connection at all. So if the hon. member will let us know which particular project he's talking about—

Mr. Sargent: Come on, the minister knows all about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —I will find out whether OHC is involved and will be glad to report back on that.

Mr. Sargent: Ask the deputy minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, may I answer those other questions while I'm on my feet?

Mr. Speaker: It really would not be proper at this point. I will call on the hon. minister as soon as the leaders of the other two parties have finished—unless it has to do with the same topic, housing, then I think we can take it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's housing.

Mr. Speaker: Then I think the hon. minister may give the answers to the questions.

METRO HOUSING SHORTAGE

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, a number of hon. members on Mar. 23 and Mar. 26 asked a series of questions regarding the production of rental housing by Ontario Housing Corp., particularly in Metro Toronto. I would first like to clarify—

Mr. Deans: It's a ministerial statement!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it's not a statement; it's the answer to a question. Now does the hon. member want the answers or does he just want the original headlines?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the hon. members would rather that some of the original misleading headlines remain on the record without an answer; but I am answering—

Mr. Deans: The minister was the one who had the misleading headlines!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Now, now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I should point out to the hon. member that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: It was the minister who was misleading!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They prompted a ridiculous question!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would first like to clarify a point made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who spoke on last Friday of $80 million to $100 million, which he said had been approved for public housing but was not expended.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's precisely what he said.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is not an answer to a question. If the minister wants to take issue with something, then let him do it before the orders of the day or in the Throne Speech debate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: He shouldn't abuse the question period this way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this was a question by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The minister is not giving an answer!

An hon. member: It's a statement he's making!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

If I might just explain to the hon. members, invariably when an answer is given which appears to be approaching a time beyond that which would constitute a normal answer, I think the hon. members would agree that I have always taken note of the time; and if it exceeds a reasonable time I add it to the question period. I started to do that this morning, and I will continue to do it.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, could the minister kindly give us the question to which he is replying in each case.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was about to do that.

Mr. Lewis: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition said:

This matter is of great importance. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you would agree I wish I could remember the specific sum—

Of course the Premier (Mr. Davis) has pointed out that the hon. Leader of the Opposition doesn't remember sums — "but I think it's $80 million or $100 million —"

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's the amount of the programme. It's an $80-million programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —"that's been approved for public—"

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Isn't it?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That's not a question yet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if you'd just give me a chance. To continue:

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wish I could remember the specific sum, but I think it's $80 million or $100 million that's been approved for public housing and the minister says now that he can't spend it because he can't find any place to build the buildings.

Why doesn't he use, for example, the land that the government owns and has serviced at Malvern?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's been used.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How could he possibly—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's not an answer!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:

How could he possibly come forward with a programme and ask us to approve huge sums of money without knowing where he was going to build the buildings? It seems to be irresponsible. I think that his duty has not been fulfilled.

This was in the question period, and I think the hon. member will agree that's a question that should be answered—and I'm about to answer it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I'll answer, if you'll let me answer it.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has to spend a week trying to find another answer, and now he's coming back.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's my business as to how long I take!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker: Do I answer this question in question period or do I not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of that particular series of questions was that the minister never at any time indicated he would take them as notice and answer them later. I don't believe the minister has the right to stand up and simply go back to reiterate answers he made previously.

Mr. Lewis: He wants to correct the incorrect answers!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I happen to feel that I have a responsibility to bring the facts back to this House.

Mr. Deans: Then make a statement!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's obvious that the hon. members opposite don't want the facts. I could have given a statement—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Every year his facts disintegrate three days after they are uttered.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I await your ruling.

An hon. member: They don't want the facts!

Mr. Lewis: He has become an embarrassment to himself, to his colleagues and to the world.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me the questions that have been repeated by the hon. minister were in fact questions that were directed to the minister during the question period. The answers apparently were not given at the time.

Some hon. members: They were. They were!

Mr. Speaker: Are the hon. members satisfied that the answers were given at the time?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, since you are about to make your ruling, you may recall that the fund to which the hon. minister is referring is an $80 million fund. I wasn't sure of the figure but I am now. It is an $80 million fund. In his answer to the question, he said that the money was not expended because of the attitude in the

community that would not allow him to build public housing and he has been bemoaning that attitude ever since. If, in his answer, he is going to explain how he is going to change that attitude or perhaps spend the money on public housing, let him go ahead.

Mr. Sargent: The Treasurer needed the money, that's why.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me, in view of the comments of several members who have spoken to this, that if they are, in fact, satisfied that answers have been given, the hon. minister should convey to the members by way of a ministerial statement anything further he has to say.

Mr. Renwick: We will be glad to have it now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, the time has to come off the total time allowed for questions. If it is the wish of the members that no further answers on this particular question be given now, I would ask the minister to wait until the next occasion for ministerial statements.

Mr. Lewis: No, let him give the answers to the questions which were asked, not the answers which are self-serving.

Mr. Speaker: Well, this is up to the minister entirely.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member mean the answers should be serving the opposition?

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, you put this House in a difficult position, because if the members of the opposition can ask a question by making a speech ending with a rising inflection and therefore it becomes a question—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That makes it interrogative!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They make a statement and we don't get an opportunity to answer them, Mr. Speaker, the only alternative—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What question is the minister answering now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —a minister has is merely to not answer the question at all but to go to the press and give them an answer to the question. Would the members opposite like that?

Mr. Deans: The minister doesn't know any more about the rules of the House than he does about housing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't do badly on television either, you know.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): In whose opinion?

Mr. Cassidy: Vanity will get him nowhere.

Mr. Lewis: Does he mean on Masterpiece Theatre?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on that particular point, let me say I will issue a statement on this to the press.

I will say, in any case, briefly, we have not been able to establish—

Mr. Martel: The minister is going to do that anyway.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —what the hon. member is talking about. There has been no lack of housing activity in the dollar range he has talked about. Every dime has been expended.

Mr. Lewis: All right, get to the questions.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, why blame the ratepayer group for blocking progress if there has been no lack of activity?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Wentworth—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Wentworth might not like this either. They don't want answers.

The hon. member for Wentworth expressed concern about OHC's rental housing programme in Metro Toronto, where we have nearly 23,000 units under management. I would like to bring him up to date and answer his question in this regard.

As he is probably aware, Metro council has requested that OHC provide 4,000 rental units annually for the 10-year period ending in 1981. For the calendar years 1971 and 1972, OHC started construction of 7,337 rental units in Metro. Commitments were given for 1,074 private rental units under the rent supplement programme, and 141 existing dwellings were purchased for a total of 8,552 units, well over the target of 8,000 units.

Mr. Deans: Last year the government built 1,300 units.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: During this period, proposals in Metro for 1,758 units were not proceeded with in recognition of limitations requested by municipalities and in response to opposition from local residents and their representatives. As a result—

Mr. Deans: It is because the government builds ghettoes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess the member doesn't want an answer. He just doesn't want an answer.

Mr. Deans: I am listening to the minister. He was breaking in when I was speaking.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why doesn't the member wait and he'll get his answer.

As a result, we made only 1,066 starts in 1972 compared with 6,271 starts in the previous year.

On March 26, the hon. member for Scarborough West asked for a list of the developments which had been stopped by area residents and I promised to provide that. The following 12 developments, totalling 1,758 units, failed to get beyond the development stage due to local opposition: Eglinton Ave. and Cedar Dr., 116 apartments; Sheppard Ave. and Warden Ave., 223 townhouses; Bridletown Circle, 102 townhouses; Finch Ave. and Warden Ave., 74 townhouses; Sheppard Ave. and Pharmacy Ave., 32 townhouses; Victoria Park Ave. and Albion Ave., 45 townhouses; Sheppard Ave. and Birchmount Rd., 196 apartments; Kingston Rd. and Pine Ridge Dr., 224 apartments; Steeles Ave. and Edgarwoods Dr. was the planned location for two prospects of 65 townhouses and 149 townhouses; Trethewey Dr., 440 townhouses and apartments; and Silverstone Dr. and Stevenson Rd., 92 apartments.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the public at large to know that OHC, while attempting to meet Metro's requirements for public housing, is also cognizant that it has responsibilities to established communities. OHC completed more than 2,500 units in 1972 and, of the 5,356 currently under construction in Metro Toronto, we expect to finish at least 3,570 this year. Included in these totals are 331 hostel units being built for the YWCA at Church and Granby Sts. We also expect to add 600 private rental units under the rent supplement programme in 1973.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What has the minister got on page 9?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Despite considerable obstacles we are still hopeful that we can sustain our rental housing activity in Metro Toronto. So far this year, we have started construction on 792 rental units. We have 1,359 more in the development process. Also, we will be issuing a Metro proposal call for additional housing in April. Our success, of course, is contingent, as I mentioned the other day, upon the co-operation of the public and their elected representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I would not like to leave the House with the impression that all our discussions with local community groups are on a negative basis. We have achieved positive results from our discussions with some local groups. I have only to cite the example of the Etobicoke development I announced earlier this month. Local residents had expressed some concern about the number of children that would occupy the development. To alleviate some of those concerns and to test the new housing concept, OHC agreed to set aside 58 two-bedroom apartments in the development for leasing on a shared-accommodation basis. As a result of this compromise, Metro will get this welcome addition to its housing stock, the development will be more readily accepted by the local community, and we will have added a new facet, we hope, to our housing activity.

Mr. Speaker: The answer to the question as given by the hon. minister exceeds what, I believe, is a reasonable time by about four minutes. We will, therefore, add four minutes to the question period. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

AYR-BLENHEIM LAND PURCHASE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if we might proceed with the second question of the day, I would like to put it to the Minister of Natural Resources. What would lead him to recommend to the Management Board of Cabinet to approve the expenditure of fairly large sums of money for the purchase of land in the Ayr-Blenheim area, which will form the bottom of a reservoir, of a dam, on the Nith River, if it goes to fruition, when the government's policy is to restrict the loss of our best agricultural land? In this case, 5,000 acres of our best agricultural land will be lost if the government's programme were to proceed.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that I am not fully acquainted with all the details of this particular matter, but I will be anxious to get them and inform the member the reasons for the decision to move ahead in this regard.

ABSENCE OF MINISTERS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House leader if he can explain why neither the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) nor the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) seem to be available for questions and haven't been for several days? Where is the Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They figure this is housing day.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't ask where ministers go.

Mr. Cassidy: He is in Florida.

Mr. Lewis: Come on! The minister knows where he is.

Mr. Speaker: The question is not a point of order nor is it a proper question for this period.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I will direct it as a question to the House leader.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I regret I didn't hear the original question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where is the Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I say I don't inquire as to the minister's activities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Whose responsibility is it to see that a minister of a department that spends almost $2 billion comes into the House, so that questions can be asked, particularly when his programmes are going to restrict the quality of education in so many communities?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll do my very best to have him here on Monday.

Mr. Deans: He can't be very far away. The Minister of Labour spoke to him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think there should be no supplementaries to that question. It has been properly and fully answered.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, any further questions? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

CONSULTANT TO MINISTER

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Natural Resources: Has the minister retained on a consultancy basis or employed in any other way a Mr. T. S. Jones to advise him on mercury pollution matters?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, under the Act the minister can appoint a minister's advisory committee. I am in the process of setting up that particular committee right now.

Mr. Stokes: The minister has had one all along.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, I'm sorry I have not. The former Minister of Lands and Forests did have a minister's advisory committee. I dispensed with that committee about six or eight months ago and have set up a new committee with a complete list of new members.

Mr. T. S. Jones is going to be a member of that advisory committee. I have asked him to accept the position of chairman, which he has done. But this has nothing to do with the point that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party brings up concerning mercury.

Mr. Lewis: But he is the same Mr. T. S. Jones who is vice-president of Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills Ltd. and Dryden Paper Co. Ltd.?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, he is, Mr. Speaker. I would say that Mr. Jones is a man of notable character and notable ability. He has also acted on the Ontario Economic Council and is very, very much informed.

Mr. Lewis: Don't be on the defensive.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Who are the other members of the committee and what assurance can we have that other sectors of society are going to be equally represented on the advisory committee?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the exact membership of that particular committee has not been completed as yet.

Mr. Martel: A one-man committee then?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, it is not.

Mr. Stokes: The chairman of a one-man committee.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It will take in all regional aspects of the province and will cover all industries that are relative to the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Mr. Lewis: The minister means he appointed a chairman from—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: These will be forestry, the pulp and paper industry, the trappers, the recreational aspects, and people interested in parks. The members will come from all over Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister going to assure the lumber and saw mill workers that they will be amply represented on that advisory committee?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I have already approached a Mr. Cloutier from Hearst to act in that capacity.

Mr. Lewis: Since the minister has now appointed as chairman the man whose company has been involved in the mercury pollution in northwestern Ontario, would he consider appointing to his committee members of the Indian bands that have been affected as a result of this company's activity?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, there will be a representative of the native population on that committee.

Mr. Lewis: A representative?

Mr. Renwick: They are the ones who are affected.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It has nothing to do with mercury. It is a representative committee.

TORONTO-CENTRED REGION

Mr. Lewis: A very representative committee!

Mr. Speaker, a question of the provincial Treasurer: Has he changed the name of the Toronto-centred region to the central Ontario region? Is that an official change in name?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I certainly don't think this affects the name of the plan, Mr. Speaker. The five regions described in May, 1972, do include what is known as the central Ontario region, which includes the Toronto-centred region plan.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT EAST OF METRO TORONTO

Mr. Lewis: Could I ask the provincial Treasurer one other question? His parliamentary assistant, the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Irvine) is quoted as saying: "Personally, I'd say there should be a change. I will recommend a change to regional government east of Metropolitan Toronto". Can the minister tell us what the change in regional government east of Metro is likely to be?

Hon. Mr. White: Indeed I cannot. We gave the minister's proposal to affected municipalities on Dec. 18. We asked for their briefs by the end of February. We became aware that there was a hiatus. There was a change in councils and so on, between Dec. 18 and the middle of January. So, towards the end of February I extended the deadline for briefs until March 31, which is tomorrow. I had thought it would be a breach of trust to try to make any kind of decision about the final shape of the east of Metro region until all briefs were received, all delegations heard, all meetings concluded, and so on. So the fact is that we won't attempt to make a decision for another couple of weeks.

My expectation is that the parliamentary assistant's remarks related to a couple of townships in Ontario county, which I think originally expressed some preference for being included in York regional government but which more recently, I think, expressed their desire to come south into the east of Metro region. Without having the context, I can't be sure, but certainly there is a consensus developing with regard to a couple of townships in that area.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister can sure be flexible when it doesn't count, eh?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, at a meeting of the Durham Progressive Conservative Association, with 300 people in attendance, in response to fairly hostile questions from certain sectors of the audience, the parliamentary assistant said: "There will be a change." He was then, I take it, speaking without particular authority?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): There's been a change.

Hon. Mr. White: I just have no idea what the remark relates to. There have been absolutely no decisions made and there will not be until after March 31.

RATEPAYERS' OPPOSITION TO PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. Lewis: All right. A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Revenue, just very quickly and then I'll sit down.

Can I ask the minister responsible for housing—as he makes his way back to his seat—would he provide for the House, along with the statement in which he has enumerating the dozen proposals allegedly turned down by ratepayer opposition, the reasons in each case?

Can he indicate the reasons in each case for the ratepayers' opposition, in the sense—if I can put it in a rising interrogative—that I recall the ratepayers' opposition in the eastern end of Scarborough—led in some measure by the member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch)—to the development of a housing project in a place which was clearly undesirable because of adjacent industrial usage. I wondered about the reasons for ratepayers' opposition to these various projects.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are various reasons; essentially they object to public housing in particular areas and they give very many reasons.

The member mentioned a particular one. It is rather interesting to note that there was no objection to private development there but there was to public housing. Quite frankly, if, as and when the environmental aspect of it is improved, and there is every evidence that it might be, I don't know what they could do to stop a private developer from going in there and building.

The only reason it was stopped here was because it was a development being sponsored and built by the government which, of course, has to concern itself with the sensitivities of the people in the area.

There are many reasons they give. Some say that there are too many units in the area already. In fact, that is one of the big objections which those people in Scarborough have. They say there are too many in proportion to the number of people there are in those borough. Others object to the size of the development.

There are a great many objections but to be honest one has to look at what the zoning bylaw permits. The zoning bylaw will permit an apartment house somewhere to have 150 units and there will be no way of stopping a private developer from going in and putting up a building of 150 units. Yet, if OHC is going to build 150 units, there's an objection.

One doesn't have to have a plum stuck in one's mouth to understand what the facts of the situation are. There are many reasons given but by and large the reasons given are those I pointed out the other day.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): A supplementary: Does the minister feel that the real reason is because the people who are to live in this housing are being discriminated against on the basis of poverty and that there is a real aspect of prejudice, similar to the sort of thing that we have under the Ontario Human Code—the sort of thing that that is supposed to stop?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will put it this way, Mr. Speaker—is there anyone here who will pretend otherwise? There is definitely a prejudice against—

Mr. Lewis: Of course!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —low-income housing of any particular size at all.

Mr. Deans: That is the problem.

Mr. Lewis: But it has largely developed because of what the government has failed to do in the last five to 10 years in acclimatizing the people to this housing—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member—

Mr. Lewis: —and in the nature of the ghetto developments. That's why it has developed and to pretend now is just an excuse.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In other words, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —the hon. member has highlighted precisely what I said. He has confirmed it. If there is a development which permits 150 units, it is acceptable, but if it is 150 units for low-income people it becomes a ghetto. Why isn't it a ghetto if it's for 150 others?

Mr. Deans: It is the way the government builds them.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Look at Regent Park! Look at Lawrence Park! Look at Warden Woods!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If it's for high income—

Mr. Speaker: This is developing into nothing more than an argument.

Mr. Lewis: Look at all the projects the government has built to develop those prejudices.

Mr. Speaker: It is purely an argument. The minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. members, Mr. Speaker—particularly with the posture the NDP has taken for years—ought to be ashamed of themselves. They are engaging in the kind of demagogy which results from the backlash—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —of providing low-income people with housing.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is using the ratepayer as a way of taking him off the hook. He glories in ratepayer opposition because then he doesn't have to build houses!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: I'm tired of it! I'm tired of that kind of an excuse.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We try to subsidize and we get—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, sure! The government is 20,000 units short in Metro.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George has a supplementary.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will it be possible for the minister to consider not labelling these projects as government projects, and would perhaps this not alleviate some of the difficulties, both in municipalities and for those living in those projects?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will tell me how we label them? We build a project—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Indeed, at one time, I was considering providing them all with euphemistic names like "Fernwood Apartments," and so forth. And my people, in discussing it, find out that's precisely the way to label them, because people will then say: "Those people from Fernwood Apartments." We don't label them. They just have an address the same as the $500-a-month suite buildings next door.

Mr. Lewis: Because it's not integrated housing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In many instances, you can't tell a public housing development from the others. I don't know how the hon. member would feel we should do this.

Mr. Deans: I can show the minister how he can tell them; they stick out like a sore thumb.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! This certainly has developed into nothing more than an argument, which is a misuse of the question period.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre was on his feet for a supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister also promised on Monday to table a list of developments that have been rejected by the OHC, and the number of units involved. Has he got that list now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will recall that when he asked that question I wasn't too sure precisely what he was driving at.

We started to develop a list of all the developments that had been turned down for various reasons, they spill over into each other. By and large, I suppose most of the developments which have been turned down in Metro Toronto, for example, were turned down—I shouldn't say most; I don't know. Many of them, let's put it that way to be on the safe side—were turned down at the Metro Housing Advisory Committee level.

Now, should they be on the list that I have just read? Strictly speaking one could argue, and I think, with a great deal of validity, that the Metro Housing Advisory Committee includes elected representatives, and the elected representatives are presumably speaking for the people in their areas. As I say, one could argue, with some validity that these projects were turned down because of objections from councils and/or the elected representatives of the residents in the area.

Now, we got into a situation as to which list do we put them on; and what to do

with those that never even reached the stage where they were being recommended for very obvious reasons—that they didn't even meet the minimum criteria in respect of that kind of housing. Or perhaps they were going into an area where there was already so much public housing that we would have preferred another area in which to build public housing. So, it became a sort of a useless exercise and I don't think anything would have been served.

Mr. Cassidy: But the minister was able to get the list of ratepayers who passed the projects!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have the list of ratepayers.

Mr. Cassidy: Such precision on one side and such waffling on the other.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What waffling? Does the hon. member really think that it would serve any useful purpose if I got my staff working on a list of all the developments which over a year, or two years or five years have been turned down by OHC for various reasons?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order please!

I should point out to the hon. members all but five minutes of the question period has been taken up with these two or three questions by the two leaders of the opposition parties and the hon. minister, which is a misuse completely of the question period. A complete misuse. I must inform the hon. members that from this date forward I'm going to tighten up on the question period.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. provincial Treasurer has the answers to previous questions.

An. hon. member: Good, good!

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think if the question period was cut from 45 minutes to 30 minutes it would tighten it up a lot.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if it were extended from 45 minutes to an hour we might be able to get some definitive answers in all this circumlocution we're treated to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I will raise it after the question period.

Hon. Mr. White: The opposition can't fill up 45 minutes on a Friday, and that's a fact.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The minister can hardly answer a question.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: Now, the member for Wentworth asked about the present legal status of the ownership of 55 acres of land apparently in dispute with the Metro Centre project. I'm informed that continuing legal representations are being made in connection with this complicated legal matter. Because these legal discussions are still under way I regret I'm not able to comment specifically at this time, but I will ensure that the member is informed of the final outcome as soon as these legalities are resolved. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

PENSION FUND

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer: With regard to the pension and retirement fund, could he tell me the total amount of money on hand in the province, who is in charge of their investment portfolios of the province, what type of investments they are purchasing and what brokerage commissions will be paid in the current year?

Mr. Speaker: I'm sure the hon. member and the minister realize that this sort of question should better be placed upon the notice paper and that notice should be taken of such a question.

Mr. Sargent: May I have a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Sargent: I definitely—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right. State the point of order.

Mr. Sargent: The point of order is that it goes on the order paper and is never answered by the Premier (Mr. Davis) or any of those fellows over there.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: This is a point of order. What are we here for? Just to make—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please be seated and remain silent?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: We don't get any answers from those people.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please take his seat?

The hon. member for High Park.

INCREASES IN PRICES OF HOUSING

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Revenue if he will permit it. Is the minister aware of the amount of rises in price of the sponsored condominiums of the Ontario Housing Corp., if we take the list issued by his department in February, 1972, and compare it with today's prices?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question is, am I aware that some of the prices have risen; the answer is—

Mr. Shulman: All of them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —not all of them—but the answer is yes, some, not all of them.

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister aware of the percentage increase or the total amount of the increase?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there are some condominiums over which we have some direct control but I don't think that we have any control over most of them as to prices. And of course there is an increase. There is an increase in prices in many aspects of our society today, not just in housing. Of course, we do appreciate housing is a particularly bad one.

The answer to that is yes, I am aware.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may: Is the minister also aware—and if so, why has he done nothing—of the fact that in this Ontario Housing Corp. list of sponsored condominiums issued by his department, prices have risen in cases over 35 per cent in one year?

Mr. Deans: He is not only aware of it, he doesn't care.

Mr. Speaker: I presume the hon. minister does not intend to reply to that further?

Mr. Lewis: I would think not.

Mr. Deans: We take it from his silence that he doesn't know and doesn't care.

Mr. Speaker: All right. The hon. member for Waterloo North.

CROP INSURANCE

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister going to accept on behalf of the Province of Ontario the offer, I believe made by the federal government, that if the province will pay all of the administrative costs of the crop insurance programme in Ontario the federal government will pay 50 per cent of the insurance premiums?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this arrangement was worked out with the federal government several weeks ago. It was reflected in legislation that was introduced in the House of Commons and was given second reading, I believe this week, although I'm not certain of that.

The Province of Ontario previously had paid 25 per cent of the farmer's premium, the federal government 25 per cent of the farmer's premium and we shared on a 50-50 basis the cost of administration. However, we were, I think, one of the only provinces in Canada to pay 25 per cent of the farmer's premium. The federal government wanted it the same right across Canada and so they introduced the legislation to do the same as was being done in the Province of Ontario, which will make it uniform across the country.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Does this not make a change in the Ontario programme, and is Ontario going to accept the offer that if they take over the complete

administrative costs the federal government will take over 50 per cent of the premium costs? Is this not a new offer made to the province just in the last short while?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it's a new offer made by the federal government to all the provinces, yes.

Mr. Good: Has the province accepted it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, of course we have accepted it—I said that long ago. I told the member when I first stood up that we had accepted it as it had been worked out several weeks ago before they ever introduced the legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

OLD SANDWICH PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. Bounsall: I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Why was the minister's response negative to the question asked of the Minister of Government Services, asking if the ministry had any interest in acquiring the old Sandwich library in Windsor, inasmuch as some weeks ago he circulated a letter stating his interest in collecting documents and properties relating to the history of post-secondary education in this province; especially since this library was originally a teachers' college and the building is considered to be a valuable antiquity? There is a group of teachers in Essex county wishing to house therein an educational museum covering all aspects of elementary, secondary and post-secondary educational documents.

Hon. J. McNie: (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of the member's speech.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce is next.

FARM TAX REDUCTION PROGRAMME

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Does the minister plan any adjustments in the farm tax reduction programme to accommodate the points raised in the Provincial Auditor's report in relation to that programme—namely, the payment of 130 duplicate payments; the definition of a farmer; and the fact that all applicants should have to apply?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to reply to that question.

Mr. Speaker: There are two minutes remaining in the question period.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let me say that earlier the Provincial Auditor, who had been doing the work for us, had drawn this matter to our attention; that is, the difference in his opinion between the definition of a farmer as given in the order in council, and the definition we have. It resulted in discussions being held with the Treasury and Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs and ourselves. We redrafted the order in council to more clearly define it, by striking out the word "farmer" in the second line and inserting in lieu of it "owners of property assessed under the Assessment Act as farm property." That was the point in dispute.

We've worked those matters out with the Provincial Auditor's office and the matters are, I think, quite acceptable to that office now.

With regard to the duplication of certain cheques, with the number of cheques that went out—I think there was over a quarter of a million cheques—there were bound to be some inaccuracies. We have been able to correct them and to straighten out, as far as is humanly possible, any errors that might have occurred. There were very few.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: I accept your admonition of a few moments ago. I personally always get a little carried away with the Minister of Revenue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You always hurt the one you love!

Mr. Lewis: I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that some restrictions on the number of questions, if arbitrarily set down by yourself, might well be acceptable to the House.

I also want to suggest to you, sir, that ministers who verge on answers or get involved in answers which are clearly and appropriately ministerial statements should be called to account immediately rather than let it be prolonged for some time.

Mr. Speaker: May I say to the member for Scarborough West that I have been attempting to conduct the question period in accordance with the unofficial arrangement agreed on by the leaders of the opposition regarding restricting the number of questions.

Mr. Lewis: There was no arrangement.

Mr. Speaker: There was a meeting in my office at which the leaders of the two opposition parties agreed there should be no restriction on the leaders of the opposition on the number of questions.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect, sir, on a point of order, I specifically suggested a limitation to you at that meeting. It was unacceptable for a variety of reasons but we hoped, I think, generally to keep it under control and I agreed that I am as much responsible for it as any.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order before you respond, I was the one who would not agree to the restriction. Why should I, unless it is forced upon me by the rules of the House? If, in your judgement, sir—

Mr. Cassidy: Because the member is a member of this House and there are other people here, too.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, that's what I say, but—

An hon. member: Particularly a mouthy one from Ottawa!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if, in your judgement, it was my series of supplementaries that held up the debate this morning, certainly I would try to govern myself otherwise. I would certainly bow to your judgement in these matters.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, and speaking only as a member of the Legislature, I have thought for the last couple of years that the 45 minutes permitted for questions and answers should be handled in what generously might be called an unrigorous fashion. And I wonder if it woudn't be wise for a week or two to try a 30-minute period—

Some hon. members: No. No!

Hon. Mr. White: —thereby forcing the questioners and the responders to tighten up on their language. I think it would be worth a try. It certainly is a slack system now, I'll say that.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, we'd get rid of a lot of evasions and non-answers.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And all the extraneous questions!

Hon. Mr. White: It's your decision, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's entirely understood by the members of the House that there is absolutely no reason why we should go the full limit on the question period. It's only a maximum time. It can be much less than the full time. I also think that there is something that isn't being observed, and that is that the questions are supposed to be urgent; it seems to me many of the questions that are asked could well have been asked six months ago or be asked six months in the future.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How do we get information?

An hon. member: Write letters!

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Regarding the other situation that is quite prevalent here, sir, and that is the matter of supplementaries; I think that any time we get past three supplementaries to the original question, then it is a new question. I think it should be seriously restricted in that respect. Thank you very much.

An hon. member: No way!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further point of order: As you know, Mr. Speaker, by agreement—

Mr. Shulman: A further point of order? May I speak on the same point of order before—

Mr. Speaker: I think the points of order all have to do with the same thing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, you are aware that you have complete authority, that we relinquished our right to appeal your rulings during that period, and we are prepared to take your guidance and authority on that basis at any time.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, On a point of order, if I may: There are just two points I would like to make in reference to the comments of the hon. minister. Every day before we come into this House, the members of this party make up a list of those persons who wish to ask questions so that we are not all bobbing up at once the way the Liberals do; we get up in turn.

Mr. Singer: On the days they are here!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They need the exercise.

Mr. Shulman: And the sad fact about that list is that every day the majority of persons on that list do not get to ask their question, nor do they receive answers. And to suggest shortening the time would be extremely unfair to the private members of the House.

The other point, and it is with the greatest of respect that I make this to you, sir, is in reference to the supplementaries. The first question that was asked today by the Leader of the Opposition was in reference to a visit of certain inspectors to a certain area; yet you allowed supplementaries from both parties on entirely different matters in relation to other cities entirely. Sir, a great deal of this responsibility must be yours.

Mr. Speaker: May I answer some of the comments that have been made, particularly, let me say, with regard to the comments of the hon. member for High Park. Certainly I have at some times in the past attempted to rule certain supposed supplementary questions out of order on the grounds that they were not in fact supplementary. I am sure the hon. member and other hon. members will recall the great furore that arose immediately and the arguments that were put forth to me to try to convince me that they were in fact supplementary to the original question—I think we had one just last week.

I have attempted to be reasonably flexible in permitting supplementaries. The rules simply state that I may allow, at my discretion, a reasonable number of supplementaries. My programme has simply been to attempt to fix in my own mind the importance of the particular question or topic, and if it's something of great magnitude and importance I allow more supplementaries. I think this is a normal and natural thing to do. If the question is of relative unimportance, one or two or three supplementaries perhaps would be better. I think the supplementaries are taking up the greatest part of the time.

I think the hon. member for Scarborough West mentioned something about the replies being given by some of the hon. members. I concur with him completely. In many, many cases their replies could consist simply of a "yes" or "no", but a great to-do is made of presenting what, in fact, does constitute in many cases something that could more properly be presented as statements by the ministry during that period.

I think two or three, or even three-and-a-half minutes by way of a response from the minister is not unreasonable. Once it goes beyond that time, as I say, I have added it to the question period as I did this morning.

Insofar as restricting the members is concerned, in the absence of any rules in the standing orders pertaining to the questions, it's very difficult to restrict many aspects in the question period. I think that it should be pretty well a self-discipline matter among the members. It's their 45-minute period—and it should be their period—and with the leadership and guidance of the leaders of the two opposition parties, perhaps they could control themselves and not ask quite as many questions.

I don't want to rule them out of order; but I think that I will attempt to do so; I will attempt to do so in the future. From here on I will attempt to control them. I anticipate that there may be some objections, but I'll try to deal with them as they arise.

Mr. Lewis: May I, Mr. Speaker, make—

Mr. Givens: Can Mr. Speaker count the number of pushups the members do?

Mr. Speaker: No. Perhaps I might finish my remarks—

Mr. Deans: We thought Mr. Speaker had finished.

Mr. Speaker: Many members have spoken to the point of order; I am attempting to respond to them. There were no indications anyone else wished to speak. I think as the rules indicate, the discussion is pretty well left up to the Speaker. I will work it out myself if the hon. members agree.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on this point of order as well? I think—

Mr. Speaker: I think not.

Mr. Singer: I haven't uttered a word this morning. I waited for a long—

An hon. member: What's that got to do with it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I waited for all hon. members to speak to the point. I waited; there was no one else who arose. Now, to permit further points on so-called points of order would simply develop into an argument. I think enough has been said.

An hon. member: Keep your damned silly argument.

Mr. Speaker: The next order of business is petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cassidy: Not again!

SUCCESSION DUTY COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that in June of last year an advisory Committee was named to examine into and report on various aspects of the Succession Duty Act, the Surrogate Courts Act, the Gift Tax Act and related matters. Members of the committee were: J. Alex Langford, QC, chairman; Elmer D. Bell, QC; G. Melvin Bird; J. Albert Brule, QC; Wolfe D. Goodman, QC; John Hodgson, QC; R. Bredin Stapells, QC; Frederick S. Mallett, CA; Garfield P. Smith, FCA; Henry N. R. Jackman; Reginald L. Kayler, QC, CLU; S. Sheldon Taerk, CLU; A. John Cheney, CA; D. Lyall MacLachlan, BSc;

The following civil servants were ex officio members of the committee: Terence M. Russell, Assistant Deputy Minister, Finance, Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs; Isaac Stephenson, director, succession duty branch, Ministry of Revenue; Derek W. Rowsell, chief estate assessor, succession duty branch, Ministry of Revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I now take pleasure in tabling the committee's report. In its report the committee has dealt in some detail with the several Acts mentioned, and has made a great many recommendations on the problems related to succession duties, including such matters as the following: The cumulative effect of capital gains tax and succession duties; the level of rates and exemptions for various classes of beneficiaries; definitions of property and persons to be taxed; the special problems of the family farm; the valuation of various types of property interest; procedural and administrative practices.

And, Mr. Speaker, while some of the recommendations can be easily assessed, other parts of the report are more complex and have far-reaching implications for estate planning and revenue management in Ontario. We will, of course, proceed immediately with a careful assessment of the report. I should also point out that the committee has recommended that the existing Succession Duty Act be replaced with a new Act. This recommendation, of course, will also receive very serious consideration.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to publicly acknowledge and thank Mr. J. Alex Langford and his committee who have given so very generously of their time and experience in the preparation of this report, which it is now my pleasure to table.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted: I have been derelict in forgetting for the moment to point out to the hon. members that Mr. Alex Langford and the members of his committee are up in the gallery. They've worked very diligently on this and I wouldn't want them to go unrecognized, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TRUSTEE ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Trustee Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this amendment permits the court before which a claim is brought against a deceased person, to appoint a person to defend an action or other proceeding on behalf of the estate of the deceased person where there is no executor or administrator. That person is called a guardian ad litem. Up to the present time such an appointment could only have been made by the Supreme Court.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I should like to point out to the hon. members that the present group of legislative pages are serving their last day with us today.

As you know we do have several groups of pages in during the session; the period lasts from 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 weeks sometimes, depending upon the timing. So the present group, who were with us up to the end of June for three or four weeks and who have

been back with us for the last 10 days or so, will be serving their last day today.

I should like to read into the record the names and addresses of these young people who have served us so well during the last period of time: Drew Brooks, from Toronto; Paul Dagg, from Peterborough; Andrew Dunin, Kingston; Catherine Frid, Guelph; Barbara Green, London; John Hoyes, Scarborough; Paul Hunter, Dorchester; David McCarthy, Don Mills; Allan McCracken Hastings; David Mercer, Southampton; Kara-Lynn Miller, Scarborough; Judith Robertson, Scarborough; James Simiana, Toronto; James Strome, Hanover; Jill Swanboroungh, Burlington; Barbara Tweddle, Fergus; Holliday Tyson, Willowdale; Gordon Watt, West Hill; Andrew Wells, Agincourt; and Sheryl Woolfe, Mississauga.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARIAN

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I understand that Miss Jean Kerfoot, the librarian of the legislative library, is retiring, either now or in the immediate future. I would like to express, as I am sure all the members of the assembly would, our best wishes to her and our thanks for the courtesy and the care and the direction which she has given to the operation of the library.

I have occasion to use the library, a number of occasions, and the unfailing courtesy of Miss Kerfoot and her staff and their helpfulness is something that should not go unremarked at this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join with the member for Riverdale in offering our thanks and best wishes to Miss Kerfoot. In the 10 years that I have been a member of the Legislature, the library has changed quite dramatically in many respects, and I think that the changes and the improvements are associated very directly with Miss Kerfoot's initiative.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government we wish to associate ourselves with the words that have been spoken on the effort that has been put forth by Miss Kerfoot and on her devotion to her position and—particularly here, of course—the members of the Legislature. We will see that she has a suitable remembrance of her duties and her time spent here.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READING

Bill 14, An Act to amend the Proceedings against the Crown Act.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in participating in this particular debate, I want first of all to commend you and your second-in-command for the way in which you handle the business of this House. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, you are in a tough spot, but I think all of us have been impressed by your unfailing good humour, a good humour which very often allows you to ride this rough steed of a House with a slack rein, which process sometimes is able to resolve the difficulties without hammering too hard with that gavel you have in your possession.

At the same time, when firmness is demanded, firmness is there. While we don't always agree with everything you do and everything you say, by and large I think we in this group respect you and respect the way in which you handle the proceedings of the House.

I want to congratulate the new members who were elected in the recent by-elections. Unfortunately it didn't turn out exactly as we in this group might have wished, but it was tough territory for us. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the results of those two by-elections simply spiked the myth which this government has been trying to perpetrate from the Lake of the Woods to the Ottawa River, that this government is doing everything which is pleasing the people and that everywhere there is approval of the policies of the Tory government of Ontario. That myth has been destroyed and no longer can it be perpetrated upon the people of this province.

I was very pleased to hear the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech in their emphasis in both cases upon the need for land use controls, a matter which we in this party have been talking about for a great many years. We have heard responses from the other side of "radicalism," and in one case

"communism," when we talked about this kind of land use control. Yet time does strange things, and today we are finding that this government has come to its senses at least a little bit and is now talking—talking I say—about the need for land use control in the Province of Ontario. What we would hope is that during this session that talk will cease and this government will take action by producing legislation which will bring these hints into fulfilment.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) yesterday waxed eloquent about the need for regional government in Ontario. I look back only a few years when the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) was thundering from the front benches of the Liberal Party about the need for regional government.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Oh, no—

Mr. Young: Oh, yes! Unfortunately many of his confreres have not followed his sage advice and very often, at election time particularly, they pry at local prejudice.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Oh, he made a speech on regional government a week ago. The member had better find out about it before he goes much further.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He has touched on a sensitive subject.

An hon. member: Don't the Liberals want regional government down in—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I just want to remind him. He made a regional government speech in Brantford just last week.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): They need it down there in South Dumfries.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's right.

Mr. Young: I spoke urging regional government. I find that the Liberals in that area are not saying what the hon. member for Downsview was saying here for years, and they are saying something different.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What else is new?

Mr. Young: One thing I would hope is that the Premier and his party, while he is so enthusiastic about the whole field of regional government, will take a look at the method by which he is implementing regional government in Ontario; and I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me on this.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right. I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. Young: First of all, we have to have a little more care in assessing local feelings and in giving local people participation in what is going to take place. Secondly, we have to undergird regional governments with some sort of financial base.

We have been talking in this party about the need for a municipal foundation plan. We had some hint that the hon. member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) was moving in that direction some time ago, but he had a grievous fall from favour, and we don't know exactly what the present incumbent is going to do about it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Neither does he.

Mr. Young: It may well be that he doesn't know himself.

But the fact remains that regional government is not going to work, Mr. Speaker, until such time as a municipal foundation plan is evolved by this government, or by another government which may take its place, to give the regional government a financial base which will give them the power and the ability to do the job they have to do.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I want to bring before the House three examples—or a few more perhaps, ancillary to them—of some of the problems that people in Ontario are facing today. Problems which arise may be just within the law, but which somehow run them into difficulties which are outside the law.

The first one is the case of a constituent of mine called Phillip Abela, a Maltese who immigrated into Canada some 10 years ago and who was a good worker and ambitious. In 1969 he received a circular letter from A and B Office Maintenance, of 2043C Avenue Rd. in Toronto.

This story was published in the Toronto Star last summer when I wrote a letter to that paper. I'll not go into all the details which were outlined at that time but I do want to set before the House what actually happened.

This letter was signed by Al Fisher—the name is important here—and it offered to provide franchises for office cleaning in spare time. In return for various size investments the company guaranteed "cleaning contracts tailored to individual time and capital." It also promised training, equipment at reasonable prices, with financing if necessary, management assistance and liability insurance.

Phil Abela like the proposition. He figured he could handle a job in the evenings and still work at his own occupation during the daytime. So he called Mr. Fisher, he made an appointment and they hammered out an agreement. Phil was to pay $750 in cash, another $750 some months hence, and in return he was getting $300 worth of contracts each month. He felt that over a period of a year he could pay off his indebtedness to the company. He could then have clear sailing to give up his job and go into maintenance work on a full-time basis.

In all this Phil had the advice of his lawyer. They went over the pertinent documents very carefully and everything seemed very clear and above board. All right. He did the maintenance work thoroughly and carefully, and his future in Canada seemed assured.

But when the time came for the first $300 pay cheque from the franchise company it didn't arrive. When he called them they said that they would pay him as soon as the company having the cleaning done paid them. So Phil waited. Another month went by and still no cheque.

Phil consulted his lawyer and the lawyer wrote the company. A cheque for $35 was received soon after this and the lawyer advised Phil to return the cheque and to sue the company, not only for his original payment but for his lost wages.

Phil tried to get a settlement out of court. He was told first of all that Mr. Fisher was out of town, then that he was on holiday. The day he was told that Fisher was on holidays he went down to the office and found Mr. Fisher there. Fisher promised he would send a cheque within a few days in full settlement, but nothing happened. Then some weeks later he got a note from Mr. Fisher that the company was going out of business and that he'd be paid.

Time passed. The lawyer finally took the matter to court. The examination for discovery was held—and more delay. Finally, Phil was advised by his lawyer that if he took the next day off and brought $100 for the lawyer's extra fees, he would go to court and they would collect. So Phil did this. He was awarded $1,290, plus expenses. The court awarded it. The company was not there to contest it. Collecting it was another matter. The company had simply vanished. The phone didn't answer and the company's lawyer refused to give Phil's lawyer the address of the company.

The Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations was called in and looked into the matter but without results. It reported that A and B was out of business and no trace could be found of them anywhere. The fraud squad of the Toronto police dug up a good deal of information about the company, its people and the various allied companies of its operation; but not a single human being who could pay Phil his $1,290 plus expenses.

What chance Phil had can be seen by the fact that at Osgoode Hall there were over 20 judgements against various companies revolving around A and B. Some major oil companies were among those who had taken court action. Also, there are a great many names of new Canadians who had the same hope that Phil had of an eventual independent business of their own.

The record shows that A and B was founded in 1959, with Robert Proctor of 62 Glenvale Rd., Leaside, as its president. Other directors listed were Alan J. Proctor of Agincourt and Mrs. M. Proctor. Robert Lemaire is also listed as a vice-president. A Leonard G. Milner of Bayview Ave. is listed. William Hearn and Brian F. Tilley were signing officers. Somewhere along the way Janitorial Development Co. of 1657 Bayview was established with some of the same principals as A and B. Centennial Janitorial Supplies of Agincourt was tied in to handle supplies for the franchise setup.

In 1969 a Montreal subsidiary of the Toronto firm was established. It was known as Montreal Janitorial Development Co. The company declared bankruptcy in February, 1971. There was also a Robert Proctor Ltd. Janitorial Co. None of these answered the phone when I called and they had no numbers listed over the last couple of years. None seems to be now operating at the addresses given.

How many immigrants in Canada, as well as the companies that I have mentioned, have been rooked by these people I have no way of knowing. Franchise legislation, of course, is deficient in Ontario and people like this do operate.

Now as I said before, Phil Abela's story appeared in the Toronto Star last summer. It brought a flood of letters about similar rackets in which customers were rooked and companies disappearing. A letter from Hespeler told of the writer's experience with the International Janitorial Services. He bought $400 worth of monthly contracts for $800.

The company collected from the offices being cleaned but failed to hand it on to the man doing the work. This chap worked for two months, paid his own expenses and quit since he was not being paid.

He tried again and ran into the same gang with the same treatment. To quote from a letter which he wrote me:

> I worked on the job in Guelph, which in a period of five months was sold at least twice. It cost me $520 and I would say it cost the other operators $780, which Janitorial Services pocketed.

In his letter he says that the contracts were a laugh. He lists some of the companies which wrote him during his period of squabbling with them. He said:

> The man who operates the Kitchener area office, with which I was first connected, and seems to have, or has had, offices in Woodstock, Hamilton, London, is W. B. Norman. Every letter seems to be from another address.

He lists the addresses: International Janitorial Services, 101 Holiday Inn Drive in Hespeler; another one at Hamilton, Ont.; Interstate Janitorial Services in Buffalo, New York; Interprovincial Janitorial Service in Vancouver —note particularly that Vancouver address— International Janitorial Services on Dundas St. in London.

The letter says, "Norman seems to have lost this one and it has been taken over by International Janitorial Services in Willowdale." He goes on with the names of the companies which wrote him during this period: International Janitorial Services in Kitchener with two addresses, one at 170 Victoria St. S. and another one at 309 Victoria St. N. Then Ontario Office Cleaning Services at 309 Victoria St. N. in Kitchener, Ont.

He says:

> I have contacted W. B. Norman who is managing these various operations. His family seems to be living on welfare while he lives in a camper behind the office on Victoria St. so that welfare payments can be made to his wife. He claims that any court action taken will only make him bankrupt and no one gets any money. I have tried to interest the local Crown attorney in a charge of fraud but the only answer I get is "to have your lawyer contact us." I don't have any money to pay a lawyer and I should have taken my former lawyer's advice months ago and forgotten all about it.

This chap's reference to the Vancouver address for this outfit is interesting in the light of a letter I got during the summer from that city. It reads in part:

> From the article I understand that no one knows where Fisher is [Fisher, remember, was the manager of the business here]. If I am not mistaken, I believe Mr. Fisher is in Vancouver and again operating a franchise office cleaning operation out of 543 East Broadway under the name of D and V Janitorial Enterprises Ltd. I am concerned about this case and believe that with this information Mr. Abela and many others may again get their money back. Concerned also since I as well as many others have been taken for a ride.

I wrote the new Attorney General of British Columbia about the matter and I have his reply here as follows:

> Thank you for your letter [and so on]. At the moment we have no specific legislation on franchises and I'm not aware of any that exists in Canada at the present time. We are grappling with the problem of pyramid selling at the moment, and if it appears that substantial abuses are taking place in the franchise field as well, then that is a matter that will have to be attended to.
>
> In any event I am asking my department to make investigations.

I got a letter from his department, from a Mr. M. H. Smith, director of administrative law, Department of the Attorney General, Parliament Buildings, Victoria. He says:

> On this date I reviewed files held at the Better Business Bureau of Vancouver, and I established the following:
>
> D and V Janitorial Enterprises Ltd., formerly known as Janitorial Developments Ltd. [these fellows change their names constantly], Vancouver office, 543 East Broadway, Vancouver [and the telephone number is given].

The head office, Mr. Speaker, is listed as 1657 Bayview Ave., Toronto, Ont. I cannot find a listing in the phone book for that office or a phone number for it.

The president is listed as A. J. Proctor, one of the men whose names I read in connection with the former Toronto operation. The vice-president is William Hearn, another name that appeared here. The president of the Vancouver office is Mr. Al E. Fisher; the vice-president, Robert LeMaire; other names are given which don't appear in the Toronto list.

He goes on to say this:

> The file indicates that there has been a large number of inquiries requesting: (a) information about the legality of the company; or (b) complaining about the terms of the contract. Letters on file indicate that this company was operating in the states of Washington and Oregon and letters from Bethell and Seattle, Wash., and Beaverton, Ore., required general information and were of a complaint content.
>
> I contacted Jacob Wiens residing at 6759 Main St., Vancouver [the chap whose letter I read recently]. A copy of his complaint is attached to this report as Annex A. He outlines his contract agreement with D and V and indicates that the company owes him a total of $620.

He is a student at UBC, I might say.

The letter goes on:

> It is obvious that the Al Fisher mentioned in this article [that's the Star article] and the present president of D and V Janitorial Enterprises Ltd., Vancouver, are one and the same person. This company was registered with the Registrar of Companies, Victoria, on July, 22, 1971.

A certificate number is given.

Members will remember that Abela got his judgement on Nov. 10, 1971, several months after this company had disappeared and gone to Vancouver and registered there. No wonder he couldn't be found in Toronto! The letters says again:

> During the review of files at the Better Business Bureau, I notice a similarity of contracts of this company and the following janitorial companies:
>
> 1. The Achilles Janitorial Services, 8183 Main St., Vancouver, telephone 324-3567. Commenced operations in Vancouver in 1970. A contractor of janitorial services and finder of janitorial contracts. Head office is listed as Suite 215, 2901 Bayview Ave., Toronto.

[Again not listed in the phone book. I tried to find it.]

> There are a large number of complaints against this company on file at the Vancouver office, Better Business Bureau. The Interprovincial Janitorial Services Ltd. located at Suite 302, 636 West Broadway, Vancouver. Principals: Reg Sisson, president, and Bill Norman, vice-president, formerly located at Suite 213, 2901 Bayview Ave. Toronto. This company's contracts are similar to Achilles' contracts in wording.

He says this:

> In all instances, the three companies have offices at either 2901 or 1657 Bayview Ave., Toronto. Their contract agreements are similar and they are located in the same general area in Vancouver. Their method of operations appears to be the same and I could obtain further information and details of the complaints if you should require more background.

I wrote again just a couple of weeks ago to Jacob Wiens to make certain that these facts were correct and he replied to me saying this:

> About your recent letter concerning Al Fisher and his franchise business in Vancouver; yes, he is still operating at 543 E. Broadway, still under the name of D and V Janitorial Enterprises Ltd. Also, I believe he has expanded his operation to centres elsewhere, one I believe in Seattle, Wash.
>
> Thank you.
>
> Yours truly, Jacob Wiens.

It's not only a Toronto-based operation with many heads; it's international now as well. When things get too hot in one location, Fisher and his crowd move and find new crops of victims.

As I said a moment ago, there is no question that the franchise legislation in Ontario is due for a complete overhaul. Hearings have been held but so far government hasn't acted.

In the meantime, the franchise racket goes on and far too many people wanting to build a secure future for themselves and their families are robbed blind. Phil Abela isn't alone. He acted in good faith, believing in the protection of Ontario law. The position he's in is a reflection on our kind of society which tolerates this kind of skulduggery, which is based here in the city of Toronto and which is stretching its tentacles into various parts of this country and south of the border. Protective action in this field is certainly long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the second case, which I also mentioned in this House a year or so ago—two years ago actually. It is the case of Mr. Len Playter who lives on Shoreham Dr. in my riding. Mr. Playter saw a TV Guide advertisement for Consumer Carpet Craft in North York. A gentleman by the name of—I'm sorry I haven't his name

here—but a salesman called on him, saw the area he wished covered in his hallway and offered a carpet.

On May 23, 1970, a carpet was laid. It was not what the gentleman had thought he ordered. He paid $12 a sq. yd., a price high enough to give him a top quality carpet. He was unsatisfied at the time of the laying and told the company it was not what he had ordered. But, unfortunately, when he had asked for a sample at the time the order was given, the company refused to give him a sample. It told him it wasn't necessary.

He called me on July 17, less than two months after the carpet was laid. At that time, the carpet had already started to disintegrate. I could take my heel and tear the carpet where it was laid on the floor, it was that fragile.

Mr. Playter, of course, was very dissatisfied. He talked to the gentleman at Consumer Carpet. They would do little or nothing for him. Finally, after some intervention, they said they would replace the old carpet with one of exactly the same quality. Mr. Playter was unhappy with that and said, no, he wanted his money back.

I have a letter here from the Consumer Protection Bureau of the then Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, which Mr. Playter contacted. They say this:

> Sandra Associates operating as Consumer Carpet Craft were registered as itinerant seller, under the provision of the Consumer Protection Act, Aug. 20, 1969, and their registration continued to be in force until Aug. 14, 1970. Termination of registration became effective on written notification from their solicitor that Consumer Carpet Craft was no longer carrying on business and the certificate of registration was duly returned to us.
>
> We have informed Mr. Hubbard, who is acting on behalf of Mr. Playter, about the bond forfeiture provisions of section 8 of Ontario Regulation 207/67 made under the court action, claim under the guarantee bond of this itinerant seller may be filed if the judgement remains unsatisfied for a period of 30 days. The regulations under the Act provide, that for the purpose of every act or omission occuring during the period when the bond was in effect prior to termination, the bond shall continue to be in force and shall remain on deposit for a period of two years after the termination of the bond.

Time passed by. A letter to his solicitor, finally, on March 26, 1971, said:

> The effective date of the cancellation of the bond is Oct. 19, 1970. Payment of any claim cannot be made until that period [two years] has elapsed. Thus your client, Mr. Playter, will be reimbursed only after October, 1972. You might care to advise him accordingly.

In other words, Mr. Playter had to wait two years for the reimbursement for the carpet which had already disintegrated.

Almost two years passed, and Mr. Playter called me on Sept. 18, 1972. He told me that his lawyer had informed him that he—the lawyer—had not been paid and that unless Legal Aid came through—and we had arranged for that, or thought we had—there would be nothing left for him, that is, Mr. Playter, out of the judgement and that Playter might well owe the lawyer money. After some haggling, via the phone, I was assured by the department and by Legal Aid that the thing was clear.

On Oct. 2, 1972, I was told that everything was okay and Mr. Playter would be getting his cheque on time. I called Mr. Playter to assure him of this. The two years were up on Oct. 19. and he looked forward to his cheque before Christmas.

Well, the lawyer had billed Legal Aid $250 for his work in the case; but finally settled for $190.25 on Oct. 27, 1972.

At the same time I was informed that legal steps necessary for Playter to get his money from the bond might take a month or two longer. Again I called Playter and told him of the delay. On Dec. 15 when nothing had happened, I wrote to Mr. Don Forbes as follows:

> You'll recall that some time ago I checked with you about the case of Mr. Len Playter of 35 Shoreham Dr. in Downsview, against a carpet manufacturer who sold him a defective rug a couple of years ago.
>
> Mr. Player, as you can understand, is very anxious to get the amount of money, in the neighbourhod of $150 or so, in view of Christmas. I would appreciate it if you would check into the matter and get in touch with Mr. Playter about it.

And I gave him the phone number. Then I had a letter on Dec. 21, just before Christmas; and the gist of it is that certain legal complications have developed in the finalization of this matter.

Well, after more phone calls, Mr. Speaker, I was finally assured by Mr. Forbes on Feb. 14, 1973—that's Valentine's Day—that the

matter had been cleared by Treasury Board and that the cheque would be issued shortly —that is Feb. 14. Mr. Playter called me on Feb. 25 to tell me that his cheque had arrived—a cheque for $160—$150 for his claim and $10 for his court expenses; no interest, in spite of his having to wait over two years, and no apology or explanation of why he had to wait an additional four months after the date of the cancellation of the bond.

It is an interesting fact, Mr. Speaker, that it cost the public treasury, through Legal Aid, $190.25 to secure $160 for Mr. Playter, after he had been rooked by an unscrupulous rug sale.

Surely legislation can be framed to prevent this kind of waiting for justice on the part of a consumer; and this kind of abuse of the public treasury in seeking justice of this nature.

I have no criticism of the staff—I want to make that clear—or the Consumers' Protection Bureau. They gave us full cooperation, right through the piece; but they had to work within the framework of legislation, which is archaic and which is patently unjust. It's time the new minister produced new legislation to clear up this kind of a situation.

And while the minister is producing this legislation, let me repeat a suggestion I made a couple of years ago, and which the then Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, agreed was practical and could be done. It was this, and it appears on page 2632 of the Hansard of June 10, 1971:

When a contract is signed for a rug, a small sample of the rug contracted for be given to the purchaser so that a comparison can be made between the sample and the rug actually laid.

Mr. Playter was certain in his own mind that the rug he got was not the one he contracted for. And certainly the $12 a sq. yd which he paid should have brought him a top quality rug; not the flimsy thing which I saw in his home two months later.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many other dissatisfied rug customers have called me from time to time. Most report they are certain they didn't get the quality of rug they ordered, and that the salesman misrepresented the durability of the product.

Just recently, Mrs. W. R. Jamieson of 2 Fox Road in my riding had been in correspondence with the bureau and me about a rug she purchased from Mr. Broadloom on Nov. 24, 1972. She paid $10.50 a sq yd for the rug and the underlay installed. She ordered "golden splendour acrilan." That's the name on the contract. She got "miraculour golden ivory." The company claims they're the same thing under different trade names; but she has no sample of the rug she ordered. And she is certain she didn't get what she ordered; and that she ordered a far better quality than the one actually laid.

In any case, flaws have developed and the company has offered to lay a new rug in the hall portion of the job but refuses to extend this to the living room, where Mrs. Jamieson claims the rug is also defective.

A letter from Mrs. Jamieson to the Consumer Protection Bureau says in part:

> I filled out the questionnaire left by Mr. Broadloom after the rug was laid and stated my displeasure at being inconvenienced for two days by two sets of servicemen who first failed to complete the job and then failed to clear up the litter after them. A Mr. Mel Radke came to see me on Dec. 14, 1972, and was in my home for a total of five minutes, which in my estimation is not sufficient time to inspect anything, let alone a rug, as he overlooked the flaw in the living room and only briefly acknowledged the large one in the hall. He states my dog piled the rug, which, of course, is not true as the dog is mostly outside. It was caused by people in three short weeks. That is not my idea of a sturdy, durable rug which I requested.
>
> He was to get in touch with me at a later date—thus the attached two letters [which I have here].
>
> Incidentally [she says] the contract [copy attached] states I purchased "Splendour, golden ivory acrilan," and both of Mr. Broadloom's letters suggest I purchased "Miraculour." Are these the same? Your assistance would be appreciated.

The guarantee which comes with all these rugs is interestering, and I simply quote a little part of it. It says this:

> In the event that any carpet is found to be worn out within the term of the warranty, Mr. Broadloom agrees to credit the purchaser towards the purchase of new carpeting of better quality at the then current market prices, a sum equal to the purchase price of the original carpet, divided by the time for which the carpet is warranted, and multiplied by the difference between this time and the time which has elapsed since the original installation.

If so replaced, the customer will pay for padding and labour to install new carpet and taking up the old carpet. [They also say this in the guarantee.] In any event, Mr. Broadloom will be the sole judge as to determining the difference between abuse and normal wear.

That's the kind of a guarantee that I think any merchant would like to give to his customers providing he is a bit unscrupulous; but that's the kind of guarantee which was given, and which is commented on, by the way, in the report of the committee on consumer warranties.

To continue, I talked to Mr. Radke, the manager of Mr. Broadloom, and suggested it would be good business to give the purchaser a very small sample of the rug contracted for, and pointed out that this would meet any charge of substitution. Mr. Radke felt that this was just not necessary. To be fair to the company, they finally did offer to replace the rug that was in the hall with another rug, not of higher quality but of the same quality.

Of course, Mrs. Jamieson is very unsatisfied with the whole situation and she wants all the rug that was laid replaced. From the number of complaints that I have had I am certain that it is necessary that a small sample be given; not a sample to every customer who comes into a place and wants to look at rugs, but at the time the contract is signed, then an inch-by-inch sample at least should be given to the purchaser of that rug. Too many shoddy rugs are being sold at prices higher than the quality would warrant, and certainly in my judgement and the judgement of other people that I have consulted, this particular rug was in that category.

If people want to buy these rugs at the prices that are quoted, that's their own business—I suppose we can't offer them any protection through this Legislature—as long as they actually get the quality of rug they contracted for. But if, in each case, the seller was required to give the purchaser a sample of the rug contracted for, then actual comparisons could be made and if the customer then feels that he has been gypped, at least the seller can prove he got the item he specifically ordered. That's the kind of legislation I think we have to face up to in this province, and I hope that the report of the committee on warranties will have some effect here.

There is one other case which I want to bring to the attention of the House. It's the case of Mr. Henry W. Francis, 233 Hollyberry Trail, Willowdale, Ont. This particular case is not in my riding, but I had a letter from the gentleman and I took up the cudgels for him. He had bought a house, and he wrote, "I've already sunk my life's savings in this house, which I purchased on March 30, 1972." And he asked for help in connection with that house.

In looking into the situation, and after talking to the building inspector in North York, in which borough the house is situated, the building inspector went out there and on Dec. 11, after we had intervened, the building commissoner wrote a letter to Victoria Wood Development Corp. Ltd., 1 Valleybrook Dr., Don Mills, Ont.

Now, by and large, Victoria Wood Development has been a pretty good builder in our borough. Recently they've been bought out by an American syndicate, one of the biggest on the continent. Whether that has something to do with the deterioration of their work, I am not sure. I can't make any charges in that regard, but certainly in recent days there have been problems.

In any case, the building commissioner wrote this letter to Victoria Wood Development:

> Following a receipt of a complaint, an inspection was made of the above-mentioned premises, which indicated a number of deficiencies as follows:

And these are very similar to what we have heard already this morning during the question period:

1. Window sash does not fit properly in the master bedroom.

2. There is evidence of dampness in the closets.

3. Sliding closet door is scratched.

4. Ice forms on the sliding track of the windows.

5. Cracks around the top of the bathtub should be grouted.

6. The two bedrooms at the front of the house are difficult to heat properly.

7. Cracks in tile joints in the kitchen should be rectified.

8. The rear door is delaminating at the bottom.

9. Water leaks at the top of the basement wall must be repaired.

10. The areaway drain must be checked to see if it is operating properly on the east side.

You are therefore requested to investigate and rectify the above-mentioned

matters within two weeks from the above, at which time a further inspection will be made.

That was on Dec. 11, 1972. Prior to this, away back in April 1972, just after the house was purchased, a letter came from the supervising electrical inspector of the Ontario Hydro North York inspection office, to Mr. Henry Francis, Hollyberry Trail. It read:

In reply to your letter of April 18, 1972, our inspector, Mr. Hogg, reports the electrical installation for the clothes dryer is not complete at your residence.

To complete the installation it will be necessary to connect the cable to the source of supply at the panel and install a receptacle on the cable at the dryer enclosure.

Well, he fought with the company about this, and finally that was made right. Then, on Jan. 8, when nothing had happened about the other matters, the chief inspections officer of Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. wrote a letter concerning the various complaints. He listed a few extras over and above what North York had seen and said, "We trust that our efforts to intercede with the builder on your behalf will prove successful."

Mr. Speaker, this was not the only house in the area. I have a copy of the Willowdale Post of Oct. 4, 1972, and, among other things, John Cotter, Post staff writer, says this—he's quoting the ratepayers' association's vice-president: "The real problem is just plain shoddy workmanship . . ." It's a frustrating experience trying to get through to the right person when you can never find out who is responsible for anything. "After our meeting [at which these things were discussed] last spring, we had a fair amount of action—for about three weeks. But every time someone comes in to make repairs it leads to more damage and more repairs.

The story adds:

"Last July a spokesman for Victoria Wood Development, Brian Sparks, told the residents that a large number of their problems stemmed from a shortage of manpower and problems of the subcontractors. He also promised that any homeowner who was absolutely dissatisfied with his house could have a refund on the home plus expenses to move. "We have tried to take them up on this," said George Cann, the ratepayer official, "but he is never in, and he wont return our calls."

I had another letter in February, Feb. 2, from Mr. Francis. He tells me that:

My difficulties with Victoria Woods Development have not been solved. As a matter of fact, there was a man here on Friday and today to look at my floors, which had since deteriorated, and my wife is informed that they will be taking the floor up to do some repairs to the sub-floor.

Now between the time of the original inspections and the beginning of this year the parquet floor began to lift, as did the tiles in the other areas in the kitchen and playroom where mastic tiles had been laid. The floor is a quarter-inch plywood above the joists, which are set well apart, and parquet tile is laid above that.

This is the kind of flooring, evidently, which is now allowed; but it seems to me extremely inadequate because that quarter-inch plywood can give between the joists and the floor when you step on it.

An hon. member: Can and does!

Mr. Young: And so, inevitably, when you get the thin parquet on top of that quarter-inch plywood, nailed to well-spaced joists, they come up, as they came up in this house.

So again we took up the cudgels with the authorities; the company, CMHC and the borough. Mrs. Francis called me one day and said that the bedroom door was removed some time ago. It's still off. She can't get it back—and the company doesn't seem to know about it. I talked to the commissioner, and that finally was restored.

Finally, in respect of the flooring, she was told by the builder that if she and her family would move out and take their furniture, they would move in and look after the floor.

Imagine! Asking these people to move to a hotel or some place else for a period of time—and look after their furniture, because the company didn't want to be accused of any damage if they moved it; take their furniture with them—and then come back when the floors were replaced.

Well Mrs. Frances would have none of that. She told them she'd move around in the house while they worked, but she would not get out.

I went over to visit the house and I found that the parquet tiles had been taken up with a shovel or some other way, and that a great deal of delamination of that quarter-inch plywood had taken place, so that the top level in many cases was missing.

You had a floor with a very rough surface, delaminated in many places. They had already laid about two-thirds of the living room on that kind of a base when the lady stopped them and told them that she wasn't putting up with that until she had some further inspection made.

When I was there that was the situation. I talked to the inspector from CMHC the other day and he told me that since the living room floor was almost all laid, they had instructed the builder to go ahead and complete it on the understanding that if it came up again, after it was finished, then they would have to pull out the floor, and its quarter-inch plywood, lay new plywood and put a new floor on top of that. For the rest of the house the company would take out the old plywood, would put in new plywood, or better still put another quarter-inch of poplar plywood on top of the old and then lay the floor. That is now being done.

But why, Mr. Speaker, should Mrs. Francis and her family have to go through that kind of a situation in order to get justice in the Province of Ontario in 1973?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): There's nobody listening!

Mr. Young: Well it will at least be on the record and we hope the minister responsible at least will read it. I know the minister's seatmate is here, as he generally is, and I give him credit for that; and perhaps he will pass the word on to his seatmate and get some results in this regard.

I also quote, in addition to the things we have heard here this morning, from the Globe and Mail of Jan. 27, 1973, from an article which brought to light some of the things which were happening. I simply quote a couple of cases:

> A Hamilton man living in his new home just six weeks complained to us about excessive dampness in the basement which lifted tiles. He complained also of mildew making the basement virtually unusable.
>
> A Burlington consumer complained to us when his basement leaked that the driveway sank 5 in. below the garage. Not only did the builder refuse to do anything but he defied the customer to sue him.

The gem comes from Sudbury:

> A consumer found that his new house was built on an underground watercourse which continues to run through the basement. On rainy days there may be 10 in. of water in the basement and no one can do anything. "The builder told us we should have seen the water before we bought it."

Mr. Speaker, I think these particular situations brought to the attention of this House should bring results if there is anything of compassion or human kindness or anything in the way of a sense of justice in these chairs —which otherwise might be occupied by government members of the cabinet. They are not here to hear it, not one, but—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): They don't care.

Mr. Young: —we take it for granted that they read and that somebody in their offices will make a résumé of what I have said and pass it on to the people responsible.

Mr. Stokes: And they maintain that the future is for people.

Mr. Deans: I don't know why the member takes it for granted that they can read.

Mr. Young: Well, I give them the benefit of the doubt, Mr. Speaker. One of the hon. members has said that I shouldn't give them the benefit of the doubt that they can read, but I'll give them the benefit of that doubt and I hope for the best.

In these cases which I've outlined—all of us certainly have many similar ones; I think there's no member in this House who hasn't received similar complaints from time to time —the customer is either being taken by smart operators working just within the law—within existing but extremely inadequate laws —or else there is no legislation which protects the buyer against certain shoddy practices or shoddy goods.

The Law Reform Commission's report on consumer warranties in 1972 covers this whose field of consumer protection with some care. For the benefit of those in the cabinet benches who might read and who may not have read this committee's report, it says this:

> We have reached the conclusion that a revision of the substantive rules of law should be accompanied by new measures in public law areas to ensure compliance with the law and to make it possible for the consumer to have his grievances adjusted in a manner which is fair to all parties, with minimum expense and maximum dispatch.

The report goes on to point out that because of the great changes over the past 50 years

in the production, distribution and consumption of consumer goods of all kinds, the Sale of Goods Act is largely divorced from present-day commercial and consumer realities. It says:

> The Act proceeds from a fictitious premise that the parties are bargaining from positions of equal strength and sophistication. It uses concepts to describe and distinguish between different types of obligations that are now obsolete and difficult to apply. Especially serious is the Act's preoccupation with the bilateral relationship between the seller and the buyer, which totally ignores the powerful position of the manufacturer in today's marketing structure. This results, at least in the Anglo-Canadian law, in shielding the manufacturer from contractual responsibility to the customer. By the same token, the law has largely ignored the impact of manufacturers' expressed warranties and the defects in their content and administration. Our sales law is private law and it has failed to provide any meaningful machinery for the redress of consumer grievances.

The commission then recommends that, since most warranty problems have a common core, a new statute to be known as the Consumer Products Waranties Act be enacted to deal comprehensively and systematically with all aspect of consumer warranties. It outlines the nature and the scope of such warranties and it is there for any member of this cabinet to read.

There is no question of the need for such legislative action. Everywhere across this province people are complaining about the quality and durability of the goods they purchase. Present warranties have little meaning and they are desperately difficult to enforce. The consumer finds himself at a complete disadvantage when he tries to persuade General Motors, for example, to live up to its 50,000-mile warranty—as I tried, and only partially succeeded. When the Firenza owners—who are now organizing to deal with General Motors because they have been sold a car which has proved to be extremely deficient in safety and in mechanical performance—try to deal with General Motors they are told to deal individually with their local dealer.

How much chance the individual has to deal with a company like General Motors is demonstrated by the list that I have here in my hand, showing that the gross annual sales of General Motors is higher than that of every country of the world except 22 of them. In other words, relating gross annual sales to gross national product, General Motors ranks 23rd in the list of power among the nations of the world—a nation in itself. What chance has the Firenza owner in dealing with a corporation of that magnitude?

Mr. Deans: None.

Mr. Young: The consumer finds himself at a complete disadvantage, too, when he faces a manufacturer of disintegrating carpet, or the giant construction company based in the United States which delivered to him an unfinished and defective house. The federal government is discussing, as it has for years, protection for the home buyer. We hope something will happen in the present situation in Ottawa.

This government here in Toronto is toying with warranty legislation, but so far it hasn't delivered. Meantime, people are buying in good faith, believing that they have a legal protection against fraud. Almost every person who comes to me believes he has the protection of the law, and he wants that protection, and that protection just does not exist. They find ou to their sorrow when it is far too late.

Mr. Speaker, any warranty legislation which may come to this House or to the federal House, and be passed there, still won't protect the public against a far worse and more blatant ripoff which is being practised openly and without shame across the country and across the world today. The automobile industry is still building bumpers which are designed to create maximum damage to other cars in collision situations. So far we have no legal action to set standard heights and resilient surfaces, although the front bumpers are now supposed to protect certain vital parts of the car at 5 mph and 2½ mph in the case of the rear bumper.

In spite of the auto pact, car makers charge Canadian dealers 10 per cent more for the same car than they charge American dealers. The April 26, 1972, Globe and Mail said, and I quote the article by Thomas Claridge:

> Canadian car dealers are being charged about 10 per cent more than US dealers for cars built in Canada. One direct result of this policy has been an estimated $150 million improvement in profits of the four manufacturers, and an extra bill for Canadian consumers totalling $180 million.

He goes on to say this:

> The gap between new car prices in Canada [These are cars manufactured in

> Canada.] widened last year to between eight and nine per cent [That's in 1971.] and then to 10 per cent in 1972 after a six-year gradual reduction to a low between 3 and 3.5 per cent in 1970. Ottawa has asked the four manufacturers for a detailed accounting of "why," but thus far none has been provided. That was in 1972, but the situation is even worse today.

I read the other day about the chairman of the prices commission in Ottawa. He asked why it was that fish was the price it was in the chain stores. And he gave this pertinent fact: fish, he said, is being bought for six cents a pound from the people who do the fishing; six cents a pound.

I happened to look into Dominion Stores last week for a piece of fish and I found that haddock fillets were selling, or were being priced at $1.65 a pound. And this week most fish is being advertised at around the dollar mark. Almost, and in some cases, more than the price of beef. But fish doesn't have to be fed. It grows up without anybody having to worry about it; the way we have to with beef or pork or lamb. Well, it used to be considered a poor man's food. Haddock, of course, is just a grade above the cod — and it should be a cheap fish. But there it is at the price of beef. It went up even though six cents a pound is the price paid to the fisherman. The consumer is being asked to pay these prices which I have mentioned.

Mr. Deans: Aren't the members opposite ashamed of their government?

Mr. Young: You know the ripoff is inexcusable; but there it is.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I would like more time off to go fishing.

Mr. Deans: Free enterprise my—

Mr. Young: Free enterprise my—the hon. member says. I call it robbery.

Well, to come to another field: The energy crisis in recent weeks is but another example of how the Canadian customer is being taken for a long, long ride. The oil companies have persuaded the Alberta government to raise the wellhead price of gas to consumers outside the province.

The Alberta treasury won't gain one red cent from the price increase. What they hope to do, of course, is to bring industry into the province for the cheaper gas. But what they get into the treasury is going to be used, they say, to subsidize their own people by the amount of the price rise to them; so they come out even.

But the new income from the higher prices will go to American owners of the companies as our own watchdog on energy resources has put it so well in his speech of March 9 of this year. Let me quote it. On page 9 of the speech he says this:

> A general gas price increase benefits primarily and perhaps inordinately the producer, at least 80 per cent of whom are not Canadian owned; that is, their shareholders are not Canadians.

That is the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) who is charged with the responsibility of policy for gas in this province.

It's a strange thing this, Mr. Speaker. We have plenty of oil and gas in Canada; no shortage at all. Although suddenly, yesterday, the Canadian Petroleum Association said that our reserves are going down. It's strange that they didn't discover it until just yesterday. But because of this sudden so-called shortage here—

Mr. Stokes: Why are they so anxious to export it?

Mr. Young: —and what has been called by experts a "contrived shortage" in the United States, we're told that we have to pay higher prices for our own gas in Canada. As a matter of fact the Americans will pay less for our fuel than we will.

The hon. cabinet expert on fuel says this in that recent speech, which I have just quoted. And I quote him again on page 13 of his speech.

Mr. Deans: Does the member mean "gassy Darcy?"

Mr. Young: Well, the member for Chatham-Kent.

> No such protection exists in Canada [He's speaking of protection in the United States.] for Canadian consumers. As a result, if the Alberta policy is successful, eastern Canadian consumer rates will escalate much more rapidly than those in the United States where the energy crisis originates.

Again he says this:

> While it is popular in the producing industry to blame the FPC for the US gas shortage, the record of the industry in finding adequate crude oil reserves within

> the continental United States to meet requirements is even worse for oil than it is for gas.

And he says:

> I believe there could be a terribly expensive experiment to ask the Canadian consumer to pay much higher prices in a vain attempt to solve a non-existent Canadian gas shortage.

So says the member for Chatham!

How much this increased price is needed is seen by a simple fact: If one reads the morning newspaper, Imperial Oil stock has risen from a low of 18⅜ in 1971 to a high of 49½ in 1973. It is 42 right now. Texaco rose from the 1971 low of 27½ to a high of 71⅜ in 1973. It sold at 66 yesterday.

This, Mr. Speaker, is hardly the performance of an industry which needs more from our pockets for its products. There is plenty of evidence to show that there is no real energy shortage either in the United States or in the world at the present time.

I have in my hand an article by Robertson Cochrane in a recent edition of the Toronto Star, which says this:

> From 1951 to 1971, 47 billion barrels were drawn from Persian Gulf reserves, and at the end of 1971, reserves were estimated at 367 billion barrels now lying in 26 large pools including the original eight.

That is nine times as much in reserve there as we used for the total period of 1951 to 1971. The article goes on to say this:

> The world energy crisis or energy shortage is a fiction, says Alderman. [This is quoting Prof. Alderman, an economist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.] But belief in that fiction is a fact. It makes people accept higher oil prices; in fact 10 to 20 times higher than the real long-run cost of producing it. They look upon these prices as imposed by nature when they are really fixed by collusion.

We are told that the oil producing nations in the Middle East are demanding higher royalties for the oil and higher taxes from the producing companies.

Well, that may be so, but this is being done, Mr. Speaker, in collusion with the oil companies. There is no price competition at all among the primary producers of oil in the Middle East, Venezuela, the United States or Canada. When an Arabian sheik wants more from the oil industry the companies oblige. It means a higher profit margin everywhere around the world. Oil can be produced in the Middle East for far less than that of the Gulf of Mexico but a world-wide cartel sets the price of all oil at the level of the highest-priced producer.

When the Middle East oil prices rise, all prices rise around the world. It's collusion all the way. There is no price competition anywhere. Even though we haven't shortages here, because of the action of collusion in the Middle East Canadians are told that they will have to pay more for their own oil.

The threat of shortage at some time in the future, coupled with the collusive planning on the part of the corporations controlling our resources, is being used as an excuse to dip more deeply into our pockets even though the oil industry has never been more prosperous in its entire history.

This is a more blatant and a more vicious thing than the rug salesman's little racket that I mentioned a while ago, but we are being brainwashed to accept it without dissent and to thank our lucky stars that we have these compassionate oil barons riding on our backs with their hands in our pockets. Some day, perhaps, we'll come to the realization that our Canadian oil and gas are Canadian resources, that they should be used to make life better for the Canadian people; but meantime we're being conditioned to the idea that we must pay through the nose to the American oil syndicates for the privilege of using our own oil and our own gas.

Of course in the last few months we've been conditioned for higher food prices. Now they're here. Every week sees the old prices rubbed out on the cans on the grocery shelves and new ones marked. The farmer isn't getting that much more for his products and no one else seems to be able to explain the upsurge, but the profit picture may tell the tale.

Just the other day I came across the morning paper of March 22, 1972. The headline says this: "After-tax Corporate Profits Up More Than 42 per cent in Years." That's the year 1972. And that follows corporate profit increase of 11 per cent in 1971.

The interesting thing here is in the breakdown. In the sector showing the greatest gain we have food processing, showing a profit gain in 1972 of 37.7 per cent.

Mr. Stokes: What's the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) going to do about that? He's not even listening.

Mr. Young: Perhaps the committee in Ottawa should take a look at those figures and perhaps they'll come to some understanding of where the ripoff is.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): He is listening all right. Members opposite would take it out of the farmers' mouth if they could.

Mr. Deans: We're trying to get it to the farmers.

Mr. Young: I said a moment ago that the farmer is not getting that much more, but somewhere between what he gets and what the consumer pays there is a ripoff of major proportions, and increasing every day.

Just yesterday, and again this morning, we had demonstrated in this House the kind of increase that is taking place in the cost of housing right here in this area—housing which is private and housing which is sponsored by Ontario Housing Corp. Houses that in January this year were listed at a certain price are listed again in March at $13,000 to $16,000 more.

Mr. Speaker, we get brainwashed all the time by people saying that labour costs are the reason for these increased prices. That's what we're fed. But certainly there's no labour cost in the increased price of land; and that is skyrocketing in an unprecedented way in Ontario today. There is no labour cost there, but it does result in higher rents and in higher prices all along the line. There are no new labour costs in these houses which were listed at a certain price in January and listed $13,000 more in March. The labour cost was there before.

Mr. Stokes: It is just a smokescreen.

Mr. Young: It won't be long until the workers of this province will be up for major bargaining again. During the past two years we've had a period of fairly stable wages. This year comes the big bargaining by the big units; and then we'll hear about the inflation, which is already here, being caused by the wage demands which are bound to come later this year in a desperate attempt by the workers to catch up with the skyrocketing cost of living.

We'll get that; but let's remember when these increases actually took place and how they are taking place.

Just as a sort of a postscript, the other day I heard a broadcast on the air, I think it was a radio broadcast, which warned us that the cost of a man's suit would soon be up to $300. Well the clothing manufacturers are getting us into the mood; they are softening us up for what they intend to do later on. I suppose with this kind of threat we don't mind paying the present prices for suits, and maybe we will hurry up and replenish our wardrobes before the main disaster strikes. It's all good for business.

These are but a few of the illustrations of the ways that the corporate controllers of our destiny are taking us for a ride, openly and without shame. It is far more damaging to our pocketbooks than the cheating that goes on through shoddy goods and the failure to honour warranties.

The fact is that action is needed all along the line to protect the consumer from the powerful interests which prey on him in a bewildering variety of ways. We need the warranty legislation, yes — to ensure that quality goods reach the marketplace and that when mistakes are made they will be rectified fully and promptly. But we also need the wider protection against the rapacious interests which have gained control of our resources and which have eliminated competitive pricing from the marketplace. I underline that, Mr. Speaker.

No longer is competition keeping prices in line as it was supposed to do in the day of Adam Smith;—

Mr. Deans: There is no competition.

Mr. Young: —collusion to raise prices to the consumer has taken its place: collusion in the increased prices of gas, food—you name it, there it is—and housing particularly, as we have seen today. Where price competition sometimes does appear, as in the supermarket scrap of 1970, the primary purpose of that competition is to eliminate the little operator and bring control more firmly into the hands of the syndicates, Mr. Speaker.

Today's prices are raised in unison. We have never seen gasoline prices raised at one outlet and not raised at another of a different name. And in our supermarkets, little loss leaders appear, but the runners of each chain watch the prices of the others and watch the newspapers and those prices are raised in unison.

There is competition in advertising to get the share of the market, but by and large prices are no longer in the competitive field so a controlled marketplace can raise prices systematically. It can also not only tolerate the inflation this brings, but also carry with it mass unemployment, a thing which we were lead to believe was impossible under

the old competitive laissez faire system of capitalism.

But it can do more, and the Minister of of Agriculture and Food will attest to this. It can not only raise the prices unilateraly on the market, but it can depress the prices to the primary producer at the farm level or the fisherman level of our economy.

The tragedy is that this government and the government in Ottawa still seem to think that we have a competitive system and refuse to face the fact of a controlled economy and a controlled price structure. This government, despite its small glimpses of sanity here and there, still collectively and pathetically clings to the hope that there is nothing wrong with our society that a little dose of competition won't cure—a competition which ended decades ago.

They still believe in Santa Claus, you see. They still believe in a competitive system which no longer exists and which has gone out of existence long, long ago. So I say to this government: It's wrong about that belief in competition and it had better get on, not only with the warranty legislation we so badly need, but also to begin to frame policies to protect the citizens of the province against the rapacious greed of syndicated collusion.

Never in the history of this land have Canadians collectively been so rich. John Turner, speaking in the recent federal budget, said we are producing a gross national product of $114 billion in 1973. We have about five million families in Canada. That is approximately $23,000 worth of actual wealth produced for each family in Canada. That's the average, yet our people have never been so harassed, and so troubled.

At this time, when we are producing more wealth than ever before, we are cutting back on services to our people—vital services that we should be increasing, not cutting down, in light of our 1973 gross national product. The division of wealth is to be condemned and it is without understanding.

The fact is that this government and the government of Canada are not administering this vast wealth-producing paraphernalia for the benefit of the people. It is being administered for the benefit of a corporate sector of the economy, that sector which has gained control of our resources and has gained control, too, of the price structure of our economy.

Far too much of this corporate sector is either controlled or dominated by people outside our country, mainly in the United States. So the big job facing this government is that of putting the needs of the people of Ontario right back into the centre of government policy.

This Speech from the Throne does nothing to break the power of the corporate monopoly structure and its power to run our economy for its own benefit. This Speech from the Throne does little or nothing to protect our citizens from the massive ripoffs that I have outlined here today. It's time the people themselves had some consideration. I support the amendment to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join in this debate.

I want to make it clear at the outset that one of the most encouraging and stimulating events of the last year to me has been the by-election that resulted in a new member in our front row. Contrary to the statement of the Premier (Mr. Davis) about the possibility that I'd be upset by not being in the front row, I consider any seat in this corner of the House, whether it be back row, front row or middle row, a place of honour and one from which one can participate effectively in debates. I am pleased that in our party the location of a person's seat isn't considered a top priority and something that he has to fight for, as he has to in many other parts of this House.

An hon. member: Very well put.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, one of the points that certainly was a major factor in the results of the last two by-elections was that of local autonomy. I mean not only local autonomy to the extent that we have visualized it in the past where individual very small communities were fighting among themselves and never co-operating, and where individuals running those little communities were often not reflecting the real concern and views of all the people because of the type of structure we had.

I am thinking of local autonomy which permits citizens to work much more effectively through their elected representatives to control their way of life and to have some effect on the quality of life in the community in which they live. This is the issue that is now facing Ontario residents, because during the past year this government has

continued to show its complete lack of appreciation of what true autonomy means.

It continues to plunge headlong toward bigger bureaucracies, more centralization, and more so-called experts making the decisions for the ordinary man, neglecting the fact that this government doesn't really think the ordinary person has enough common sense to make a right decision for himself.

The move in the last year that has really shattered those in my community is the move to establish the North Pickering development. Without question, this is the epitome of bureaucratic planning and waste. Its location contravenes every principle of sound planning.

Imagine our province, our government, coming forward with a plan to put a city the size of London or of Quebec City right up against Metropolitan Toronto. Imagine the failure on the part of those experts advising this ministry and imagine the failure of those people to realize what is truly happening when they design a North Pickering development.

First of all, they are only adding to an existing megalopolis. Let's not kid ourselves: We're not dispersing growth to the east of Toronto; we're not encouraging growth to occur where it is much more needed, which is truly to the east of Toronto. I am surprised that the member for Oshawa (Mr. McIlveen) and some other members to the east have felt that the Pickering location would be a good location for them, because all the flow of activity will not be toward Oshawa; it will be to the south and the west, to Toronto—more for the big cities.

In planning this North Pickering development, the boundaries have been set in such a way that in effect they are destroying an already strong community, a community that is capable of growing in a way whereby the people can maintain an identity with their neighbours, a community that has strong participation on the part of citizens because they feel they belong to it, and a community that has heart, as well evidenced by the many activities that occur in the Markham area.

The Markham Fair every fall is one of the finest Class A fairs in Ontario. It has a long history of successful operation; it's one of the places where people can really enjoy themselves and feel they are not going into an impersonal money-generating exhibition but one where there are still local people running a local show. And I mean local people—people who live within 10 miles or so of that community. Whitevale, in the township of Pickering, has been one area where people have been more active in participating in occasions such as the Markham Fair.

I cite the Markham Fair because it is only one of the many activities that reflect what a real community there has been out there. It hasn't been a community as defined by the boundaries of the old village of Markham, later the town of Markham. It is a community that has developed because of the actual activities going on in the centre of that community, in Markham itself, to which people from several miles around are attracted. They take part in such activities as the Family Life Centre, which was a leading example of co-operation between the various denominations. In fact, every single denomination in the community and other groups co-operated to provide a counselling service for those who have need of help in the community.

Markham also for many years had a group working toward the establishment, of a hospital originally, but now of a total health care programme, recognizing that the best type of health care doesn't mean the need to build a large building but rather the need to have preventive health measures, public health care, good nursing home accommodation and the many things that make up the total health picture.

Markham has been an area where there has been a great activity to ensure that this community—and I mention again that the community is not just the old town of Markham, or the towns right around there, but the total area to which people have been attracted—to ensure that it does enjoy a high quality of health care.

I can cite many other features that lead one to the conclusion that Markham is already a strong centre of activity. This whole concept of putting this new so-called North Pickering development right against its border, a mile and a quarter to the east of Highway 48, is wrong. The feature of that whole proposal that has really angered those of us who live in the area is the manner in which the government has done it. It has done it first of all by announcement, without any consultation with or involvement of the people whatsoever in the decision. It has done it by imposing on the area a large staff of bureaucrats who have been trying to sell the people on what the government has considered best for them.

Isn't it a sad commentary when we don't realize that adults, the citizens of our community who have the responsibility for voting and so supposedly controlling our democracy, are not given the opportunity, and it's not indicated to them that they have the necessary intelligence and wisdom to participate in changes in the structure of government and the structure of their municipalities, and that we have to impose it as it's been imposed in that North Pickering plan?

This is why, when the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), who was for a period—and I'm not sure if he still is—responsible for that development, appeared one day in one of the local restaurants and I introduced him to some of the people who were nearby in the restaurant—including some executives of the local Progressive Conservative Association— he suddenly met a barrage of angry criticism that was beyond anything I could have imagined.

Certainly I'm sorry that he did experience what he did as a guest in our community. But those people on the local Conservative executive, who just happened to be in the restaurant at the time, told him in no uncertain terms that his government had completely lost their confidence because of its failure to recognize the common sense of local people and the priorities of local people in planning and developing their future municipalities and structures. The imposition of that whole North Pickering project is an insult to the people of this province.

The second aspect of that North Pickering project that really reflects the ineptness of this government is the whole principle of thinking that government has to own land in order to control land prices and in order to ensure that there is sound development. Here is a party in control of this province, supposedly standing for free enterprise, Mr. Speaker, and it goes in for the idea that free enterprise really can't operate.

It's never given free enterprise a chance to operate here. For many years, it has imposed controls on the availability of services and the means by which services would be made available; that is on assistance to municipalities that would enable municipalities to provide approval for developments of a good type. It's done nothing to ensure that there is an adequate supply of places where people can build a home. In other words, the government has created an artificial shortage of homesites and that has resulted in the last year—actually the last several years—in a feeling that you can't lose by putting your money in land.

We have no better example of that than the example shown by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Bales) and his decision to participate with some others in the purchase of land in that area. We've seen other examples as a result of the disclosures made following the Premier's order last year. Many members of this government are investing in land and consider land one of the finest things you can put your money into.

I wouldn't object to that if it were land purchased at agricultural values for agricultural purposes. But when it's land purchased at far above agricultural values because it is known that that land will be available for development at high market prices, then I do object and I object strongly. It has been the policy of this government for many years that has caused land to rise to these astronomical levels. It is the policy of this government which has enabled speculators to rip off millions of dollars at the expense of the home buyers of this province. And it is the lack of understanding—

An hon. member: Sit down!

An hon. member: How can the member believe that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deacon: —on the part of those free enterprisers in the Conservative Party of this province that has made it possible for speculators to fatten their pockets and their corporations—

An hon. member: The government knows it, too.

Mr. Deacon: —at the home buyers' expense.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition): Profiteering!

Mr. Deacon: If the so-called free enterprisers of the Conservative Party including those on my left—will start to analyze what is a basic cause of speculation in land—maybe they'll be able to get some common sense into the cabinet ministers so that they will take a proper course of action.

For example, if we spent a matter of $250 million in each of the coming two years and invested it in services for water and sewage treatment, for plants, we would be able, in that two years, to overcome the shortage of serviced land available in this

province. That would not be money going down the drain for subsidizing housing.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Get help from Ottawa.

Mr. Deacon: That would be money going to build an asset through the sale of water and sewage treatment to municipalities; it would bring in revenue in the years ahead. It is not money going down the sewer as is the money that we are at present putting into subsidized housing in this province.

We have done nothing to overcome the basic problems of speculation, and of the high cost of homes. That is our real problem in this province. This government has been trying to put out fires but is causing a conflagration by pouring gasoline on the fire all the time.

I tell the House that the way it has been pouring gasoline on the fires has been well illustrated by this whole North Pickering project. Who has owned most of the land that has been acquired in this North Pickering project? Who are the ones who will be expropriated in the future? A major amount of land in that area has been owned by speculators who will then have money to go out and cause land prices to rise in other areas where they decide the province is going to have one of its pet developments—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Were they all Tories?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What does the member mean, were they all Tories? Every last one of them.

Mr. Deacon: —which does not do anything to ensure there is an oversupply of lots on which people can build homes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Attorney General is one of the landowners.

Mr. Deacon: I mentioned this matter of investing $250 million a year in each of the next two years, on sewage plants, water treatment plants, and pipelines and trunk mains. It would enable every municipality in the province which has a demand for services and a shortage of serviced lots—which wants to create an opportunity for people to build homes—and which wants to develop land in its area to have an adequate supply. If we did this, working on the average cost of about $750 to $800 to provide the basic sewage treatment plant and water treatment plant and trunk mains for every home—and I'm not talking about the distribution mains within a subdivision—we would have ample facilities to catch up on the tremendous shortage of services that we now have in this province.

We would be in a position to offer to municipalities, without the ridiculous, unnecessary agreement that we now insist they sign, all the help they need to ensure that the services are there. If we needed some help from Ottawa, which I don't say we would need because, after all, what we are doing here is investing in plants that will be returning revenue—

Mr. W. J. Nuttall (Frontenac-Addington): The municipality needs all the help it can get.

Mr. Deacon: We won't need help from Ottawa any more than we need help from Ottawa to run Ontario Hydro. We can get other types of help from Ottawa and I would certainly be the first one to go after it. That is, when we have a loss on the operation of such plants, to the extent we have to subsidize this type of operation—

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): The member would get no help from Ottawa.

Mr. Deacon: —then we would certainly want to see help from Ottawa, because that is the way Ottawa can best help us. But don't let's wait for Ottawa to take action in a field that is truly our responsibility—

An hon. member: The member wants to pass the buck.

Hon. Mr. Deacon: —that is in dealings between ourselves and the local municipalities. After all—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sparrows on a wire.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deacon: After all, we have always been saying that Ottawa shouldn't interfere with our business. And Ottawa doesn't need to interfere with our business if we'll take the steps to look after the municipalities, for which we are responsible anyway.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

An hon. member: What does the member mean?

Mr. Deacon: Well, Ottawa gives about 40 per cent of it back to us to spend.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wardle: What about the airport backed by Ottawa?

Mr. Deacon: I'd love to have the Province of Ontario today tell Ottawa it doesn't want the Pickering airport. Tell them that! The members opposite will see what happens! The Ontario government tries to straddle both sides of the fence. We should get rid of those things we don't need.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deacon: It is an Ottawa project that has been put forward in the belief—made very evident by this government— that we need to have a second airport. I don't think we need to have a second airport.

An hon. member: And they don't need to have a second airport to the east of Toronto.

Mr. Deacon: I am certainly no apologist for Ottawa, as anyone knows who has read the papers over the last year. I have been strongly opposed to the Pickering airport. I have done this after reviewing the facts as to the need; and there is no evidence of need—no evidence of need for many years to come. By the time a second airport is needed it would probably be a far different type of facility.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Deacon: Let's get back to serviced land and the government's whole approach to the serviced land question. The fact is that this government doesn't seem to realize that just holding land doesn't do anything. How many acres of raw land does the government of Ontario own?

An hon. member: Three thousand in my area.

Mr. Deacon: I think the last figure that I heard was around 13,000 acres of unserviced land.

An hon. member: They don't know what to do with it.

Mr. Deacon: One of the most notable examples of what the government does to get this land into housing is that of Malvern. We don't need to talk too much about Malvern, because everybody knows that sorry tale—19 years of ownership before anything happened. The first land that was bought there was $500 an acre—and the farm was abandoned. It went into disrepair for 19 years. The land wasn't used properly during that period. It did nothing but provide a blight for the whole area. That's all it did.

An hon. member: And to drive up the price of other land.

Mr. Deacon: And whenever we talked to our former member for Don Mills, Mr. Randall, he would say it was premature. What's premature when you have a shortage of homes. What's premature? The reason he said it was premature was because he couldn't get an arrangement with the municipality of Scarborough to pay the cost of putting in trunk services. He couldn't get Scarborough to agree to pay a far greater share for services to that community because it was going to be a low-cost housing community.

He didn't seem to understand, nor did his colleagues, that what was needed was for the province to put in those trunk sewers and to sell the land to the local municipalities at a rate that was common to all the Metro boroughs; with the provision of water and sewage treatment so the need for services would be filled.

He also didn't recognize that it is quite natural for a member of any council to resent approving a subdivision that is going to bring a burden on the other taxpayers within that municipality. Why should they want to do that?

I can well remember years of sitting on our Markham township council when we had subdivision proposals coming before us for lots of homes. Strawberry boxes we described them. We didn't want to have those things built, because we knew that as soon as they were built there would have to be a new school and the taxes would go skyrocketing as a result. But we did know that, had this province recognized those people-service costs and had it made it possible for us offset them by making a grant over a period of years to provide the funds to put in these schools and so we would have the funds to put in these people services, we knew that subsidy could disappear, because at the end of 10 years we would know that the commercial and the industrial development that comes along after residential development would provide us with a good assessment base.

Back in 1952, Scarborough tried to sell bonds to finance services and it couldn't do it. The debentures wouldn't sell and they didn't sell. I remember one particular issue just didn't sell until the word came through

from Mr. Frost that he was going to form the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. The great advantage at that time of forming the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto was that it gave an overall assessment balance that was attractive. It had the core of the old city of Toronto with a lot of commercial and industrial development that was able to carry the new residential development of Scarborough with its strawberry boxes, so many of which had been built during the early Fifties.

But in this day and age we know that property is not the best place to get revenue for people services. We recognize that the property tax is the easiest tax for the local municipalities to collect. We recognize the fact that it is not sensible to have a local sales tax or a local municipal income tax as is the case in some municipalities south of the border. This isn't a sensible thing. It is just annoying. Why is it that this province doesn't recognize methods by which it can enter into tax-sharing arrangements with municipalities, unconditional tax-sharing arrangements, so that municipalities can be in a position to approve housing regardless of its assessment?

Isn't it wrong for us to have this present pressure of assessment placed upon us in such a way that we distort our planning, and we fail to make available to the ordinary person the possibility of building a home that fits his need—if maybe not his aspirations—and his ability to pay? Why do we have the type of assessment pressure that forces us to ask for homes of 1,200 sq ft and 1,500 sq ft minimum when possibly a 700 sq ft or 800 sq ft accommodation would be quite adequate?

Why do we continue to fail to realize that would be a very sound long-term programme if the Province of Ontario were to undertake the responsibility for providing the basic water and sewage services, so that we don't have consideration of boundaries in municipalities which bear no relation to the real needs of the people?

The province has, in the end, the responsibility and does take the responsibility for financing these projects. Why does it bother burdening the municipalities with agreements? Why does it bother trying to make each project stand on its own feet? Why doesn't it take the Ontario Hydro approach of having a standard rate across Ontario for the wholesale supply of these services, thus enabling municipalities to fill the local needs as the local needs arise?

Mr. Deacon moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I will say that on Monday we will remain on the current debate, and on Tuesday, certainly from 2 o'clock until 6 o'clock we will do second readings. I am not certain about the course of events on Tuesday evening. I expect the House next week, and subsequently, will sit Tuesday and Thursday evenings.

I would caution the members of the House that the current debate will terminate on April 11. Therefore, we will give every opportunity from now until that date for members to participate in the Throne Speech debate. The hours of the sittings, in general, I think, will be somewhat dependent upon those who wish to contribute. I am not concerned about the order of speakers. We will hope that everybody who wants to participate will come forward.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We haven't had a Conservative speaker.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We will. Have no fear. I would suggest to the leader of the Liberal Party that the Conservative members are probably so satisfied and their confidence is so great that they may not want to participate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I hope that's a guarantee that they won't come on in the last two days and take all the time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That won't happen.

On Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the first bill that we will consider stands as item No. 10 on the order paper. I will endeavour to announce on Monday what the balance of legislation will be for Tuesday. As I said, we will sit Thursday on the Throne Speech debate and Thursday evening. At that time, then, we will look forward to the business for the following week.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 30, 1973

Strike of French-speaking students, statement by Mr. Guindon 369

Strike of French-speaking students, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. R. F. Nixon 369

Elizabeth Gardens project, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Deans, Mr. Sargent 369

Metro housing shortage, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon 372

Ayr-Blenheim land purchase, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon 375

Absence of ministers, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. F. Nixon 376

Consultant to minister, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stokes 376

Toronto-centred region, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 377

Regional government east of Metro Toronto, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 377

Ratepayers' opposition to public housing, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Givens, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Cassidy 378

Pension fund, question of Mr. White: Mr. Sargent 380

Increases in prices of housing, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Shulman 381

Crop insurance, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Good 381

Old Sandwich public library, question of Mr. McNie: Mr. Bounsall 382

Farm tax reduction programme, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Gaunt 382

Presenting report, succession duty committee, Mr. Grossman 385

Trustee Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 385

Third reading, An Act to amend the Proceedings Against the Crown Act 386

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Young, Mr. Deacon 386

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deacon, agreed to 405

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 405

No. 11



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 2, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 2, 1973

The House met today at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always very pleased to have guests with us. Today in the Speaker's gallery we have with us Sir Frederick Bennett, MP, chairman of the General Council Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, who is accompanied by James Walker, MP, from Ottawa.

In the east gallery we have students from Runnymede Collegiate Institute of Toronto; and in the west gallery students from Huttonsville Public School of Huttonsville and Burlington Central High School of Burlington.

Statements by the ministry.

SUPPORT FOR PHYSIOTHERAPY INTERNS

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned last week in this Legislature, I am aware of the difficulties facing physiotherapy, occupational therapy, and dietetic interns, and pharmacy and administrative residents, who are required to spend varying periods of time serving in a hospital.

This government has now reviewed this situation very thoroughly. I am pleased to announce that with the co-operation of hospitals these interns and residents will continue to receive payment for services rendered.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Reversal No. 17.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Another by-election lesson learned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Additional funds, Mr. Speaker, will be provided by my ministry to hospitals, which will be over and above existing limitations for the current year, in order that hospitals will be able to continue to pay for these services.

REORGANIZATION OF MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of statements made during recent weeks, both in the Legislature and in the press, which relate to the ongoing reorganization of the Ministry of Health.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Not going fast enough.

Mr. Lewis: I would say so.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Concerns have been expressed that the changes which are occurring are not in the best interests of the public, nor will they lead to an improved health care system for the citizens of this province.

It has also been inferred that the ministry itself is in chaos and disarray, with senior staff demoralized and opposed to the concepts underlying the reorganization.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, no.

Mr. Singer: Who suggested that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: What many observers do not realize, Mr. Speaker, is the scope and magnitude of the changes being introduced. In such a situation there inevitably is some room for honest difference of opinion, particularly when the new concepts significantly affect the current jobs of senior staff members.

Some commentators charge that we are playing a game of musical chairs with senior appointments—

Mr. Lewis: No!

Hon. Mr. Potter: —while others advocate some sort of a purge which would solve the difficulties we are facing.

Mr. Singer: Why don't they start with the minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Naturally enough—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Let's skip the blame for a lot of other views and just get to the minister's view.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Who's running this show? Perhaps some of the hon. members would like to make this statement?

Mr. Singer: Yes, and we'd do it much better too.

An hon. member: And announce the minister's resignation.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Naturally enough, Mr. Speaker, statements of this nature do not assist those of us actively involved in a process as complex as this.

One of the basic principles underlying our reorganization is a redefinition and separation of health care standards and health care services. Until now these two functions have frequently been combined, with the result that medical and other professional personnel primarily responsible for the type and quality of health care programmes were overburdened with day-to-day managerial chores.

This meant that physicians were not able to utilize fully their professional skills, and were required to handle tasks which personnel with administrative qualifications could more effectively handle.

The new Ministry of Health, through a number of divisions and branches contained in the health standards group, will provide for the development of provincial standards and guidelines for the total health care programme. It will undertake the evaluation of services now available or proposed for the future, and provide professional and technical advisory services on a province-wide basis.

The health services group, on the other hand, will be responsible for the administration of direct services provided by the ministry, such as facilities for the mentally retarded, psychiatric hospitals, laboratory services, emergency health services, inspections and so on. In addition, this group will be concerned with the health services which are delivered at the community level by a wide variety of institutions and agencies.

In implementing this new design, ministry personnel with medical and allied health services qualifications will be working in the standards group where they will be able to apply their special training to the fullest. They will not be involved with ongoing administration, which becomes the responsibility of managers who are running the programmes in accordance with the established standards and guidelines.

It will take time to define in detail the responsibilities of programme consultants for all the disciplines involved with health care. However, in making senior staff moves, no professional person who is reassigned to other duties to bring about the restructured organization will suffer loss of pay. It is true, though, that for many their role and function will certainly change, and this in itself has caused worry to some.

It has been suggested that this kind of apparent "job splitting" simply raises the cost of administration. What is really involved, Mr. Speaker, is a clarification and rationalization of professional and administrative functions necessary for a more effective and economical ministry operation in the long run.

I wish to make it very plain that the vast majority of Ministry of Health employees are providing competent and devoted service. Mistakes have been made from time to time in the past, and no doubt some will occur in the future.

Mr. Lewis: Fifty million dollars' worth?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am not aware of any large organization, public or private, where all decisions are always correct and all plans work out perfectly.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Well, that's a relief!

Hon. Mr. Potter: I wish to assure all concerned that the health care system which is now being developed will serve the needs of the people of Ontario over many years to come. And every effort is being made to make best use of the human and financial resources available for that purpose.

Mr. Lewis: What a silly statement that is! What a lot of gobbledygook! Good Lord!

COMMUNICATIONS POLICY

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, on March 22 the federal government released what is known as a green paper entitled, Proposals for a Communications Policy for Canada—A Position Paper of the Government of Canada.

This is a compact and complex document. The federal government describes it as being designed to suggest possible approaches to a series of problems arising from attempts by Ottawa to formulate a Canadian telecommunications policy. Some of these problems relate to the rapidly developing awareness by all provinces of the importance of communi-

cations to the economic and social development of the provinces. Others relate directly to the wide variety of jurisdictional control existing in communications across Canada.

As the minister responsible in communication matters in the government of Ontario, I welcome the green paper as a first step by the federal government. The green paper gives substance to the dialogue which has been going on between the various provincial governments and the federal Department of Communications for some months and years.

Because of the multitude of implications of what is said in the green paper, our analysis of its contents will continue for some time. But I felt I should give the hon. members some background about it and my reaction to it.

In the introduction to the green paper, the Minister of Communications, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, has written an explanatory letter. In it he states that the paper "does not present exclusive or definitive answers." He states that its purpose is to put forward a number of optional solutions as the basis for public discussions by all concerned.

I wish to assure this House, as I have assured Mr. Pelletier by letter, that we welcome the discussion and are prepared to participate fully in discussions both bilaterally and at a federal-provincial ministerial conference or conferences.

An examination of the issues involved leads one to believe that both the provinces and the federal government have a share of interest in all fields of communications. If we are to reach a consensus on a national policy, there must be full exploration of the provincial interest, objectives and policies, as well as those put forward by the federal government. Because surely a real national policy is not equated with the policy of the federal government, but is a composite of all provincial and federal interests.

The green paper does not lead directly to that national policy because it precludes discussion of several issues of vital interest to the provinces, including broadcasting and cable television.

I would like to emphasize that certain basic principles enunciated in the green paper are those which this government espouses. For example, and again referring to Mr. Pelletier's letter in the green paper, this government supports:

1. The assurance that Canadians have available a reasonable variety of choice in the communications services and that at least basic communications services are available to all Canadians wherever they may live at just and reasonable rates.

2. This government supports efforts to assure that telecommunications systems be developed and used to strengthen the unity of Canada and foster Canadian social and cultural values.

3. We agree that telecommunications systems should strengthen the east-west links in Canada in relation to what Mr. Pelletier describes as "the powerful pull of north-south ties."

4. We desire, and certainly have demonstrated by action in related fields, that communications systems are and remain effectively in Canadian ownership or under Canadian control.

In his letter, Mr. Pelletier also refers to what he describes as "the best means of harmonizing federal and provincial objectives and activities in the field of telecommunications for the greatest benefit of all Canadians."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the House that we also seek the best means of doing this. Given that these are the basic principles of a national policy as expressed by the federal government, I feel extremely confident that collectively we shall achieve the kind of communications system which Canada needs to deal with the pressures and problems of the years ahead.

The debate, sir, therefore is not about the objectives. The debate surrounds the best means of accomplishing the objectives, and which level of government can best respond to the needs and interests of the people of Canada.

We believe strongly that the provinces have the responsibility to define what is meant by "the public interest" at the local level and, in Ontario, we are preparing to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, last November, for the first time, representatives of all provinces met in Quebec City to explore mutual interests in communications. A second meeting of provincial communications ministers will be held in Calgary from May 31 to June 1 to continue these discussions. A third meeting likely will be necessary before the provinces will be in a position to respond constructively to the federal green paper and the other green papers planned by Ottawa in the next few months.

The federal Minister of Communications has invited the provinces to discuss the contents of the green paper on communications

policy at a conference in July. For the reasons I have outlined, I have written to him suggesting that such a meeting would be more fruitful in the autumn, but that in the meantime, I welcome the opportunity to have our officials engage in the exploration of a full range of topics related to the interests of both governments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to serve notice to the hon. members that I plan later in this session, time permitting, to present a full report on the attitudes we have been developing in the field of communications.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

STATUS OF HEALTH OFFICIAL

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: From his statement today which apparently had to do with further reorganization in his department, would he comment specifically on the status of Dr. McNally, whom I asked about last week, whose status as chief of one of the branches of the department is apparently in question?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I have no comment at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the minister not recall that when I asked the question before he said he would undertake to make a statement on this matter; in fact, is what he said today the promised statement?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No it is not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister inform the House, if Dr. McNally is removed as director of emergency health services, who would be responsible for the medical aspects and the quality of medical training in the ambulance services?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I have no further comment to make on this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order: I realize, sir, that under the rules the minister is not required to answer questions in this regard, but when it is public knowledge that the job on one of the senior officials has been declared vacant, or he is under the gun as far as the minister is concerned, surely it is the minister's responsibility, as the chief policy-maker in that connection, to make some statement to clear the air? He can't just say, "I have no comment."

Mr. Singer: Particularly when he played footsie with us the other day.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the rules clearly indicate that any minister may or may not reply—he need not reply—to any question. There is no way in which the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition can be construed as a point of order. Therefore, it is entirely up to the hon. minister if he wishes to make any further comments.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Surely natural justice would require an answer.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, which relates to the minister's statement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister guarantee to the House that Dr. McNally will not suffer a reduction in salary, as he indicated explicitly in his statement today?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Definitely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think there have been enough supplementaries on the original statement.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Are we to gather from his answer late last week to a question about the logbooks of the 40-odd aircraft under his control that he refuses to make any information public or available to this House about the use of those aircraft, except for specific people on specific flights?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, as I said at that time, I had answered that question at the last session of the Legislature. I pointed out that I didn't think it would be a public service to divulge all the logbooks. As the member well knows, there are at least three logbooks for each aircraft and we have 40-odd aircraft. It seemed to me a little ridiculous to give all that information out, but if he has a specific request on a specific flight, I would be glad to get that for him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I have a specific request. Because of the recommendation made by the Provincial

Auditor to the minister on May 23, 1972, would he undertake to have excerpts from the logbooks made public, indicating the flights made by cabinet ministers, senior officials of the government and the people referred to by the auditor as others who made flights which were charged to a certain segment called the environmental protection branch of the minister's department which, according to the auditor, should not be charged to that particular branch? Now unfortunately—

Mr. Speaker: I think that is sufficient for the question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I cannot name the names, but that is because the information is not public.

Mr. Speaker: The hon leader's remarks are simply comment.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take that question under consideration.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has undertaken to take the question under consideration. I think we need not have any further supplementaries. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have any further questions?

Mr. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the original question.

Mr. Speaker: I think we have had enough supplementaries. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

ALBERTA NATURAL GAS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice: Has he got his experts and his colleagues in that area of policy looking at the possibility of bringing some sort of a legal action against the government of Alberta, if it persists in imposing a two-price basis for natural gas on the basis that it may very well be unconstitutional?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): To answer the hon. member's question directly, Mr. Speaker, the answer would be no. Our policy field is, in fact, involved with the Resources Development policy field in looking at the whole picture of an energy policy for Ontario and how it affects Ontario vis-à-vis Canada and, therefore, Alberta. This is something that respective staff are looking at. There is no particular reference or direction in respect of the hon. member's question.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, does the minister not believe that it is against the provisions of the British North America Act if one province should by regulation discriminate against interprovincial trade, and, particularly, direct that discrimination against another province?

Mr. Lewis: Come on!

Mr. Singer: In the event that he does, would he not consider that it is an urgent problem to refer this matter to the law officers and get their advice as to whether or not an action should be placed before the courts to test the constitutionality of the actions of the Tory Premier of Alberta?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as I say, there is a very broad general consideration of the whole energy picture in this province. It would include all provinces. As the hon. member knows, there are negotiations still going on between Alberta and Ontario. I think it may be just a little premature to answer the hon. member's question today in that regard.

Mr. Singer: Does the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for York South have a supplementary?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I'll permit a supplementary.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question of the minister: Does the minister believe that the obligation rests with the pipeline companies or eastern Ontario public utilities to take action in the courts for breach of contracts by the Alberta Government?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, if there are private agreements in existence with the government of Alberta, certainly their recourse would be to the courts. But, again, I don't want to give any definitive statement of what our policy would be while the study is going on and while negotiations are going on at the top level between the two provinces. This is the type of thing that would be considered in any policy statement that will be enunciated at some later date or in whatever stand we take.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me clarify—

Mr. Singer: By way of a further supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South, I believe, has a supplementary. We'll permit it.

Mr. Singer: I have one, too, except you cut me off for the hon. member for York South.

Mr. Speaker: I apologize to the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. MacDonald: Am I not correct that the action of the Alberta government in effect constitutes a breach of existing contracts, because it is forcing a change in the price within those contracts before their termination?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the terms of the contracts. I don't know all the contracts that are in existence at the present time. This is something that would have to be decided between the two parties and the courts, if necessary.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, is the minister in fact saying that part of this ongoing study does not involve any reference to the law officers of the Crown for an opinion as to the constitutionality of the actions of the government of the Province of Alberta? Is that what he is saying?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am not saying that. I am saying that that could be very well part of the overall consideration and study that is now being undertaken under the aegis of the parliamentary assistant to the Premier (Mr. McKeough).

Mr. Singer: Well, is it or is it not going to be!

Mr. Speaker: There have been enough supplementaries. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions of urgent public importance?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, not at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

APPOINTMENT OF PERRY RYAN TO OHI CLAIMS REVIEW BOARD

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: What were the qualifications which caused the minister to appoint Mr. Perry Ryan as head of his review board on Ontario Health Insurance claims?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Really, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that this is the place to answer that. These appointments were recommended by government. I am not in the position to advise the opposition in respect to the appointments.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: He is not prepared to answer any questions.

Mr. Singer: What is the place? Tell us about the ministry's reorganization.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Minister of Health has a minor health problem. When he doesn't hear the opposition, he turns to you. I would appreciate it if he could put it to the opposition. I didn't hear the answer at all.

Mr. Speaker: I must confess I didn't hear all of it. Perhaps the hon. minister would repeat the answer.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. These appointments are Lieutenant Governor's appointments. I am not prepared to make any comments as to the qualifications of this particular individual.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: On a supplementary, since the Minister of Health has no basis for justification of the appointment, can he tell us then how he justifies the $100 a day which is paid to Mr. Ryan for sitting as chairman for reasons that are yet unknown to the House?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): It's better than being a member, I would say.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. minister need not answer that question. He doesn't seem inclined to.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, I'll put it—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister doesn't wish to answer. There can't be a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am going to put it in a context which may prompt a reply. In the context of the financial problems of the Health Ministry, how does the minister justify $100 a day to a political appointment?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has no inclination to reply.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Lewis: All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Singer: The minister needn't bother to come into the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: Has the Minister of Natural Resources followed the Auditor's recommendation, in May, 1972, regarding flights involving his planes, to turn all of the administrative and operating expenses of such flights over to the Ministry of Government Services? Has that been done?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I would say to the leader of the New Democratic Party that this matter is presently under review. I am hopeful to have a policy statement—

Mr. Singer: This is information day.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —in the not too distant future, and I will make it available to the members of this House.

MERCURY TASK FORCE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Minister of Natural Resources—unrelated.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) is here now.

Mr. Lewis: Well, we welcome back the prodigal. They're waiting for him three seats to his right.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources what has happened to the study of mercury pollution of the English River system and the task force set up?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this particular task force is finalizing its report at the present time. I can assure the member that when it has reached the government's hands, it will be very carefully studied.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, it is not in the government's hands yet?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, it has not reached the government's hands yet.

Mr. Singer: If it had, they wouldn't tell us what was in it anyway.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River may have a supplementary on that question.

Mr. Reid: Can the minister indicate, especially because this mercury problem is in his own riding, why it took the Minister of Health and his department so long to inform the Indians who are living in the Whitedog reserve and the Islington reserve of the mercury levels that they had? Why did the Ministry of Health wait until March of this year to inform these people of the high levels of mercury?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this is a health matter, as the member for Rainy River has very clearly pointed out. I think the question should be directed to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Reid: There's no sense in asking him.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have any further questions?

DEMOLITION PERMITS

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a last question of the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker: Would he consider bringing in an amendment to the Planning Act which would give municipalities the right to issue or withhold demolition permits in order that what is happening now on Sherbourne St. in downtown Toronto would not be readily permitted?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Yes I will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions? If not, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources has the answer to questions previously asked.

REMOVAL OF AGGREGATE FROM LAKE ERIE

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) has inquired as to the removal of sand from the bed of Lake Erie. National Sand and Material Co. Ltd. has been informed that the licence for the Point Pelee area will be renewed provided it continues to prospect for another source of material elsewhere in Lake

Erie. Their performance bond has been submitted and the licence fees are in the mail to the ministry.

There has been no proven connection with erosion to date. However, studies are continuing on this very problem. No operation may be carried on within two miles of Point Pelee. The licensed area and the amount of material that may be dredged per year were reduced in 1971.

Erie Sand and Gravel Co. Ltd. has completed its application and the renewal licences are ready for signature. The area licensed to this company is in the middle of the lake at the international boundary and it is highly unlikely that dredging would have any effect whatsoever on any shoreline.

Another reply, Mr. Speaker, to a question asked by the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook). I'll put it on the record. He inquired about action on the recommendations made in the report of the select committee on lake levels of the Great Lakes to the Ontario Legislature, dated and tabled in this House in 1953.

While the recommendations were of such nature as to involve a number of provincial jurisdictions, I can advise the hon. member that many of the studies that refer to Great Lakes levels have been undertaken. In June, 1964, the then Prime Minister of Ontario convened a meeting in Toronto of all the jurisdictions fronting on the Great Lakes and having an interest in Great Lakes levels. As a result of this, and a subsequent joint reference by the United States and Canada to the International Joint Commission, a number of hearings were held in Ontario and in the United States where briefs were received and persons heard in conjunction with the low levels which prevailed that year.

The IJC has undertaken to investigate whether it would be practical and in the public interest to regulate further the levels of the Great Lakes so as to bring about a more beneficial range of levels for the various water users. The IJC established the Great Lakes Water Levels Board to undertake this investigation, and according to my latest advice the report is to be submitted by the board to the IJC possibly next month. We are most anxious to examine and study this report as soon as it is available.

In connection with the administration of public lands fronting the Great Lakes, all the Crown lands were withdrawn from disposition in September, 1963.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. David.

FOUR-DAY SCHOOL WEEK.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. In view of recent newspaper reports on proposals for a four-day work week by certain boards of education in response to the Ministry of Education request for ideas on varying the school year, can the minister inform the House as to whether his ministry would indeed give serious consideration to such a proposal as an alternative to the existing school week?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has stated, these requests have come in response to our memorandum which to a great degree modifies the school year in this province. It allows for several alternatives to be accepted by boards. The third alternative is a more radical type of school year which could include something like a four-day school week.

If this were to be introduced there are a number of steps—as well as approval from the ministry—that we would insist be gone through before it was introduced. These steps would include consultation with parents, students, the community and so on, because I think what has gone on in other jurisdictions has shown us that the premature introduction of any radical type of school year usually leads to misunderstandings and objections from a great section of the community.

So, in summary, if any board wished to introduce some such school year, if it followed certain procedures, presented them to us and so forth, it would be possible for this to happen in this province. But to this point we haven't had any formal proposals from any board in the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

TOBACCO INSURANCE.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is it correct that the Ontario Crop Insurance Commission has hired some insurance agents to go out and inform the tobacco farmers in regard to its insurance plan, and does he agree that this is discriminating against those insurance agents who are not hired by the commission?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I would suppose that no matter who was hired it could be discrimination, unless everyone was ap-

pointed to be an agent for tobacco insurance. But in the areas where tobacco is grown it was felt that those who were involved now in providing tobacco insurance could very well be those who would handle the programme.

Actually, it is an entirely different selling programme for tobacco crop insurance than it is for other crops, because the records for every producer's acreage and yield going back over a number of years are very obviously held by the tobacco board. The records are there. It's simply a matter of filling out the forms based on the records now available. It is easier than for any other type of crop insurance there is.

So there was a special arrangement made in this particular instance and I frankly feel it will work to the advantage of the flue-cured tobacco growers, the board and the insurance agents involved.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Could the minister inform me how many agents have been hired and are they located in counties, or where are they located?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I saw that information, Mr. Speaker. I haven't got it with me but I'll get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

FLOODING IN HAMILTON

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) and because of the seriousness of the situation I would direct my question to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

In view of the serious flooding affecting the function of septic tanks on Beach Blvd., Hamilton, commonly known as the beach strip, would the minister have officials of the water resources division immediately contact and co-operate with the corporation of the city of Hamilton in providing engineering and financial assistance to protect the health of the 1,000 residents in these homes?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Yes, Mr. Speaker, certainly with respect to the engineering. I can't be as categorical with regard to financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview is next.

DIAL-A-BUS SYSTEM FOR TORONTO

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transport and Communications in reference to dial-a-bus.

Could the minister tell us how much it is going to cost? How many people does he think might be served by it? Why does he describe the areas which are proposed to be served as low density areas; and does he, and his officials, really believe that the areas needing such service stop at Highway 401? There are none south of Highway 401.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, is it more than a coincidence that there is such a heavy concentration of this new and wonderful service east of Yonge St. which is already served by the Don Valley Parkway, and which happens to be represented by the hon. member for York Mills (Mr. Bales) and partially represented by the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton)?

Mr. Speaker: I'm not sure that the total question is of urgency.

Mr. Singer: I think it's urgent.

Mr. Speaker: Well, the hon. minister may reply.

Mr. Lewis: Certain parts of it are urgent.

Mr. Speaker: Certain parts of it certainly are.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, first of all I might point out that when it comes to urban transportation there is no unanimity. There are varying opinions. The hon. member for Downsview could be as right as I am or I could be as wrong as he is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I doubt it.

Mr. Singer: That is the difference.

Hon. Mr. Carton: But in any event, Mr. Speaker, the reason that these areas were chosen was that this happened to be the largest single densely populated area with respect to roads—fixed routes that are a mile and a quarter apart. This was the reason that this particular area of North York was chosen.

Mr. Singer: It just isn't true.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, it is true.

Mr. Singer: Downsview Airport is right in the middle of one of those areas.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, and we've taken—

Mr. Singer: That is dense.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Would the hon. member let me finish my answer, please?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, please let's not have an argument.

Hon. Mr. Carton: And we are servicing the hon. member's riding very well, Mr. Speaker. We have one of the peak routes and one of the off-peak routes in the hon. member's riding.

I have not become too definitive about the particular routes because they are outlined and anyone can get them. They were given with the press releases. I have seen them, however, at the presentation that was made to me.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the routes were determined, not just by my ministry, but by the planning experts in the Toronto Transit Commission and the planning experts in Metropolitan Toronto. This was a recommendation of the joint technical transportation planning committee. So there are a great number of—

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): One that the minister is accepting.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —experts who have had input, as they call it these days, into the determination of the particular routes.

With respect to the money, it will cost about $540,000 startup capital. If we amortize the startup capital over a period of three years—this is amortized capital costs—it is considered that there will be an annual cost, depending on rider volume—whether there is a high or low volume of riders—of about $900,000 to $1,100,000.

It will, again depending on rider volume, break down to 41 cents per passenger deficit or 70 cents per passenger deficit.

I'd like to point out, sir, that this is a demonstration project. It is the largest demonstration project of dial-a-bus which is taking place on the continent. I would also like to point out that we have been pioneers in this particular system and that other cities are now copying the system. From the Bay Ridges area demonstration project, which was highly successful and which was turned back to the village of Pickering, have emanated the ones for Stratford and one for Kingston; there are two others which are proposed to begin shortly. It is a very highly successful urban transportation aid.

Insofar as the rider volume is concerned—

Mr. Speaker: I think the answer is approaching a ministerial statement.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill has a supplementary.

Mr. Givens: Will the minister please tell us what he intends to do or how he intends to increase the capacity of the Yonge St. subway and the station—which were planned and designed many years ago—to accommodate the flow of about a million passengers that he has stated the dial-a-bus system will feed into it?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker this particular point was gone into by the planning officials and it was estimated that the effect on the passenger total would be about two per cent per annum and therefore not of a greatly significant amount.

Mr. Givens: Does the minister intend to run a GO train from Richmond Hill to Union Station or does he contemplate approaching the federal government with respect to a commuter train from Richmond Hill to Union Station?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am leaving for Ottawa on Friday morning with a view to speaking to the federal government about a commuter train from Richmond Hill—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): He's not going by train, I'll bet.

Hon. Mr. Carton —to Union Station.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Don Mills.

Mr. Timbrell: Does the minister anticipate that before the service starts, I believe in November of this year, he might—

Mr. Singer: Or next April 1.

Mr. Timbrell: —consider adding additional routes which would serve the Don Mills-Victoria Village area? Main bus lines pass through there travelling to the Bloor-Danforth subway line. Would he anticipate possibly serving those areas as well?

Mr. Singer: The member's riding has the Don Valley Parkway already.

Mr. Timbrell: That's like a parking lot.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. minister was asked a question.

Hon. Mr. Carton: This is, as I explained, a demonstration project; everyone could say, "Why not put the demonstration project in my particular area?" We have the fixed boundaries located now and as it is a demonstration project—mind you, as the success of this demonstration project is seen as we go along, there can be additions made but we don't contemplate putting them in at present.

Mr. Givens: How long is the demonstration going to take?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Three years.

Mr. Givens: Two years?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Three years.

Mr. Speaker: If there is a supplementary from the New Democratic Party members, it is their turn.

If there is no supplementary I think we have had sufficient supplementaries.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): This is not a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right. It is the New Democratic Party's turn. The hon. member for Sudbury.

COST OF HEALTH UNIT OPENING CEREMONIES

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health; I would ask him why it is necessary to spend $8,500 on opening day ceremonies at the Sudbury and district health unit scheduled for June 9?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is news to me, Mr. Speaker. I'll have—

Mr. Lewis: There is a lot of money in that ministry to throw around.

An hon. member: Especially in Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Germa: A supplementary: As the minister is going to supply 80 per cent of these funds and since there are certain constraints on expenditure in his department, would he not consider it wise to intervene in this waste of money, which is essentially a Tory propaganda instrument?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is not properly phrased.

Mr. Lewis: There is always money for Tory propaganda.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

FURNITURE SUPPLIES TO GOVERNMENT

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Government Services in relation to the auditor's report. Has the minister taken any action and can he give the House any information on the one firm and its affiliated companies which supply all the furniture and equipment to the Ontario government? What is the name of the firm and what action has the minister taken to prevent this kind of monopoly and to spread this kind of business around?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat at a loss to know exactly what the hon. member is referring to—

Mr. Reid: Hasn't the minister read the auditor's report? On page 49?

Mr. Speaker: That's not a supplementary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It certainly refers to the minister regularly.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Certainly the ministry does not buy the total office furniture requirements from one supplier.

Mr. Reid: By way of supplementary: Is the minister not aware that on page 49, if I might quote:

> A special review was also conducted of purchases of furniture and equipment from one supplier and its affiliated companies. As a result, a number of matters came to our attention which were of interest.

Now, surely the minister is aware of that and has he asked for any further information to find out what's going on in his own department?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information readily available. I'll get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

QUETICO PARK

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. What is he going to do about the master plan for Quetico Park that he's had in his possession for about eight months? Has he issued a policy statement, or is he going to adopt it—or what is he going to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out in this House on previous occasions, the report is in the ministry's hands. We asked for public opinion and for public comment by the end of 1972. This has been received and the members of my staff are going over all the submissions. It will be brought before the resources development policy committee very shortly. I hope to make some statement on it in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Mr. Singer: The task force will review it.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Since the minister well knows that the advisory committee sought out the opinion from the public for over two years, why does the minister now feel it's necessary to go back to the public for any reaction to a report that was based on public opinion and two years in the making?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, over on this side we believe in participatory democracy. We like to get as much public involvement as we can; and—

Mr. Stokes: That's what we did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —this is one way of doing it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it participatory democracy that is delaying the minister's decision on Algonquin Park policy?

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is it the same thing that is delaying the minister's decision on Algonquin Park policy?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Or on mercury pollution?

Mr. Singer: Or on the guy who issues the airplanes used by cabinet ministers? Is that it?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The government doesn't do anything on that side except appoint members to advisory boards.

Mr. Stokes: Just to study the study.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Some participation!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is lots of public interest.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister: Since he will not lead, will he perhaps follow the example of the American side in Superior National Forest and for the coming year in Quetico Park ban all non-reusable metal containers and bottles, and also restrict to 10 the size of parties using Quetico Park?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, any information along these lines, of course, will be incorporated in the statement and the decision of the government when it is made.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Sure! Right! It is being looked into.

Mr. Reid: What is the delay?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: What a ministry!

Mr. Speaker: An hon. member of the Liberal Party has kindly pointed out to me that the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain would like to ask a question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They need all the help they can get.

ROYAL VISIT.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Government Services: Would the minister please explain why—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Would the minister please explain why, on the forthcoming royal itinerary, a visit to Hamilton-Wentworth is not listed?

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I personally did not arrange Her Majesty's tour, at least the itinerary. I do understand that—

Mr. Singer: Take it up with Her Majesty directly.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —there was a request or an invitation by the city of Hamilton, from the mayor and council, for the royal visitors to call at Hamilton; but by the time this was received by the government—the request was made to the Governor General of Canada—and passed on to Her Majesty's staff, the itinerary for the tour was too far advanced to include the city of Hamilton.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: She is going to be in Brampton that day.

Hon. Mr. Snow: In any case—

Mr. Singer: She told us she doesn't like Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I know on her tour she will be coming from the Niagara Peninsula and she will be passing through Hamilton—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —as she will also be passing through Oakville.

Mr. Lewis: A good view of Stelco, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I understand that the royal train will slow down—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —so that Her Majesty will have every opportunity to see as many people as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

ILLEGAL USE OF DRUGS

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary for Justice. With the recent deaths caused by illegal use of drugs, will the ministry give serious consideration for new legislation to control such drug abuse, particularly to amphetamines and those disguised as MDA? Second, will his department provide funds for drug bounties to control drug pushers in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, this would be mainly within the responsibility of the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) and also the Attorney General (Mr. Bales). I might just mention that the Speech from the Throne indicated that there will be a stepped-up war, shall we say—increased emphasis against the use of drugs in Ontario. More funds will be allocated for the enforcement of the present provisions of the Criminal Code against the use of drugs, particularly drug trafficking. I would suggest that the member refer his question to the Solicitor General.

Mr. Singer: Can we expect another task force?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

ACQUISITIONS OF FOREST PRODUCTS COMPANIES

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources.

In view of the acquisition of Lac Seul Land and Lumber by Pope and Talbot of the United States, and in view of the acquisition of Multiply of Nipigon by MacMillan Bloedel, and since both of these companies were recipients of forgiveable loans or performance loans from the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, has the minister looked into the overall effects that this will have on the wood-using industry? Is the minister satisfied that those acquisitions are in the best interest of the economy of the province and his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the member for Thunder Bay, that as far as Pope and Talbot is concerned, it was Boundary Sawmills, of B.C., a subsidiary of Pope and Talbot, of Portland, Ore., that bought out Lac Seul Land and Lumber. So that there was cer-

tainly Canadian involvement in that particular purchase.

With regard to the loans, it is my understanding that while the loans made to the Lac Seul Land and Lumber Co. were outstanding, these have been totally paid by Pope and Talbot, and that there is nothing outstanding. Under the new terms of reference, of course, if they are not completely Canadian, as I understand it, then they don't become eligible for NODC loans. So there are no loans outstanding to that operation at Hudson.

With regard to the wood usage I can say that we looked into it very, very carefully. We think that both operations are in the best economic interest of northwestern Ontario. When the expansions are completed in both of these areas, I think that the member for Thunder Bay will—and I know the member for Kenora will—be very pleased with what is going on.

Mr. Stokes: Does the minister plan on making any announcements or is he aware of any announcements of any major expansion of Multiply in Nipigon?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say to you that there are discussions going on between my ministry and MacMillan Bloedel, but I am not at liberty at this time to make any comment or statement. I hope that all the details will be finalized in the not-too-distant future, when the announcement can be made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron.

MEAT BOYCOTT

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the present situation whereby consumers in Ontario are seriously thinking of boycotting meat products because of rising prices, will the Ministry of Agriculture and Food—and I firmly believe this to be the responsibility of the ministry—use every means possible to disseminate information to the consumer regarding the cost of production of such products as far as the farmer is concerned? Would the minister relate this to the price and income which the farmer receives for his products?

I feel that the farmer is being unjustly blamed for these rising prices and that it is time that the consumer realized the farmer is barely making a satisfactory standard of living.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that this was the hon. member's first question I extended a special courtesy to him. It was not in order.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister always gives a speech as an answer, so I am sure he will have a speech in reply to this question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: With deference to my hon. friend from York South, Mr. Speaker, that question requires a lengthy answer.

Mr. MacDonald: When does the minister ever give one that isn't?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I looked at the clock to see if I had time. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the question posed by my hon. friend from Huron county is one that was of very great concern to us. It was of so much concern that this government a year ago introduced a programme to increase the number of beef cattle produced in this province by providing a bank guarantee to those beef producers who might purchase female breeding stock to increase the beef herds of this province.

We have already guaranteed something like between $3.5 million and $4 million to increase beef production in the Province of Ontario. Obviously it was not possible, prior to the more satisfactory price which emerged in the last six to eight months, to encourage many people to get into beef production because, contrary to what my hon. friend may suggest—and I am sure he knows full well, being a member of the extension service of our ministry—it was a well-known fact that there was little or no money to be made in beef production in this or any other province in this country because of the disastrously low prices that beef producers were being forced to accept.

I find it extremely unfortunate today, when for the first time in this century, except the brief period of 1951, the farmers of Canada are receiving a half-decent price for their beef, that people should start to protest against that decent price.

I find it singularly coincidental and most unfortunate that the federal government has not seen fit in this last few days to implement some type of an embargo against the great volume of beef cattle pouring into Canada from the United States, when this country implemented a moratorium against

the use of DES, the hormone drug that cannot be used in Canada but can still be used in the United States.

If it's not good enough for our farmers in Canada to produce beef with the benefit of that drug, then why is it acceptable for the Americans to ship beef in here that could be fed that drug?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! With respect, the hon. minister's response is exceeding the requirement for the question in terms of time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling.

Mr. Riddell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I didn't get my question answered.

Mr. MacDonald: One never does!

Mr. Riddell: I want the Ministry of Agriculture and Food to disseminate the information to consumers regarding the cost of production, because the farmer is—

Mr. Speaker: All right, the hon. member is repeating this time. The hon. minister responded in the manner in which he saw fit, which is all that can be required of him.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, let me say that I would like to offer publicly my congratulations to the Toronto Star for the excellent article today on beef and meat production and the costs of distribution and handling, which are so very obvious. It covers the story very well.

What my hon. friend suggests is that we should detail the cost of producing a pound of beef from the time the idea of retaining an animal for breeding purposes in this country is conceived right through to the finished article. That information has been documented and made public by the Ontario Beef Improvement Association and by our information branch.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has elapsed.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Fatal Accidents Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Fatal Accidents Act, an action may be brought by the wife, husband, parent or child of a deceased person where the death has been caused by wrongful act, neglect or default. One of the claims that may be included is the funeral expenses. This bill increases the maximum that may be claimed from $300 to $800 in an action under that Act.

COMMISSIONERS FOR TAKING AFFIDAVITS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the amendment ensures that certain officials of metropolitan and regional municipalities are ex officio commissioners for taking affidavits in the same way as the same officials are in the older forms of municipalities. It also provides that the mayors, controllers and aldermen of the boroughs of Metropolitan Toronto may take affidavits in the metropolitan area in the same way as is provided for the regional municipalities.

FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Flood Control Commission.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, the bill proposes that a commission be established to protect the shoreline of the Great Lakes from flooding and erosion.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I would simply like to take a moment or two to express my appreciation to the hon. members for their co-operation during the slightly amended question period.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amend-

ment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment of the debate on Friday I was reviewing the fact that the real culprit in the soaring cost of housing in this province is not the speculator but it is truly the government of this province, which has failed to understand the significance of the free market with regard to housing.

For the last 15 years or more it has, by regulation, restricted the availability of places where people can build a house and has caused a market condition to exist which is ideal for speculators in that they know each year there'll be more people wanting places to build than there are places for them to build on. The government has done this by failing to invest the resources of this province in the provision of ample services. It has done this by failing to place behind municipalities the assistance needed so that the assessment tail doesn't wag the planning dog.

We are absolutely out of kilter in the way we have organized our provision of government funds to ensure that housing is provided for the people of this province. I am completely behind the concept of this government in rent supplement programmes. But one of the major reasons we have continued objection from municipalities to low cost housing in this province is that the municipalities know they will not obtain from low cost housing sufficient revenue in property taxes to cover costs in the initial years of those developments. That is one of the major problems.

The other thing is the fact that public housing, as it has been carried out, has really resulted in ghettos. It's been of a type that has not allowed people to work off a feeling of being wards of the state. It has not put them in a position to be able to stand on their feet with pride. It has marked them from the beginning, and this is a disaster when it comes to re-establishing people and enabling them to be contributing members of society.

It's the government of the province that is the culprit. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this government, until it changes its ways, is one which is going to cause conditions in this province which could lead to riot and unrest of a type we have seen too much of to the south of our boundaries.

The other point I brought to the House's attention was the North Pickering nightmare created by this province and announced a a year ago, by which the province is trying to "Malvernize" Ontario, to provide a city the size of London as an alternative thrust to growth in this Toronto region, when it is quite obvious that any city the size of London, Ont., right against Toronto is doing nothing to disperse growth. It is doing nothing to further the principles of the Toronto-centred region. Any development of such a city should be well to the east of Oshawa.

I want to continue, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the development of regional government in this province. I would like to review the fact that in the past this party has stated on many occasions that it does not deny there is a great need for local government reform in Ontario.

What we have objected to is the process whereby this province has written to people saying they need to have local government reform, something that is quite obvious. But it has consulted with the local representatives, with heads of councils, in closed meetings, with no background of information provided to these representatives on a basis that could enable them to truly analyze alternative solutions to their problems.

The government has had, in the course of development of plans, programmes which have not envisaged the possibility of types of provincial financial assistance being given which differ from those given in the past. For example, as the Treasurer (Mr. White) will recall, he has stated on many occasions the importance of Ottawa giving a new basis of tax revenue to the Province of Ontario. I agree with him. It is important for the province to have additional resources available. Why is it the Treasurer and his government have failed to recognize this tax-sharing type of concept is needed in relationships between the province and the municipalities?

There have been practically no changes in the type of grant made to municipalities, particularly regional municipalities. As a matter as fact, one of the reasons that Highway 404 should be built between Newmarket and Toronto is that with the new region of York the conditional grants are so stringent that heavy traffic has to travel between Queen's Park and Toronto to be sure on each occa-

sion that the way the region is spending its money is going to fit the strings attached to and binding on each particular little grant which has been made. The government does not seem to understand the concept of true local autonomy. It does not seem to understand that our role should be one of not instructing by these conditional grants how money should be spent, but rather by setting out information which will help local councils to make the judgements allowing them the complete discretion to make judgements, whether or not we agree that they are good, and then ensuring that the public, which elects these local councils as well as ourselves, is in a position to understand and appraise and assess the quality of representation, the quality of decision making these local councils have demonstrated

This whole concept of Ontario, in setting up these regional governments, saying there has to be between 200,000 and 300,000 people in these regions, thinking in terms of numbers of people instead of in terms of the accessibility of those people to their local representatives, is completely wrong. The Treasurer and his advisers should understand —and they probably do understand—that this type of region is one that can never really provide meaningful local representation and local commitment to improve government services.

The important part of any democratic system is for the people to feel that the government is theirs, a government to which they can provide input. But in these regions, with their huge areas of responsibilities, those sitting on councils have such a small portion of the area that they represent and are so remote from the centre they have no opportunity to provide a different level of service, a different quality of service to their municipality in accordance with the variation in local aspirations.

We must realize that it is not the size of a municipality that determines its efficiency, it's the ability of that municipality to co-ordinate the aspirations and the requirements of the people, the ability of that region to attract involvement of the citizens in the decisions and make the people feel that those decisions are the type that really reflect their aspirations. It is not until this government changes its thrust from one of where they are dictating what the level of service will be to a direction of where they are assessing and enabling the local people to understand the quality of the government their local people are giving, that we are going to get the quality of government, the value for our tax dollars, that we are entitled to in this great Province of Ontario.

I think the whole approach to the district health council that the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) described about a year ago is an interesting illustration of the conflict that exists in this government between really trying to get local involvement in local government or trying to impose a new level of bureaucracy. In the region of York there is a movement by the local MOH, Dr. Slingerland, at the request of the ministry, to investigate the need for a district health council in that region. He thought in terms of his existing public health service, which is on a regional basis, and he really thought the only efficient region would be one of such a vast scale which has no relationship to the local types of community involvement and participation that exist within that region of York. Some of us were of the view there really should be in the order of three district health councils within that region; that if we had three different district councils we would be able to attract volunteer participation of a type that could greatly reduce the cost of administration and co-ordination of health services; one that could really give the people an incentive to save money and at the same time streamline and improve the health service.

It was one that, if it were carried forward in the years to come with modern technology, could mean that we could have a different level of health costs reflected in the taxes of people within these districts, so that districts would have a real incentive to improve their whole health programme. It would enable districts to recognize the fact that a health programme isn't just of a clinical nature. A health programme should be one that involves preventive measures such as good nutrition, participation in recreation; and all types of improvements in other preventive aspects of health care so that the need for hospital space, that is the clinical aspect of health care, the demand for facilities of that type would be greatly reduced.

Now if this type of district health council were the type of district health council organized in Ontario, then the provincial government would really be doing a first-class job of organizing and reorganizing health care within the province. It would mean that people were close to their health situation and would feel they could have an impact on that health within their own districts. We woud see a far different approach than they now take to an impersonal bureaucracy; an approach of indifference that is reflected by

the fact that in the region of York less than two per cent of the population are aware of such a thing as a public health programme being in existence. That is a shockingly low percentage!

We don't need regulation all across the province because the way of meeting a high standard of health care in some areas of the province will be different than in others. I think we can have the high standards we wish to obtain, but let's not insist on each area achieving those standards by the same route. Let the local people find the means of achieving the high standards, don't tell them how they must do it.

If we were to establish these district health councils we would also have a potential new form of co-ordination of welfare services, because certainly health and welfare are very closely related responsibilities.

Take for example the situation with regard to mentally retarded patients in our province. Quite wisely, this province is moving away from these huge provincial institutions, institutions that did not provide much hope for the patients within them. It has been recognized, through this programme, that it is important that these patients become part of the communities from which they came; and further, that local involvement would be possible where there was a personal interest in individual patients. But unfortunately at this time, although the province is acting wisely in moving these patients back into smaller institutions, it has made no co-ordinated effort with the Ministry of Community and Social Services to provide grants so that a different type of facility can be made available to them.

In the region of York the Aurora school is going to be expanded to accommodate more people from Orillia; but at the same time we could be providing in existing housing and in new housing excellent facilities where these patients could be looked after at a far lower cost per diem than in provincial institutions. We could do it in a manner which would enable these patients to participate in community life of one sort or another. We have the ARC industries, for example, in Richmond Hill, where these patients can become usefully employed.

We can, by means of this whole approach, really make mental patients a contributing part of the community instead of a weight upon the community. But at the present time the whole programme with regard to additional accommodation in a local community is dropped because the Ministry of Health hasn't talked yet to the Ministry of Community and Social Services and worked out a scheme for shifting grants.

This shows the whole sham of the new structure of government, where we do have a secretariat for human resources, so-called, secretary for human resources, but what has it been doing to really get down into the departments and provide for co-ordination? Nothing is shown, particularly in that area, at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to move into the field of pollution, and the whole aspect of the control of the environment which is the responsibility of that minister.

I was very disappointed last year, as I mentioned to the minister, when he did nothing at the time when the city of Toronto decided to proceed with the reconstruction of the Commissioner St. garbage plant. And the reason I was dismayed at that time is because, although disposal of garbage is his responsibility, he is also the minister accountable for Ontario Hydro and the whole Hydro utility system. It is well known that the Commissioner St. plant is located a very short distance from the Hearn power plant.

It is also known that Toronto Hydro operates a steam heating plant at Adelaide and Simcoe Sts. in Toronto; and both of these plants consume vast amounts of fossil fuels—quite irreplaceable. Yet we're building a new Commissioner St. garbage disposal plant which doesn't make any use of the heat generated by the burning of garbage. It has very few of the modern pollution control improvements which can be achieved by utilizing the heat generated by such burnings. It not only doesn't reduce the amount of pollution but it also doesn't take advantage of the energy that is generated by these other plants.

The east Hamilton solid waste reduction plant, located just off the Queen Elizabeth Way at the south traffic circle, now disposes of most of the waste collected in the city of Hamilton. If you drive by that plant at almost any time it is in operation it is virtually impossible to see any smoke rising from a stack of only 150 ft in height. That plant is designed to take advantage of modern technology in the burning of garbage; not just burning it and wasting it but actually converting it into steam.

The tragedy is that there has been no method made available to the city of Hamilton by this government to sell that steam to industry in the nearby area.

Surely with a little encouragement from this government plants like the east Hamilton waste reduction plant could be established in many parts of this province, particularly in the Toronto area.

It has been shown that if steam is sold at a price anywhere close to the present cost of steam to industry and to consumers in central Toronto, sufficient revenue could be generated by such a plant to virtually cover the full cost of operations. The plant also has the great advantage of taking such recoverables as metals out of the garbage. It converts the ash into a fine powder that can be used in glass manufacturing. In effect, it is a very fine recycling operation.

Yet this government, despite the leadership of the city of Hamilton, has done nothing to take advantage of that practical leadership in providing such plants in areas where the need for improved garbage disposal is well known.

Isn't it a tragedy that the only disposal method the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) can see at this moment—and I repeat, at this moment, because he is talking about studies for the future—is to fill in holes created by the removal of gravel. Surely it is much wiser for us to landscape these old gravel pits in other ways and not fill them up with compressed garbage of various types, thus threatening these areas with pollution of a sort that can never be corrected in the future. I am thinking of the threatened danger to Stouffville and other areas a few years ago when a former Minister of the Environment was confronted with the disposal of liquid wastes at the headwaters of the Holland River in the area from which the town of Stouffville got its water supply. These kinds of approaches to the disposal of wastes reflect the lack of energy, imagination and initiative on the part of the minister to really get on top of the garbage disposal problem.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Has the member seen the new liquid disposal plant at Mississauga?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Why don't they dump it into Hamilton Bay like they do in the minister's area.

Mr. Deacon: In the town of Vaughan the proposal is to start running CN trains to build up Goodhead mountain to further heights and to fill in the various gravel pits around there with more mountains of garbage instead of building ski areas in more logical places and of materials far more suitable than old garbage.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Build them out of the minister's old speeches!

Mr. Deacon: We've got studies, studies and studies, but we just do not get any action of a nature that makes use of the energy of that garbage or of the recycling potential; we are simply wasting the future resources of our province.

The last area that I wish to review, Mr. Speaker, is in regard to the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations and the approaches being taken in that department to improve safeguards for the consumer.

I am pleased the minister has stated that it is his wish to involve the public more in the direction which this legislation may take and to further involve the responsible industries in the actual control of abuses within their respective areas of activity. But I'm also dismayed that this minister is still incapable of understanding that the involvement of the citizens who have the problems and the solutions to the problems is vital to arriving at a sound solution. His ministry still is following the old method of having briefs submitted to it, having the experts within the department decide what the solution will be and then placing it before us in the Legislature with a grand announcement.

Surely it is important, prior to the government arriving at a decision, that there be an opportunity for those who have the problems to share in an open manner, and in a way that is well structured, the views of various people who are active in that particular industry and the problems related to it. Surely it is important to get consumers sitting down with retailers, and they in turn with manufacturers—in short, to get all these groups together at one time to give us in the Legislature an opportunity to listen to the arguments.

Surely it is no longer practical for this government, from its perch on high, to ask industry and the rest of the people concerned to make separate submissions and then have the government pronounce its own views, without giving all of us concerned with the problem—that is, the Legislature, the public, the consumers, the manufacturers, the retailers—an opportunity to understand the total picture.

We're not stupid. At times we seem to come up with very shortsighted observations, but surely to quite an extent that is because

we are not given the opportunity or the encouragement to know the overall situation. That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the serious failures of this government over the last several years which is leading to its decline in popularity in this province. It is its failure to recognize the wisdom of the ordinary people; its failure to sort out a process whereby the ordinary people can become involved in the decisions that it makes, recognizing that we are not asking this government to abdicate the responsibility to make the decisions.

We are saying that this government has a responsibility to stop trying to sell some fait accompli to the citizens. It is vital, if we are going to increase the confidence of citizens in our democratic process, that we give the citizens an honest opportunity to understand the whole situation.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that in all these aspects that I've reviewed—the matter of the North Pickering nightmare; the regional government shambles that has been created; the impasse in district health councils; the failure to deal with problems of the environment and pollution control; and lastly, in the important field of consumer and commercial relations—everywhere, this one thread is lacking. That is the failure of this government to involve people, to enable them to see the whole programme and contribute suggestions to solutions. This government must be truly accountable to those people for the decisions it finally puts before this Legislature.

Thank you for this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to participate in this debate. I also thank you for the role you have played in making this Legislature a more meaningful place for debate.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Muskoka.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, my comments in reply to the Speech from the Throne are not lengthy but I hope they are meaningful.

I have listened with respect to parts of the speeches given by the leaders of the two minority parties and I have, I admit, listened with apprehension to other statements made by them. It is because I do admire the intelligence and the oral ability of both of them that I feel compelled to comment upon some of their charges.

I recall a year ago, when I was following both of these gentlemen in their Throne Speech replies, I heard the leader of the Liberal Party comment at length on his reason for being a Liberal—he followed in his father's footsteps. Not to be outdone, the leader of the NDP stood up and, I think, used the word nepotism. He said that he was still following in his father's footsteps, and this explained his philosophy. Well, I feel a lot better because I couldn't tell members what my father was. I was able to make my mind up by myself so—

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Someone led the member astray, then.

An hon. member: Does the member know who he was?

Mr. Miller: Thank you! But at least the choice was my own, and it is the better for it.

What a delight it must be, Mr. Speaker, to be able to solve all the problems of government from the opposition benches; to make broad statements without being held responsible for implementation. It make me think of something I read once: "It is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." I refer, of course, to the opposition members' constant raucous calls for my minister's resignation. It's all in the rules of the game, of course—fair is fair—but I suggest that beneath their public posturing and beneath their petulant pronouncements must be a realization that the present Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) is one of those rare souls, a man with courage, with determination and with a real understanding of the problems.

An hon. member: He had it, but he sure lost it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): But with the member there to help him he has got one problem too many!

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): The member shouldn't stick to the text.

Mr. Miller: I cannot speak on an impromptu basis like the rest of the members. I have to have something to say.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We gather that one of those chaps in the member's office has provided him with it.

Mr. Miller: He's a man who says what he believes to be true and he follows up his statements with actions. Far from being a captive—

An hon. member: We don't know.

Mr. Miller: —of his profession, he looks upon it with a critical but comprehending eye, determined to be fair, both to patients and practitioners. It is a measure of his success, and a success that will become all the more obvious as the current reorganization results are made visible by improved efficiency, that he has been singled out for so much attention by the two leaders adjacent to me.

I will go so far, Mr. Speaker, as to predict that when a less emotional analysis of this current minister's effectiveness is made—say five years hence—he will be rated as one of the most successful tenants of that sometimes embattled ministry.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Not in a 100 years!

Mr. Miller: Talking about tourism now, I must say that I've been impressed by the improvements shown in the last two years by the Ontario Development Corp. in its dealings with applications for both performance loans and regular loans, particularly in my riding of Muskoka.

Mr. Bounsall: That's where it is all going.

An hon. member: Sh! The member is on my side.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Miller: Employment is being stimulated by the assistance given to Canadian-owned, and in fact often individually-owned secondary industries within our district. The economic base is being broadened in an area that has traditionally suffered seasonal swings.

Some tourist operators have also received aid. I believe and I sincerely hope that the bung in the money barrel has just been popped and that many more operators will be given the monetary aid to expand, upgrade, winterize and generally improve tourist operations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How about Santa's Village?

Mr. Miller: It's a net lender!

If all that part of Ontario lying north of Severn River were a separate province, the essential nature of the tourist industry would be so self-evident that—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Is the member in the north or the south?

Mr. Miller: Well by definition; I am glad to say I finally saw a regulation that says the north begins at Severn River. I say with due respect to the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) that it's a fact. Is it not, sir?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What was that definition? I thought the north began north of 401.

Mr. Miller: It's in a regulation that I'll produce on demand.

Mr. Stokes: At Richmond Hill anyway!

Mr. Miller: Because, luckily for us, we are part of Canada's wealthiest province, it's absolute local value is sometimes obscured by the economic smog generated by our vibrant, industrial south. Thus those of us from the north feel compelled to shout just to be heard.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): How far north is the member?

Mr. Stokes: When did the member for Sault Ste. Marie let him join the club?

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): He chose to come!

Mr. Miller: There are such nice fellows in the club.

The need for government guaranteed loans of considerable size remains urgent. These loans must be for expansion, for operating moneys or for refinancing, if our industry is to compete for a world population that is now beginning to continent-hop with all the ease that used to be attached to a road trip to the cottage.

We have problems. Money invested in tourist facilities doesn't always earn the return it can in industry. But in terms of human needs and jobs created money can scarcely be used to better avail. These needs are urgent. One of our largest summer resorts in Muskoka has served notice that it will close unless such help can be extended, and soon.

But money isn't the only problem. The industry itself must face some of its problems squarely. Management, once a seat-of-the-pants procedure, needs to be upgraded.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Who is that? Holiday Inn at Huntsville?

Mr. Miller: Not quite!

Promotion needs to be directed at far-away foreign markets. Attractions and programmes must be competitive. Hopefully, our Ministry of Industry and Tourism, under the

direction of its dynamic young minister, will encourage such changes.

I'd like now to talk a bit about environment and energy.

Mr. Lawlor: He's got missions all over the world looking at every country—Mexico, Spain, Ireland. They haven't got anybody left at home.

Mr. Miller: It's winter!

Environmental problems have received much public attention and government financial and regulatory support. I'm very pleased to note that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) very recently increased grants for municipal sewage systems to as much as 75 per cent.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Haggerty: For the smaller municipalities.

Mr. Miller: Yes; well they are the ones that need it.

I am particularly pleased because last year in my maiden speech I mentioned that this level of support was necessary for so many municipalities that lie in the shield section of Ontario. Hopefully ways will be worked out that will permit municipalities which use their native ingenuity to save money installing these costly services—ways that don't always meet engineering criteria—to receive assistance. To demand engineering standards that are twice as costly as tolerable standards before grants can be made is self-defeating.

But much of Ontario will remain dependent upon septic tanks for sewage disposal. Research needs to be done to determine what ingredients, if any, can be added to the filter beds to chemically or physically remove nutrients, as is now done in sewage plants.

It is a fact that soil which is sandy enough to allow fast movement of sewage is seldom efficient as a retention medium for phosphates. Compounds such as iron or aluminum salts should be tested for efficacy. Regulations, uniform across the province, which are stringent enough to protect and and fair enough to be financially feasible need to be adopted. As it stands now each medical officer of health is a law unto himself.

Sewage systems should be tried that use less water in homes that are served by septic tanks. For example, wash water should be filtered and reused to flush toilets. Aerator septic tanks that cut down the biochemical oxygen demand of the effluent and simultaneously increase the ability of the ground to absorb this effluent should be approved across Ontario.

Air pollution standards need to be tailored to Canadian needs, not those of California. In particular I am thinking of the present attention to automobile exhausts. These are aimed at reducing the hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides now created in most car engines.

The familiar air pollution index measures only two contaminants, sulphur dioxide and particulate matter. However, a few weeks back tests showed the five most common contaminants to be, by weight, carbon monoxide, 52 per cent; sulphur dioxide, 18 per cent; hydrocarbons, 12 per cent; particulates, 10 per cent; and nitrogen oxides, six per cent.

Interestingly enough, totally ignored on this list and in present automobile standards is the one gas that I personally believe to be the sleeper, the truly long-range contaminant to be reckoned with, carbon dioxide. I say this because its short-range harmless nature and relatively low concentration has tended to make us believe it to be the best end product of combustion. In fact I think most of the standards today specify that this be the product of combustion.

Thus today's auto pollution control devices are all aimed at converting hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide into carbon dioxide—and water, of course—while burning fuels at low enough compression ratios to prevent nitrogen oxides from forming.

I haven't been in the chemical engineering field for some years, I say with respect to the gentleman behind me, but I hope the facts are still as pertinent as I think they are.

The irony of this is the fact that, once formed, carbon dioxide is stable and has an exceptionally long residual time in our atmosphere. In fact one recent estimate showed it to be increasing its percentage in our atmosphere at about one per cent of its current level yearly. Seemingly inert, nontoxic and non-irritant, it is becoming increasingly suspect due to its ability to absorb light of certain wave lengths. To date, scientists disagree about its net effect, if any, on our biosphere, but it may eventually change the surface temperature of our earth significantly.

Mr. Lawlor: Hot or cold?

Mr. Miller: We don't know. One set of people say hotter, and I think this is the generally accepted trend right now. There is

a second set that say colder; and luckily there may be, if they are both wrong—

Mr. Bounsall: A balancing effect!

Mr. Miller: —a balancing effect. This may turn out to be the case, if we are lucky.

Mr. Stokes: What happens if we're not?

Mr. Rhodes: We go up in smoke.

Mr Miller: The hydrocarbons and nitrogen compounds do react in sunlight under certain conditions to make photo-chemical smog. These conditions occur often in California; and so their rules have been applied with little thought, in my opinion, to all of North America. The smog itself is dangerous to people with respiratory troubles and is a nuisance to all. But you know, maybe one or two days a year we have these conditions that generates this, whereas California has many days a year.

I feel a great deal more needs to be known before we commit Canada to California's specifications. Imagine how Californians would feel if we said all cars there should have block heaters and snow tires as standard equipment. We must be sure we are not jumping from the frying pan into the fire, eliminating one set of pollutants and producing another with long-range implications. I wonder if it's shades of "Silent Spring"?

Perhaps, though, my real concern about the new methods of controlling auto emissions is their corollary effect—the increase in fuel consumption which they cause.

Remember the days not too long ago when almost any standard sedan got 20 to 25 miles-per-gallon? Today the man who gets 14 to 16 is lucky. And as emission standards tighten, fuel consumption will predictably increase.

Thus we have a paradox. To clean up our air we are burning more fuel. While no one likes to pay the immediate costs, I think we are mentally prepared to do so if the results justify them. But the long-term costs —more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and less fuel for future needs—may be the more critical in the end. In fact—and for an ex-car dealer this sounds like heresy—I question this generation's right to accelerate fuel use.

Mr. Stokes: Or to export!

Mr. Miller: It may well be that alternative fuel sources will be found, but it is by no means certain that they will be. One thing is certain; energy costs will increase sharply in the near future.

So to our government, which has appointed an extremely capable person to study our energy needs, I suggest we should consider means of reducing petroleum use while time permits. Probably the problem is national at least, and even international. But unless we act within our own power to act, we cannot blame others.

There are ways that come to mind. They are not necessarily popular, and in fact may not be politically possible to effect. But apart from changing every man's secret ambition of owning a huge V-8 gas-eating chariot—an ambition which I share with several members here, I must admit—to that of owning a light, four-cylinder engine Econo-Jet, perhaps the most effective route open to us is to make it very costly to own these hungry leviathans.

Or perhaps we could take a page from the European book of the thirties and increase licence fees on big cars to the point where it hurts; or add restrictions for city use.

If, as a result, lighter vehicles increased in popularity, not only would pollution be curtailed, but valuable energy would be preserved. For example, I have a light four-cylinder car that takes me to Toronto and back to Muskoka for less than $3. My family V-8 sedan, a run-of-the-mill thing, does it for just under $9 dollars. The difference, per trip, is about 13 gallons of fuel left for another day.

My concern about the coming crunch for energy took me to articles in Scientific American and Fortune magazines. I must admit I was booted into doing this. Recently both described hydrogen gas as a possible new fuel. As described by these articles, hydrogen could be electrolytically generated by nuclear breeder or fusion reactors, set out to sea to prevent thermal pollution. The gas produced would be piped by traditional methods—at lower costs and energy losses than for electricity—for use in the home, automobiles and industry. Without going into the many solvable technical details, hydrogen could be burned for heat, producing only water as its byproduct, or converted by fuel cells in automobiles that run on electrical energy. It sounds like Buck Rogers, but remember it was hydrogen that fueled man's trip to the moon.

Mr. Stokes: The member is in the wrong ministry. He should be with the Ontario Research Foundation.

Mr. Miller: I am surprised the hon. member is not suggesting somewhere further away than that!

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Miller: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the clamorous cat-calling and prophet-of-doom comments emanating from our opposition leaders, may I say, in conclusion, that the government is to be congratulated for its well-balanced programme presented by His Honour in the Speech from the Throne, and I am proud to be a member of the party which offers it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on three topics today, the first of which is the E. C. Row Expressway in the suburbs of Windsor.

E. C. Row Ave. for many years was a narrow two-lane road with deep ditches on either side. Some called it a mere cow path.

According to the Windsor Star, Sept. 2, 1970:

> It was back in 1954 that Windsor's traffic engineer first suggested that Windsor needed a ring road. Eight years later, in 1962, M. M. Dillon Ltd., a Toronto firm of consulting engineers, made a study which was published in January, 1963. Then came the Windsor Area Transportation Study, known as WATS, which presented in January, 1964, a plan for a $4.5 million arterial road through Windsor's suburbs. This would be along E. C. Row Ave.
>
> By 1965, the then Highways Minister, the Hon. Charles MacNaughton, was announcing that the work would start in two years, which would be 1967.

However, Mr. Speaker, on Jan. 1, 1966, Windsor annexed the suburban area and moved up the social ladder of the big cities. As you know, big cities have to have an expressway; it is indispensable as a status symbol.

According to the Hon. George Gomme, who was Minister of Highways in 1969, this is what happened next:

> On May 20, 1966, council for the city of Windsor passed a resolution indicating the need for an east-west arterial street south of Tecumseh Blvd., and that there would be a need for an expressway-type facility with graded, separated interchanges before 1981.
>
> Contained within the resolution was the fact that the projected capital works programme indicated that immediate construction of an expressway was not feasible. As a result, council requested the province to proceed immediately with the development of a facility generally along the alignment of E. C. Row Ave., provided sufficient right-of-way for an ultimate expressway facility along this route be acquired immediately.
>
> It was intended that while the ultimate aim was for a highway of expressway standards, certain portions of E. C. Row Ave. would be constructed to arterial standards.

In November, 1967, the Dillon engineers brought in a massive functional report for the E. C. Row Expressway. Instead of a $4.5 million ring road with four lanes, perhaps separated by a median strip, with one railway overpass or underpass, the project had become, in the words of the Windsor Star, Sept. 2, 1970:

> An ambitious project which is supposed to become a 10½-mile long crosstown artery for the Windsor of the future, possibly into the next century. The idea is to build now when things are relatively cheaper, then have a 70-mile-an-hour freeway waiting for the city to grow up around it as Windsor pushes south.

The total estimated cost of this 10½-mile expressway was $67.5 million, including such minor items not required by ordinary four-lane roads as: signals, $172,000; signs, $315,600; landscaping, $672,000; the relocation of utilities, $905,000.

Expressways, Mr. Speaker, are luxury items which small cities of 200,000, such as Windsor, cannot afford—at least until they have finished their sanitary and storm sewer projects. Expressways, of course, generate other expenses, especially service roads. In the case of the E. C. Row, the service roads will almost equal the expressway in length, approximately 10 miles.

In the fall of 1968 the city of Windsor applied to the Municipal Board for permission to dispense with a vote on this very expensive undertaking. I opposed this action which deprived the citizens of Windsor of any say in a multi-million-dollar venture of which they would have to pay 25 per cent.

The expressway would help relatively few citizens of Windsor. It was hard to imagine how more than a few residents of Wards 1, 2, 3 and 4 could make any significant use of the expressway in going to and from their daily place of work. The only major industry

whose employees would benefit in any number was Chrysler's. Unlike the Gardiner Expressway in Toronto, the E. C. Row Expressway in Windsor is, at its nearest point, three miles from city hall and the heart of Windsor.

At the time I appeared before the board, asking unsuccessfully for a referendum, I pointed out to the board members—all Torontonians, of course—how remote the expressway was from the activity of Windsor, and how all that was needed along E. C. Row Ave. was a four-lane road with overpass or underpass at the railway tracks between Howard and Dougall.

I mentioned also that an overpass on Tecumseh Rd. between Jeanette and South Cameron would break one of Windsor's oldest and worst traffic bottlenecks. Unfortunately, it is only recently that I happened to obtain a copy of the Windsor Area Transportation Study of 1963. Guess what, Mr. Speaker? It featured, among many other excellent minor suggestions, the two major suggestions I have just mentioned: railway overpasses for E. C. Row and Tecumseh Rd., without any of this cloverleaf nonsense or expropriations of homes and businesses, just a simple $4.5 million plan.

Who are the experts who recommended this 1963 plan? None other than the M. M. Dillon Co., the same experts who about three or four years later designed and defended a $67.5 million super expressway through the suburbs of Windsor, running from the town of Tecumseh – population 5,000 – to Ojibway, with a population of two—not 2,000 just two; a caretaker and his wife. That's hardly the way most of us imagine expressways should be built.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): They don't own a car!

Mr. Burr: They have two bicycles, I believe. The 1963 study also showed a traffic destination map based on thousands of questions to travelling motorists: Where have you come from? Where are you going? The map shows that even if an overpass existed E. C. Row Ave. would have served the needs of very, very few motorists at that time. Of course, with the prospect—or perhaps it was a promise of an expressway, a huge shopping mall dominated by Simpsons-Sears has been built on Howard Ave. at E. C. Row. At the time, 1968, I made the following statement:

> Many Torontonians are incensed that they, as taxpayers, have literally paved the way at great expense for the Yorkdale Shopping Centre, or as they put it, for Eaton's and Simpsons. If the E. C. Row Expressway is built and if the outside commercial interests build a "regional shopping centre" on Howard Ave. at E. C. Row, as predicted, the hundreds of downtown merchants in the present "regional shopping centre" in the core of Windsor may find to their sorrow that they have contributed generously through taxes to their own detriment, or even destruction commercially.

And that is what has happened, Mr. Speaker, in many cases. Simpsons-Sears occupies part of the new shopping mall, and with its cut-rate gas station, is making life very miserable and difficult for scores of service station lessees, whose taxes for the E. C. Row enticed Simpsons-Sears and its discount gasoline to Windsor.

Now that phase I, the overpass on Howard Ave. is nearing completion, residents on Parkwood and Woodlawn to the south of the expressway, find that they are going to be cut off; not only from the rest of their community on the north side of the expressway, but also from Howard Ave. by the shopping centre. The 500 residents of these two streets will have to travel an extra 2.7 miles every time they wish to go north on Howard Ave. To go to church will require about 3.2 extra miles; just to get to their church only a few blocks away.

The residents of this area are now asking that one level crossing be left for them on E. C. Row between Howard Ave. and Walker Rd.—until, or unless, access to Howard Ave. near the expressway can be made available to them.

These are not the only people who will have extra miles of travel forced upon them by the E. C. Row expressway. Until the expressway was started, Windsor had one good, and potentially excellent cross-city shortcut, which saved a great many motorists a great deal of time and would have been used by a great many more if traffic lights had been provided as it crossed Dougall Rd. I refer of course to South Cameron, now utterly destroyed as a quick, safe shortcut from the south-central part of Windsor to the mid-western section.

A great many motorists did not make use of this route for two reasons: (a) because it was usually poorly maintained; and (b) because lack of traffic lights at Dougall Rd. made that crossing somewhat dangerous. Nevertheless, it was one of the bright hopes for rapid traffic movement in Windsor; and it is now irretrievably destroyed.

I mentioned the estimated cost as $67.5 million. That was the cost in money. But the cost in human anguish is another matter. By the end of 1967 it became clear to a great many residents living on and near E. C. Row, that they were about to become displaced persons.

A great many, perhaps the majority of these residents, had built their homes themselves—some being veterans of the Second World War. More than four years passed during which many of them lived in a state of uncertainly, fear and discouragement. Some are in their sixth year of upset, hoping that a reasonable offer will be made that will permit them to find equal accommodation elsewhere. Many have built gardens complete with shrubs, ornamental and fruit trees and berry bushes. They have achieved what they consider the right kind of soil, the right kind of drainage; they have planned their property for their retirement activities.

These dreams or plans are all doomed now, because somebody decided that an expressway would get some people home from work or out to the shopping centre a few minutes earlier each day or each evening. The dubious benefits for some overrode the undeniable happiness of others.

For most of the residents of E. C. Row, the four or five years after 1967 have been years of unhappiness. Those responsible for assembling the land have caused, perhaps unwittingly, mental anguish—extreme in many instances—to an alarming number of residents. They have done this by causing long delays, by making ridiculously low offers to purchase, by leaving long periods of silence and by presenting letters of possession.

I should like to thank the present Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) for bringing about settlements last summer for some of the residents who had been in a prolonged state of frustration. When their plight was drawn to his personal attention, he acted—but the record of this government on the treatment of the E. C. Row victims has been a sorry one.

I wish to contrast the treatment given to two businessmen whose businesses were disrupted by the decision to build the E. C. Row Expressway. The first is a barber who bought a barbershop, its contents and its goodwill for $600 in 1957. For 14 years, he maintained a modest one-chair shop, renting the premises from the same owner during all that time.

When it became clear that he must move, he made inquiries. He tried to find alternative premises nearby in the same neighbourhood where his customers lived. Every effort was thwarted by local municipal by-laws. Although washroom facilities were used by customers about twice a month, a new barbershop must have a toilet. He agreed to provide one. Sorry; the premises he wished to buy were not large enough for another septic tank—which would be used only twice a month. There was no way.

As E. C. Row families moved away month by month, the barber's business receipts gradually dwindled despite inflation. Finally, a notice came from his landlord to vacate the premises. He made further inquiries. The city would not even move his barber's chair to his home for storage. Because he had no written lease, he was not entitled to any compensation whatsoever. So said the Hon. Allan Lawrence in a letter written to me when he was Minister of Justice. A letter from the present Attorney General (Mr. Bales) gave a similar opinion.

My constituent finally secured a copy of the agreement of purchase from the previous barber as well as a statement from his landlord indicating that there was a verbal agreement that the barber could stay as long as he wished. Finally, a letter from the Hon. Allan Lawrence suggested that my constituent might appeal to the municipality, asking for compensation for business disruption.

This he did on Nov. 30, 1972. After about five or six weeks of waiting, he telephoned city hall and was finally asked whether $500 would satisfy him. His losses in business have exceeded $1,000 and if we took inflation into consideration, his losses would have been even greater. His equipment was now of no value to him and the usual goodwill that is passed on when a business changes hands simply evaporated along with the demolished building.

Forced, at the age of about 50, to give up the only trade in which he was skilled, it was difficult for him to find another job. Eventually, he found janitorial services work at the minimum wage. He worked steadily on the midnight shift. This has meant a complete change in his lifestyle. Previously he was his own boss, able to take an hour off or a day off if he wished to—not that he often did but he was in a position to do it if he wished.

Now he is bound to a monotonous routine. At the barbershop he had enjoyed meeting the public; now he may go hours without a conversation with another human being. Before, he worked normal hours and slept

normal hours; now he must adapt to daytime sleeping, which is very difficult for many individuals.

Although he earns a few more dollars than he did as a barber, he no longer has work that he enjoys. Yet what is he offered by way of compensation? After more than five years of certainty, anxiety, without even a word of apology from those who have destroyed his lifestyle—$500—maybe!

This offer of $500 is only tentative; it was made in a telephone conversation in January of this year. But it was not really an offer, because it would have to be taken to a subcommittee, meeting somewhere. After five years of frustration, perhaps he may get $500. That would come to $2 a week for his inconvenience, suffering and change of lifestyle. It is now April 2. My constituent has asked for a board of appeal.

Contrast the niggardlly attitude of government to this very small businessman with the very generous treatment accorded to a big Windsor company, influential in local Conservative circles. I refer to Marentette Bros. Ltd., which since 1960 had a lease on a stretch of land on the west side of Howard Ave., south of E. C. Row. Remember that on May 20, 1966, according to the hon. George Gomme, Windsor city council passed a resolution indicating the need by 1981 for an expressway facility along E. C. Row Ave.

Council asked the Ontario government to proceed immediately, provided that sufficient right of way for an expressway be acquired immediately. Within two months, by July 15, Marentette Bros. Ltd. had borrowed $160,000 from the Industrial Development Bank. By July 18, they had purchased from a Chrysler subsidiary the land on Howard Ave. that they had been leasing for the past six years. The price paid has been reported in the news as $110,000. Because they borrowed $160,000 a few days before, let's be generous and say that this land cost $160,000. As the land transfer tax was paid in Toronto, the Essex county registry office has no record of the selling price. If anyone wishes to find out, the deed was registered on July 22, 1966, and the receipt number is 1742.

On Dec. 19, 1966, the company acquired another parcel to the west of the original parcel on Howard, paying to the New York Central Railroad only $4,000 for this one. Whether the two parcels cost $114,000 or $164,000 doesn't make much difference. In 1969, Windsor city council approved expropriation proceedings to acquire this property. On April 14, 1970, the property passed from Marentette Bros. Ltd. to the city council of Windsor by sale, not by expropriation. According to the Windsor Star of Sept. 1, 1970, it was not until Aug. 10, four months after the sale had been completed, that city council learned of the sale. I quote:

> At the Aug. 10 council meeting, aldermen also expressed shock when they heard some of the land costs, especially the cool $1,260,000 for the Marentette land.

The newspaper does not break down the $1.26 million selling price, but mentions:

> Higher mortgage rates, real estate brokerage and legal fees for property transfers, moving costs and, most important, the cost of disrupting or terminating a business.

This made interesting reading for my barber constituent whose business was not only disrupted, Mr. Speaker, but also terminated permanently.

Whether there was any significant disruption to the Marentettes construction company, we can only guess, but certainly their business was not terminated. On the contrary, it is building the overpasses for Howard Ave., for the former New York Central Railroad and for Dougall Rd. I believe that it has also relocated the Grand Marais drain at Howard Ave. which flows in the neighbourhood of those three overpasses. At any rate, somebody relocated the drain at a cost of $443,000.

In 1968, Marentette Bros. acquired the remaining portion of land, forming the triangle enclosed by Howard Ave., E. C. Row and the New York Central Railroad tracks. The cost of this third parcel was $147,000. I have examined the map, but not closely enough to say for certain whether any part of this third parcel was sold to the city for the expressway. My impression is that it was not.

But it is interesting to note that this third parcel and what was left over from the other two parcels have been sought as a site for a shopping mall. The land is sufficiently valuable to rate a mortgage from the Canada Trust Co., just a few weeks ago on Feb. 19, 1973, in the amount of $600,000.

So we find that for approximately $300,000 invested, half in 1966 and half in 1968, Marentette Bros. in 1970 sold about one-third of it for $910,000 for expressway use and still has about two-thirds left worth at least $600,000.

How the Department of Highways could accept an evaluation of $910,000 in early 1970 for a part, perhaps no more than half, of what had sold in 1966 for $164,000 at

the most is a complete mystery. The price of that piece of land, bought by the city of Windsor and approved by the Department of Highways for $910,000 in 1970, cost the Marentettes approximately $100,000 in 1966.

According to the Expropriations Act, the price to be paid for land, Mr. Speaker, is the market price plus any legitimate expenses the owner can prove.

This piece of land was the least attractive piece of land in Windsor. There is not a member in this House who would have accepted it as a gift, if he were required to build his home on it. How then, I ask once more, could its market value soar from probably considerably less than $100,000 to over $900,000 in less than four years? I suppose the answer is that with the Tory government all things are possible.

In addition, Marentette Bros. received $350,000 for such things as disruption of business and legal fees. My barber friend is asked whether he would accept $500 to compensate him for his loss of business over 3½ years, for the termination of his business and for the forced change in his lifestyle—$500, Mr. Speaker, that's all. Of course, there are two Marentette brothers, I believe, so the disruption might be twice as painful as it was for the barber.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Was he the PC candidate?

Mr. Burr: No, he denied any connection with them, except by birth.

Mr. Paterson: The other brother.

Mr. Burr: Yes. Nevertheless, there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the barber has suffered far more both financially and emotionally. Yet the big business already has made $1 million out of the E. C. Row Expressway land acquisition and stands to make the better part of another million out of the land that may still be used for a shopping mall. The little businessman as yet has received nothing except an insulting offer.

To those that have, much more shall be given, and from those that have little shall be taken away even what little they have. That seems to be the Tory philosophy in Ontario as it applies to the acquisition of land for government projects.

Secondly, I want to speak at much less length on a topic that has interested me for some time since I've been in this House. That is the subject of consent cards. A couple of days ago there appeared in the Toronto Star a familiar story. A kidney from a donor in Houston, Tex., had been flown by jet and helicopter to the Sick Children's Hospital. From there it was taken to the Toronto General Hospital to be transplanted into a patient whose life was thereby saved and perhaps prolonged for many years.

A few days earlier another Toronto Star story featured Debbie Nottingham, an 18-year-old North Bay girl, who has been waiting since 1970 to have a kidney transplant. Toronto Western Hospital has been searching for a suitable donor for two years. Her life is now dependent upon an artificial kidney machine at Civic Hospital in North Bay. Her particular blood type makes it impossible for any of her relatives to donate a kidney to her.

Eight thousand Americans die annually for want of a kidney. Yet thousands of people die yearly with perfectly good kidneys they would have been glad to donate had they had any idea that their deaths were imminent and if someone had offered them a donor consent card to sign. When is the government of Ontario going to act in this matter?

It would be simple to have an extra inch or so added to drivers' licences or vehicle licences on which a donor consent form could be printed. It would be simple also to have the OHIP certificate, which all of us carry in our wallets, enlarged somewhat by the provision of a donor consent from indicating that the bearer, in case of death, wished any tissues or organs of his body to be used to help a fellow human being.

The eye bank of Canada provides these cards for those to whom it occurs to donate their eyes for corneal transplants or other uses. Unfortunately hundreds of people die daily in Ontario without thinking to will their eyes to the 40 or 50 who are always on the waiting list for the gift of sight.

Just after Christmas in 1972 the Windsor Star carried the story of a beautiful six-year-old girl who had given sight to two blind persons. Her name was Michelle Havens. Her mother, who had signed a consent card at the age of 16 to donate her own eyes to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, had registered her daughter as a donor shortly after birth. When the daughter died suddenly the mother remembered.

The publication of this story has prompted several hundred Windsorites to inquire about forms and to sign them. In the previous eight years I believe there were only about a dozen people in Windsor who had signed cards for the eye bank of Canada.

Almost certainly in future years, many more blind persons in Ontario will see again because of this mother's thoughtfulness. A young lady, Miss Vicky Affleck, herself a recipient of corneal transplants, has been very active in publicizing the eye bank donor consent cards in Windsor.

The Human Tissues Gift Act has removed the red tape from the making of donations, but this is not enough. Unless victims of accident fatalities carry consent cards, the chances of their becoming donors are quite remote. Relatives are often far away at the time of a fatal accident of this kind and usually are in a state of shock. Few doctors, nurses or others interested in arranging a donation have the required tact and courage to broach this very difficult subject to grieving relatives.

On the other hand, when a family has discussed the matter and is prepared, the matter is usually easy. Consider the actual case of a man hospitalized after a severe heart attack. Because his wife knew that he carried a consent card, he was able on his death to give sight to two blind persons by way of corneal transplants and to save the lives of two other persons requiring kidney transplants for survival. One thoughtful couple, Mr. Speaker, saved or enhanced four lives.

Only yesterday I received a copy of the donor card promoted by the Kidney Foundation of Canada, located in Montreal. The accompanying brochure that I hold in my hand asks and answers several questions. I shall read parts of only two.

> Question: What are the ethics of organ donation and transplantation?
>
> Answer: Moral leaders, the world over, favour such donations as expressions of the highest humanitarian ideals. The gift of an organ essential to the life of another human being is consistent with principles of religious and ethical systems overwhelmingly held.
>
> Question: What else can I do to advance this life-preserving programme?
>
> Answer: Acquaint others with our donor card programme. The more donors available, the more new and important medical advances can be used for the benefit of mankind. Your kidney foundation will be happy to provide additional donor cards.

So we have, trying to reach eight million potential donors in Ontario, two private organizations—the eye bank and the kidney foundation—using their limited and difficult-to-collect funds on brochures and other forms of advertising, yet reaching very few individuals. How much better it would be for the government of Ontario, at scarcely any cost whatsoever, to enlarge drivers' licences and OHIP certificates, thereby reaching millions of possible donors who would carry in their wallets or purses these consent cards.

To put the matter bluntly, Mr. Speaker, how much longer will this government allow lives to be lost through its inaction on this issue? Donor consent forms need to be publicized and popularized. Above all, they need to be made easily available.

The third and final topic is the matter of the rates for Ontario housing geared to income. I should like to make a few comments on this policy, followed for some years by OHC, as it relates to the whole purpose of public housing.

As I understand the theory, citizens in the lower income brackets were to be assisted with low-rental housing while they were temporarily down on their luck. Somehow, this would provide an incentive for people to save up a sufficient down payment for a house of their own.

There is one serious flaw in this plan and I intend to explain it briefly, but I hope adequately. Let us take the case of a married man with two children under 16 years of age. He earns $4,800 a year, which is recognized as being near the poverty line. His rent geared to income is $100 minus $4 for the two children, in other words $96 a month.

His income tax, according to 1972 rates, is $280 plus a few cents. Suppose his income goes up by $1,200 to $6,000 a year. His geared-to-income rent is now $125 less $4, in other words $121 monthly. His income tax increases by $296 a year and his rent by $300 a year. Thus, of his $1,200 increase, he keeps only $604, which is about 51 per cent.

Suppose he goes up to $9,000 a year. His income tax rises to $1,380 and his rent to $183.50 a month. Thus his income has gone up $4,200 but his income tax increases $1,100 and his annual rent increases $1,050. His net increase is $2,050—less than 50 per cent.

Let's put him in the $12,000-a-year bracket. His rent would be $246 a month. His income tax would be $2,290. Thus, out of a $7,200 increase in income he would suffer a rent increase of $1,800 and an income tax increase of $2,009, a total of $3,809, leaving

him and his family a net income increase of only $3,391 out of $7,200.

In other words, he would get only 47 per cent of the increase. OHC and the provincial and federal income tax collectors would take 53 per cent of his extra income. No other workers, Mr. Speaker, lose 50 per cent of their overtime money. The geared-to-income renters are the only workers from whom the provincial and federal governments take 50 per cent of whatever money they earn above their subsistence level.

This explains the bitterness of those affected. The harder they work the bigger the slice that goes to the government—25 per cent to OHC and a rising percentage to the income tax departments of the provincial and federal governments. This explains why we hear of tenants who seek to conceal their extra earnings. Dishonesty, Mr. Speaker? Yes. But the OHC system is partly to blame.

Even the capital gains tax, which affects mostly the wealthy, does not tax above 50 per cent. Geared-to-income renters are taxed 49 per cent at the $6,000 level. I use the word "taxed" because they are paying a rent tax and an income tax on any earnings beyond the poverty level.

There must be some changes made. The minister's task force has heard many suggestions from many quarters. In Windsor, representatives of the Windsor council of citizens' groups called for a reduction of the present 25 per cent of gross income to a formula based on 20 per cent of net income.

They asked also that the $2 allowance be increased to $5 for each child in calculating rent scales. I have spoken along these lines before, Mr. Speaker, but I am more convinced than ever that changes in the OHC rental rates are needed and must be made.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, you haven't heard anything yet.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor: (Lakeshore): That is right. Let the government know what you think this time.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): We know they are not going to be able to.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to rise at this point and take part in the Throne debate.

I should like first, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you on the admirable way you conduct the proceedings of this House. I have been most impressed with your patience and good humour. You are dealing with men and women who have submitted themselves to the electors of their ridings, have received their endorsation and have come to this place to make their contribution to the public life of this province. Every member of this House has an important part to play in the government of this province, be he a government member or a member of the opposition. I have been most impressed by the talent displayed here and the dedication of the members.

Mr. Speaker, your office is an ancient one. It seems to go back to Sir Thomas Hungerford, who was appointed Speaker of the House of Commons in Britain in 1377. However, there is some history of presiding officers being appointed even before that time. It seems the primary function of the Speaker in that early time was to act as the resolution of the Commons and to communicate their resolutions to the King.

It was said to be an unenviable task, and at least nine Speakers are known to have died violent deaths—four during the War of the Roses. On the other hand, frequently the Speaker turned out to be a King's man and in the Tudor period is described by the writer, Stubbs, as being the manager of business on the part of the Crown and probably the nominee of either the King himself or the chancellor.

The reign of Charles I saw the climax of the struggle between Crown and Commons and the establishment of the Speaker's first duty to the House. Our procedure carries on in that tradition.

Mr. Speaker, when we read of the evolution of your ancient office, it is plain to see why some Speakers in the past had to be dragged to that very seat, and we can understand their reluctance to assume that office. However, Mr. Speaker, times have changed; but the honour and dignity and responsibility of your office still remains.

The address of the Hon. W. Ross MacDonald is an outstanding document and, speaking of this hon. gentleman, I should like to say that he has represented Her Majesty the Queen in this province with dignity, great ability and with a dedication to his duties that has enhanced the honourable office that he holds.

The Lieutenant Governor will have a busy schedule ahead of him, especially during the latter part of June when this province will be the host to Her Majesty the Queen. I know that the people of this province will

offer Her Majesty a warm reception. We know the personal sacrifice that such a position requires and the complete dedication of Her Majesty as head of state under our parliamentary system.

We welcome also His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh who, in his own right, is making an important contribution to world progress and achievement. I hope that the school boards of Ontario will, in advice of the Queen's visit, bring to the attention of the students the importance of the monarchy in our system of government, and will declare at least part of the day a holiday when the Queen visits the various communities in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the young people today more than ever before are becoming aware of this great country and its future potential. It is most important, therefore, that we should be more aware of our distinctly Canadian heritage, and the parliamentary institutions that have allowed Canada to remain as a free and independent nation on the North American continent.

I am most impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the large numbers of young people who want to learn more about our constitutional monarchy and its present and future role in our parliamentary system. We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that constitutional monarchy is respected not only by those of British and French descent but by people who have come here from all parts of the world to make Canada their home. Many of the critics of the constitutional monarchy tend to forget that the system of monarchy is also a respected institution in many countries from which Canada's immigration has come.

In this connection, I wish to quote from a book entitled "The Conservative in Canada," by the late George Hogan, a former Progressive Conservative candidate in Woodbine provincial riding.

Mr. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A pretty dull book.

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Hogan said:

> The Crown is the symbol and spirit of those lasting values that unite us as Canadians. When all other political elements conspire to stress the passing issues that divide us, the Crown is also our reminder that we are a nation not only of the past and present, but of the future.
>
> It represents our obligation to ensure that future generations will share with ours the full measure of our national heritage. Conservatives uphold the Crown because it symbolizes stability, it rallies patriotism, and it commands loyalty. Without these qualities no nation can grow and prosper in the modern struggle of competitive survival.

I should like to quote further from a statement by the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent, a former Prime Minister of Canada. This esteemed gentleman, a former leader of the Liberal Party, said that the constitutional monarchy was "a system of government to which none anywhere in the world is superior."

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honour to have been given the opportunity to represent the people of Beaches-Woodbine riding. We are proud of this riding and we have every reason to be proud.

For example, to the south we have a long stretch of waterfront, where during the year people enjoy the boardwalk, the beaches and parks, and other facilities that have been provided. The beach and waterfront provides recreation for thousands of people, not only from our riding but for miles around.

Then, too, Beaches-Woodbine is an area that has a good family-housing stock. Homes are generally well kept; a number of the older homes have been rehabilitated, and "For Sale" signs are not up for very long. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have excellent schools and recreational facilities, and there are no highrise buildings in the Beaches area.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Is the boardwalk under water, or are they okay there?

Mr. Wardle: From another point of view, we have a number of sporting traditions in Beaches-Woodbine. The Beaches Fastball League in 1971 celebrated its 50th anniversary, and they have provided good sport and good fastball all through those years.

And, Mr. Speaker, I know that all the members of this House have heard of the Balmy Beach Football Club; it is well-known to sportsmen. The club itself, founded in 1902, has been a family club and still is.

In 1927 and 1930, the Balmy Beach Football Club won the Grey Cup. Those were the days when an athlete was an amateur in all that the word implies. Men such as Ted Reeve, Ab Box, Bobby Porter, Alex Ponton, Harry "Red" Foster, and a former member of this Legislature, Alf Cowling, a former member for High Park, played on teams from Balmy Beach.

A resident of our area for all of his life, Mr. Roy Nurse, a member of the Balmy Beach club, won the single sculls in the Paris Olympics of 1924. We have also in the area the Ashbridge's Bay Yacht Club—

Mr. Givens: And Ashbridge's Bay?

Mr. Wardle: —with over 300 members, and this yacht club has provided facilities for sailors for many, many years. I know, Mr. Speaker, the member for York-Forest Hill is an ardent sailor—

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): He can walk on the water, what is the member talking about?

Mr. Wardle: —and I should say that this club, in addition to the 300 members who own boats, has a long waiting list. What we need on the waterfront in the city of Toronto, Mr. Speaker, are more facilities for small boat owners—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Not just on the waterfront.

Mr. Wardle: —to enjoy this wonderful recreation.

Mr. Timbrell: Why didn't the member for York-Forest Hill put through the waterfront plan in 1959?

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Speaker, in 1952 the municipalities surrounding Toronto were in some cases in financial difficulty. An expanding population required services of all kinds, especially in the suburban areas. There were great pressures placed on all the services. Many people from the city of Toronto moved to the suburban areas; and the city of Toronto was fortunate in the fact that of all the immigration into Canada, a good percentage located in the city of Toronto and the surrounding areas. This meant that houses in Toronto were bought by new people arriving in this area. Mr. Speaker, without this immigration into the city of Toronto we would have had many empty houses within this area.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to put on the record the immigration into Canada in the past five years and the percentage of immigration into Ontario. I should mention that 53 per cent came to the Toronto area in the following years.

In 1967, 220,876 people entered Canada. Of this number 116,850 came to Ontario. In 1968, 183,974—96,155 to Ontario. In 1969, 161,531—86,588 to Ontario. In 1970, 147,713 —80,732 to Ontario. In 1972, for the first nine months only, 86,787—45,290 to Ontario.

I should mention particularly the problems faced by the boards of education and especially the Board of Education of the City of Toronto after the formation of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto in 1953. At that time the board of education of Toronto was faced with serious problems. In the city of Toronto itself the population continued about the same, but the suburban areas were growing rapidly. New schools were required for the expanding population.

The city of Toronto was faced with the requirement of making an approximate 50 per cent contribution to the building of new schools and new facilities in the suburbs under the Metropolitan Toronto plan, and at the same time the necessity of building new schools in the city to replace some schools that were 75 to 100 years old and bringing up to an acceptable standard other schools in the city of Toronto.

During the Depression before the Second World War, very little money was spent on school maintenance, and no money was spent during and immediately after the war on school construction. Indeed, some schools at that time could be described as firetraps.

The Toronto Board of Education made a decision in 1955 to go ahead with a programme of school rehabilitation and construction. This cost a great deal of money, but it was money well spent; money that had to be spent if the standard of education in the city of Toronto was to be on the same level and offering the same opportunities to the children living in Toronto as in the other areas where new schools and new facilities were being built.

In the Metropolitan Toronto area we have now a good system of education. Over the years many special programmes have been added to the school curriculum. I refer particularly to the programme for exceptional children. These include not only the especially bright children, but those who have learning disabilities—such as those who are retarded, have hearing and learning problems, and who require special help.

Mr. Speaker, I was honoured to be a member of the Toronto Board of Education in the years 1955 to 1960 and I had the honour in 1960 to be chairman of the board. One of my most satisfying pieces of work on the board was working with the children who had learning disabilities and those who needed special care. I hope, Mr. Speaker, any cut-

back in the metropolitan area will not come in this particular programme, which I feel is most important.

These special programmes are expensive, but it seems to me that they are a good investment, for I believe in the principle that every child and every adult should have the utmost in educational opportunities.

While dealing with education, I cannot help but make several observations about our own provincial effort with respect to community colleges. I am certain that members of this Legislature are familiar with the fact that the community college aspect of post-secondary school education became a reality only a very few short years ago—in 1965 to be more specific—when our government announced its intention to provide whatever opportunities necessary to enable each individual, through education, to develop his potentialities to the fullest degree. And we know, Mr. Speaker, many young people who for a number of reasons, financial and otherwise, could not go on to university, were able to go on to worthwhile job opportunities through this community college programme.

Further in the matter of education, I think we owe it to the young people of today to provide for more Canadian content in our textbooks. It is a sad commentary that some of our young people seem to know more about the history of the United States than they do about the history of their own country. But I am pleased with the progress being made in this regard.

Another point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, has to do with our senior citizens and their needs, particularly housing. In my riding we have about 65,000 people, and there is only one small nursing home in operation, although another one is being built at the present time. It would be an ideal situation if nursing homes could be built in areas where there is a proved need, such as in my area, where the accommodation would be close to relatives and friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is of course a wrench for the persons going into such a home, as well as for their families, when they must be accommodated in an area far removed from their relatives and friends.

We are equally as desperate for senior citizens' homes in Beaches-Woodbine. At the present moment we have four so-called senior citizens' apartments—Glen Stewart with 154 units, Kinsmen Manor with 45 units, Beaches Lions with 43 units and Woodbine Acres with 42 units. Altogether, then, there are 284 units to serve an area with a population of more than 65,000.

Obviously this does not even begin to satisfy the need.

As is the case with nursing homes, our senior citizens must seek vacancies in homes in more distant places and are more than often far from their families, church connections, friends and so on.

I did mention, Mr. Speaker, that our area is an area of family homes. Many people have lived in that area all their lives, and when they come to these latter years of their life to be told that there is accommodation in a senior citizens' home at a price they can afford, but it's out in the north part of Scarborough, in North York or in Etobicoke—just think of the wrench and human problems this causes.

I commend the government for beginning a programme of foster homes for senior citizens. I know many senior people would appreciate living in a home-like atmosphere, and I know homeowners would welcome a congenial person in their home as a companion and as a source of income to pay the expenses of maintaining a home.

At the same time, senior citizens who qualify—at least in the city of Toronto—are given some relief with respect to education tax. At the moment, the city is providing assistance of up to $100 for those senior citizens who own their own homes and who do not have joint incomes exceeding $4,500. They must also be 70 years of age or older.

Many of our senior citizens find it impossible to maintain their homes because of their low incomes and the high cost of living. As a result, they end up giving up their homes and depending on being put up and cared for by the municipality and the province in one way or another. Would it not be more logical to provide for them in their own homes? I'm certain it would prove less expensive. It is in the public interest to maintain people in their own homes rather than elsewhere. An expanded rent subsidy programme is needed in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech we were told that the province's economy had been strengthened considerably in the past year and had enjoyed the fastest growth rate in the level of employment in over a decade. The government expects this trend to continue in 1973, with an increase in real growth of goods and services of six per cent this year, compared with an estimated 5.5 per cent again in 1972.

Despite the continued rapid growth of the labour force in Ontario, the average unemployment rate has declined from 5.2 per cent in 1971 to 4.8 per cent in 1972, and a record 140,000 new jobs were created. This achievement compared favourably with Canada as a whole where the unemployment rate last year remained virtually unchanged at 6.3 per cent.

A moderation in the labour force growth in 1973 combined with the continuing expansion of job opportunities should further improve the Ontario employment picture. Indeed on a seasonal basis, unemployment in Ontario was 4.1 per cent in February this year, compared with 4.6 per cent in February, 1972.

Ontario's fiscal policy in the past two years has played an important part in alleviating unemployment, including such matters as personal income tax reductions and selective expenditure increases made by the province which have had a favourable influence on subsequent federal policy.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this government has established an objective, to continue the expansion of the economy and the substantial improvement of our unemployment situation. This must remain the overriding goal of our economic policy. I am certain that it is because of these policies and the policies of past Conservative governments in Ontario that our unemployment level, although not acceptable, is far below that of many of our sister provinces and naturally below the national level.

The Throne Speech says the government will provide increased assistance and encouragement to our amateur athletes through special community-wide athletic and recreational programmes. It will be giving full support to the first Ontario summer games which will be held in Oshawa this summer.

Mr. Speaker, one of the aspects of professional sports today is the high salaries for the players and the commercial aspects of the various games. I am encouraged by the response of the government in giving to our amateur athletes and the various associations the type of help they require to carry on.

We pay tribute to the unpaid coaches and managers of hockey, baseball and football teams—men and women who give of their time freely in order to encourage young athletes. Mr. Speaker, I like particularly this aspect of the government's programme. Sometimes a grant, which will provide sweaters, bats and balls, etc., to a baseball league, will enable dozens of youngsters and parents to enjoy healthy recreation. Sometimes the expenditure of only $1,000 will keep a softball league going with 16 teams all through the summer months.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, before getting into the balance of my address, I wonder if it would be possible to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Wardle moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

APPRENTICESHIP AND TRADESMEN'S QUALIFICATION ACT

Mr. Drea moves second reading of Bill 18, An Act to amend the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Drea moves second reading of Bill 19, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. F. Drea: (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have combined these two bills because I think they are part of a package and unless we have the entire package, I don't think we can begin to deal with what I regard as one of the most pressing of consumer requirements in our contemporary society. It is a matter of significant concern to an area of small business that, indeed, has been able to expand and hopefully prosper—which is against the general economic trend. Finally, but not least, it is on behalf of future job opportunities for a great number of talented young men and women in this province.

The reasoning behind Bill 18, I think, is fairly elementary to anyone who has had any experience with trade qualifications in this province, because, with the exception of the electricians and the plumbers and sheet metal workers, all trade qualifications and certifications in this province are voluntary.

In short, those qualifications and the accompanying certificate of competency are very nice to have. They certainly show that you persevered and you sacrificed of your time and talent to obtain the necessary knowledge and experience to qualify, but in

realistic terms they mater not, because somebody can walk in without having invested in any training whatsoever and proclaim himself a tradesman.

I think that this is a deterrent, particularly to young people who are looking for occupations where they will have stability, where they will have an opportunity to better themselves through the use of their talents and, indeed, can make a contribution to the community.

Mr. Speaker, I think it very significant that we in this province, particularly in the larger urban centres, are now on the threshold of the era of the wired home, if indeed we are not there now. First of all, colour television is becoming more and more accepted as a common thing in homes. Secondly, a number of television sets in a home are becoming accepted as commonplace as technology and, unfortunately, the ability of overseas competitors to put them on the market at a reasonable price with reasonable quality has made the smaller portable set fairly common in households as well.

But we are also into the time when more and more homeowners are beginning to wire their houses for inside communications. We are already into the time of the home entertainment centre, where people are able to buy videotape equipment for a relatively reasonable price—a little under $1,000—where they are able to make their own television or film programmes, or indeed, with the aid of certain technological devices, to be absent from their home and to videotape television programmes that they want to see and be able to see them at a future date. Then, of course, we have the wall-to-wall stereo which is now becoming very commonplace, particularly in the homes or the apartments of younger people.

Mr. Speaker, all of this requires a tremendous amount of service, because no matter how good the equipment there are the inevitable breakdowns that come from very frequent usage. But the problem is—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): We experience them from listening to the member.

Mr. Drea: What was that?

Mr. Cassidy: We have those breakdowns listening to the hon. member.

Mr. Drea: Well, why doesn't the member go and have his breakdowns somewhere convenient to him?

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): He has already broken down.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, to come back to it, one of the problems in all of this is, marvellous as the machinery may be there is the problem of service. The popularity and the frequency of use, as well as a number of other factors, have brought the service on these particular machines into the limelight, because quite frankly, across this province there have been virtually untold numbers of people who have been either ruthlessly swindled in trying to get their television sets repaired or, while there has been no attempt to commit fraud, have had their machines repaired by people who at best could be described as incompetent or untrained.

As a matter of fact, in the Metropolitan area there is still a thriving industry whereby totally unqualified people advertise that they are in the TV repair business. They come and they pick up your set. Ostensibly they take it away to repair it, but they do not even have a shop. They merely take it to one of the factory outlets where one of the manufacturers repairs it, then they very calmly take it back to the place that is supposed to be a service centre, put on an exorbitant additional fee—and then return it to you.

Furthermore—and I had some experience with this a year or two ago with the Toronto Telegram—I suggest to you that trying to get any kind of service at night or on Saturdays and Sundays puts you in the very unfortunate predicament of virtually being held up for ransom, because the people who are in business naturally want an eight-hour day. They have to pay their technicians. They pay them a very good sum. They are not available at 9 o'clock at night when you come home and suddenly find that your set has broken, and that is the time that people want it repaired; so you turn to the phone book. I suggest very honestly to anybody here, if this ever does happen to you, I would beware of the great number of advertisments in the phone book that deliberately have initials placed in front of them so that they can be Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 in the book.

Some of the most remarkable things happen to you. The particular experiment that I did was to replace a very simple tube and to put in one that was defective. To the person looking at the TV set it would appear as though the entire set was shot. To any qualified tradesman it was the first thing he would look for.

A great number of things happened. Unfortunately, about only one out of the seven who was called ever looked at it. The others went through a great variety of excuses, all of which were to get the set out of the particular premises into a repair place where supposedly great things were done to it—at a very good fee. Again, the problem was there was misrepresentation when you asked for the tubes that were taken out. You were told you were getting in a brand new set the products of another manufacturer—which is rather difficult to do when the back of the set had never been off.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the public is virtually left at the mercy of the serviceman because it neither knows nor is expected to know the inner workings of a television set. I must say to you, Mr. Speaker, the same experiment was carried out by a newspaper in Ottawa with even more drastic results. If I recall correctly, they carried the set into repair premises and, even in places where there was diagnostic equipment available, the number of things they found wrong with a set that actually only had a very small thing the matter with it was really amazing. Of course, they were amazing only in terms of the bill that was submitted for the repairs that supposedly had to be done.

Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting here today is that there are two facets to this. First of all, the great paradox is that you can have a totally crooked repair service where the repairman is technically competent; and vice versa you can have a totally incompetent repair service where the man is honest. So I think the trade qualifications as well as the licensing and bonding of the repair service are necessary if we are to come to grips with the particular problem that afflicts many thousands of Ontario residents.

I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the Metropolitan Toronto area in the last two years there has been tremendous work done by the repairmen's own industry, that is, the Metropolitan Toronto TV Service Association. These people who represent the vast majority of the industry, who are not only honest but extremely hard pressed by the dishonest, have taken it upon themselves to act as ombudsmen to the public. I think that that is very commendable. I think that where we can encourage small business to regulate itself and to protect the community are avoiding the unnecessary proliferation of the bureaucracy, which unfortunately is a problem for all of us.

In any event, this association has listened to the public. It has gone out and provided them with an expert commentary on whether the repairs were really needed or not, or indeed whether the repairs were competently carried out. I think this is very important, too. As you know, Mr. Speaker, you can get into what appears to be an endless series of minor repairs. Nobody seems to be able to get at the real problem. The set comes back and it breaks down in another two weeks. It goes out again and they promise that this time it's done and, again, it is back within a week. This is extremely frustrating for people.

Mind you, there is a trend in the industry now that all the parts are going to be in a drawer—all the parts. If one goes wrong you just remove all the parts, throw them away and put in an entirely new set of parts.

This may be very convenient and it may make great television commercials, but it also is an extremely heavy burden upon the consumer. Because all you really need is for a couple of minor parts to malfunction and you are throwing away some of the major parts.

I think a far more reasonable approach to this is to have things that can be serviced —can be guaranteed, so that they will work —at the most reasonable price to the consumer. I don't think that the consumer can ask for these things to be done for nothing. But at the same time, I think that a situation where an industry does not expect to have its equipment serviced and instead throws the entire load upon the consumer, is quite unfair.

Again, there will be difficulty if we get what has been repeatedly asked for and that is that municipalities receive the right to license within their own jurisdictions. I am sure that my hon. friend from Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) will discuss some of the ramifications of this in the medium-sized municipality with which he is most familiar.

But I would like to point out to you that Metropolitan Toronto started into this about a year and a half ago. It was going to license because something had to be done. It went on and on and it held hearings and so on and so forth. Then it came to the point where Metro found out it was going to cost money, and when they found out it was going to cost a little bit of money, then, of course, they shied away.

Now if the largest municipality in the province, one that already has a Metro-wide licensing system, feels that it has to soft pedal this because it is an expensive commodity to the taxpayer, then I suggest to you that it is really the responsibility of the province. Again, if you leave it up to the larger municipalities to do this, you wind up with all kinds of bucket shops two or three blocks outside the actual boundary of the municipality, and I really don't think you accomplish anything.

To come back just a moment to the tradesmen's qualifications. Mr. Speaker, in this province now we have a demand that there be some empty schoolrooms used in technical institutes, both at the secondary school level and in the community colleges. I suggest to you that by putting in mandatory qualifications, and phasing them in over a particular number of years, we can attract young people to this occupation. Once there are qualifications then they do have some bargaining power when it comes to get a job. At the same time, so do the businessmen who will have to employ them as apprentices or as learners.

At the moment, there is little percentage in taking in an apprentice and investing your time with him because right down the street somebody can set up shop, operate at a cheaper price because they (a) have no intention of staying in business, (b) aren't qualified, and (c) use the easy escape route through the factory outlet that I have talked about before.

There is another problem in this too. At the moment it is somewhat customary that people can buy protection policies, and these protection policies range from one, two to five years. What happens if the place goes out of business?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is the case of one large retailer which did encourage people to buy these protection policies—the standard one, where they will make so many service calls over a particular period in return for a certain amount of money being deposited with them. Mr. Speaker, the company they were dealing with went out of business; in fact, it went into receivership. The interesting thing is up to a week before they were offering two and three-year service policies which people had paid for.

Of course, when you go into bankruptcy, as you know, that policy is not only worthless. If your set is in there, you are in real difficulty.

I had some experience with people who had to go to the successor company, go back to the original workshop of the company in receivership and hunt around on the floor for the parts of their set that had been taken out and not repaired. Then they had to take their set somewhere else and pay to have it repaired. And they were told by the people arranging the affairs in receivership that, quite frankly, they were very lucky that they had a receipt that it was there in the first place, or indeed the whole lot might have been sold as a means of satisfying some of the creditors.

Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying in essence today is that on the threshold of the electronic era in the household entertainment centre, that the time has come in this province—despite the fact that we may never be able, because of overseas competition and other factors, to manufacture the particular products that are going into the household —when there is the possibility of a very strong, a very expanding and a very lucrative industry here. Lucrative not only in terms of profits for the owners, but in salaries and work stability for the employees and indeed in service to the community. There is the possibility of creating that kind of industry throughout the Province of Ontario; and I think that this should be looked at in that light.

Secondly, I believe that the compulsory certification of the television repair men — and I would point out to you that the usual grandfather clause would be there so that anyone who now has the experience and is recognized as being experienced would automatically be licensed—would provide an incentive for young people to go into this field.

I think it is common knowledge that we are having more and more difficulty attracting people into the repair industry. It seems to be a very common complaint in our society that you can buy anything new, but you can't get it fixed, even if there is only one small screw or bolt loose.

But secondly, I think the time has come in this province where the consumer protection bureau can stop passing the buck. Virtually every phone call that you make there now winds up with the response that somehow it isn't in their jurisdiction.

I don't think consumer protection begins and ends with magazine salesmen who are coming to the door. Mind you, they were bad enough; and I certainly think that the 48-hour clause, and all that kind of thing, was very necessary.

I don't believe that consumer protection begins and ends with new or used cars. Where the used car business may have been atrocious at one time, through a lot of legislation and a great deal of regulation—in fact in my view a little bit of over-kill—that problem has, by and large, been resolved.

But here we are into something that is in nearly every home. Here we are into a chronic complaint area of the public. I think the time has come to find out if the Consumer Protection Act is worth the paper that it is written on. If it is, then it can quite easily make accommodations for this type of industry.

The people who are in the industry are not asking for total government regulation. What I think they are asking for, Mr. Speaker, is that there be an overall type of regulation, but that the specific recommendations be left to various trade associations.

This, I suggest to you, would be the most efficient and most economical way of doing things. I don't think just because you have consumer protection that you have to have a civil servant, or someone apprenticed to a civil servant, peering over everyone's shoulder. I think that this only adds to the particular bill for the service.

I think that it is a very easy and economical proposition to say, "Yes, we are going to license and bond." Why license and bond? Well, you license for identification purposes; you bond in case anything untoward happens.

And then you say that hand-in-hand with tradesmen's qualifications that the trade group should be able to act as an arbitrator between the public and the individual firm when the customer believes that something has been done to him, either in terms of a very unfair bill or in terms of very slipshod work.

May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that such a thing is neither new nor radical. The Law Society has had this type of thing for that profession for over a century; in that you do have a taxing officer and you do have places to go if you feel that you have not been properly dealt with by the profession. I suggest to you in that case it has worked out very well.

I suggest to you that the same type of thing can be applicable to properly trained and certified people in an occupation.

That is why I've introduced Bill 18, which would for the first time in this province bring compulsory certification to someone in the repair industry. I think that this is extremely important at this time.

Secondly, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act would license and bond. I think that the two go hand-in-hand and I think that separately they do not attain the goal. The goal is that the public be entitled to the service it should be able to think that the two go hand-in-hand and I expect in a province that is as technologically advanced as this one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the hon. member for Scarborough Centre and congratulate him on the introduction of the two bills—Bill 18, An Act to amend the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act and Bill 19, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

The hon. member is interested, not only in the protection of the consumer but also in the protection of the small businessman who will be involved in the repair, in this instance, of television sets. However, I would like to point out to him that he is becoming involved in only one small segment of the electronics industry and I don't think that it goes quite far enough even though the bill, as presented here, is satisfactory. I think we should be interested in a little further protection and the bill should possibly include all electronic equipment.

One year ago, I introduced a bill that would set up a bureau of repair services. I think that my suggestion of including all the repair services, which would include all facets of the electronics industry, would have been far more appropriate. He does have the bonding principle in his bill which I think is noteworthy and should be incorporated in any other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 19 deals with television repair services solely and that's only one of the concerns of today's consumer purchasing electrical appliances. It's important, of course, to regulate this type of service because of the two dangers inherent in it—those are the dishonest serviceman and the incompetent serviceman. There is little legislation to protect the public against either of the two, the dishonest or the incompetent.

Most television repair servicemen, Mr. Speaker, are extremely reliable. They are trustworthy. They give good and efficient service but it takes only the one rotten apple, really, to spoil the barrel and to blacklist all television repair services.

All of us can recall the Reader's Digest articles several years ago in which they checked across the United States on radio repair. Years later, it was television repair and then, likewise, they went into automotive repair. They went into appliance repair and they found that too often they came upon unscrupulous repair personnel who took full advantage of the unsuspecting public.

Mr. Speaker, there is an apprenticeship system of a sort in the province now and after a certain period of time the provincial government does give the individual a certificate of qualification. But when a person brings a television set in for repair very seldom does he ask to see the repairman's certificate. He still unsuspectingly assumes that the individual is fully qualified.

The city of Detroit has a licensing system. However, Mr. Speaker, the licensing system only licenses the owner of the shop and not the repairman and, as a result, it has been extremely unsuccessful.

There are numerous cases of fraud, which are both reported and unreported, relating to television and appliance repair services. In 1971, the provincial consumer protection bureau received 379 complaints dealing with appliances and furniture and 207 complaints about TV sales and service. The Toronto Better Business Bureau received 814 complaints about TV, radio and phonograph services in the 10-month period of last year; that is, January up to and including October. This was one of the highest categories of complaints. It comprised nine per cent of the total complaints to the Better Business Bureau in that 10-month period.

The problem of repair is only one of the problems involved with electronic equipment and TV. There is also the problem of warranties — the manufacturer putting a warranty on the merchandise yet the warranty being meaningless, so the warranty does not necessarily cover the product to the extent that the purchaser assumes it does. The warranty is fairly drawn and sometimes honestly implemented. It expresses that warranties can be of assistance to the consumer. Unfortunately, warranties don't necessarily all meet this criterion.

Here are some examples of typical pitfalls as far as warranties are concerned: warranties that cover only part of the component and not the most important one; warranties that undertake to replace defective parts but hold the consumer responsible for the cost of installing them—this leaves the consumer at the unscrupulous dealer's mercy since the dealer can manipulate the prices to suit his own purposes—warranties that expire long before the normal life expectancy of the product especially in coloured television picture tubes; and warranties that merely credit the buyer with the original purchase price on the purchase of new goods of the same type at a higher price.

Mr. Speaker, possibly the dating of television sets or all types of electronic equipment —the date that the set was actually manufactured, when it left the plant after final inspection—should be visible in some place in the set so that the individual purchasing the set knows that he is buying a 1973 model, not one that was shipped out of Japan in 1969.

The Ontario Law Reform Commission report dealt with the problem of warranties but as yet no legislation has been enacted. As far as warranties are concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is quite unrealistic to expect the consumer to bring these grievances into the regular courts since ligitation is expensive and time-consuming and the results are usually unpredictable. The commission made three proposals to deal with this situation. First, the Ontario consumer protection bureau should be specifically authorized to mediate all warranty complaints. Secondly, if mediation is not successful, the parties will be invited to submit their dispute for arbitration before a government-appointed arbitrator free of charge. Thirdly, the alternative for the consumer will be to bring his grievance before the commercial registration appeal tribunal. The government must waste no time in implementing these or similar proposals to ensure that the consumer will get a fair hearing for his complaint.

In Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, the appliance division of the Electrical Services League is setting up an arbitration board in an attempt to settle disputes between consumers and the appliance industry — that is, television industry—over services and other matters. It is expected that the board will deal with small appliances, home entertainment items and major appliances. The board will probably include consumer groups, suppliers and retailers.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): A very enlightened bunch in Manitoba.

Mr. B. Newman: In Metro Toronto, it is estimated that there are 475 people who have a licence to purchase parts for the repair of electronic equipment. The Metropolitan Toronto Television Service Association has

only 130 registered members in Metro Toronto and the total number of repairmen working on a full-time basis is approximately 260. However, there are many repairmen, who operate part-time from telephone answering services with no stated address, advertising a ridiculously low, bait-catching service charge. These people must be brought under control.

Electronic and TV servicing is now one of the most advanced technical and highly specialized fields. With microminiaturization, with the modular concept in electronic equipment, with integrated circuitry and with hand-held computers you can see the need for a bureau of repair services. Only the skilled and knowledgeable technician, using the most up-to-date, sophisticated electronic equipment, can ever begin to cope with the problems involving modern, advanced, transistorized, colour circuitry. The television set is a complex electronic equipment, and there are no standards for good or bad service.

The training and experience of a serviceman is extremely important. Even though associations in Metro Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, Windsor, and Sault Ste. Marie do have official codes of ethics, a small group of people who may be inadequately trained and unethical can cause a great furore in the press and damage the reputation of the entire television repair industry.

It's precisely for these reasons that some type of licensing is important. It would eliminate the fraudulent operator by making it impossible for him to obtain a licence.

Some of these operators, Mr. Speaker, use bait advertising, stating that TV repair calls will be $2 or $3. The average TV service call, including travelling time, takes about one hour. The cost of the car and the cost of having to give some free calls make it virtually impossible to make a profitable service call at that price.

This is used as a ploy to get into a customer's home. Once inside the home, charges are also made for additional labour, setups, adjustments and so forth, so the average bill is usually $10 to $15.

Mr. Speaker, the licensing of television repairmen is an excellent concept but it should not end there. People involved in the repairing of all household appliances should be licensed. Along with this a bureau of repair services should be set up to receive and investigate complaints.

A bureau of this type has been set up in California to fight against outright repair frauds and inept repairmen. With a staff of just 11, it is estimated to save California more than $15 million a year. It is financed by registration fees paid by repair dealers. Now California has legislated a similar bureau for auto repairs.

Some states have enacted legislation recently to follow the lines of the California setup. These states are Florida, Oregon, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts and Connecticut.

In conclusion I would like to bring to the attention of the members sitting here that the Metropolitan Toronto Television Service Association has brought up a series of 10 points on its golden rule or code of ethics. Surely, its members wouldn't have had these 10 different points if they didn't see a real problem in the television repair field.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the legislation introduced by the member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say that we support the legislation proposed by the member for Windsor-Walkerville because, in fact, it is considerably different from the legislation proposed by the member for Scarborough Centre! To support the legislation proposed by the member for Scarborough Centre, as it is drafted, wouldn't achieve the results already discussed by the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

With those two things clearly out of the way, I want to make it clear to you, sir, that we—well, I shouldn't say "we" since this is private members' hour—I have some doubts about whether Bill 19 achieves the results that the member for Scarborough Centre is, in fact, trying to achieve.

I was eagerly looking through the material which is available through the press clipping service for something to say about this particular bill because frankly I had little experience with fly-by-night television repair people. I have received few complaints from constituents about fly-by-night television repair people although I do understand that there are members in the Legislature who have received a goodly number of complaints. The matter does, in fact, exist as the member for Scarborough Centre has outlined it.

I don't doubt for a moment that there is need for some kind of legislation to protect the public against the crooked element in the business society. Whether it be here or whether it be in some other area of business, there is no question that into every area creep a few crooks. They give a black eye to all of the legitimate operators.

In this case we are dealing with, I suspect, a minority but nevertheless that minority is perhaps a minority which has to be dealt with. I do like the way the member for Windsor-Walkerville put the case about the protection bureau. I think that approach probably would achieve a better result.

I want to suggest to the member for Scarborough Centre—

Mr. Stokes: I wonder why he knows so much about crooks?

Mr. Deans: —to begin with, that I think in his section in which he defines both the repairmen and television repair service, he ought to have included in that section defining repairmen the requirement that any person operating in the trade be qualified to receive a licence under the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act so that we would have tied the two bills together.

The one bill should have said, I suspect, under section 1(R)(a), "Repairman means a person employed, appointed or authorized to give a television repair service who has obtained a certificate under the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act." Then we wouldn't leave it up to the director or leave it up to the industry to have the kind of grandfather clause that the member is talking about. Frankly, I think that if we are going to protect the public we have to protect them all the way. We have to ensure that the people who are going to deal with their products are, in fact, well qualified and trained to do that. Upon reading the Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act I came to the conclusion that it was a sort of circuitous thing; it was like a dog chasing its own tail. At the beginning we don't set out what a repairman is or how he becomes a repairman, and therefore you end up in the final analysis by saying, "If you don't comply with this Act, you may lose your bond." But to comply with the Act simply means that you have got to satisfy the director that you ought to be licensed. I think that it should go a little further than that.

I want to go even further than that though, to be quite frank with you. I don't think that it's only a matter of protecting the public against the fly-by-night repair people; I think it's a matter of protecting the public against shoddy work by the manufacturer. I'm absolutely convinced that in the area of television sets in particular, and in other appliances, there is some pretty slipshod work being done by some of the manufacturers—not nearly enough testing, not nearly enough care and attention paid—and people are buying inferior products as a result. There is no quality control.

I want to say that in looking for something to refer to in this regard, I came up with—

Mr. Stokes: A lot of it is planned obsolescence.

Mr. Deans: —a Consumer Report of late 1969, which is now perhaps somewhat out of date but it does point out the picture that I am going to make. It deals with the major television people—RCA, Zenith, Magnavox, Sylvania, Motorola, and on and on—and it's interesting to note that in the years 1964 to 1968 inclusive, only Zenith gained a rating of better than average in regard to the service required for the colour television sets which they produced, and that other names which many of us might tend to think are acceptable brands—RCA, for example—during the same period had a rating clearly poorer than average in this Consumer Report.

Let me look at two others that are of interest to us, which fall in this area: Admiral —which really doesn't apply too much any more—and Westinghouse simply qualified as being average throughout the entire period. We find that Zenith, Westinghouse, RCA, Sears-Silvertone—a lot of people buy Sears —were clearly poorer than average for 1964 through 1967, but better than average in 1968. So maybe they are improving.

What I am really saying is that there is not much point in having some kind of guarantee for the public against shoddy repair if the product they are getting in the first instance is shoddy. I think that we are going to have to put some responsibility on the manufacturers to guarantee their products, and we are going to have to write into the legislation some pretty firm guarantees for the kind of protection people can expect for the product they are buying, and the kind of service that they can expect.

I think maybe it's time that we put an onus of responsibility on the manufacturer to guarantee his product and to guarantee it against all defects. Not only that, not simply the one or two year guarantee on the picture

tube, I am talking about guaranteeing the workmanship of the product so that if, in fact, something does go wrong with it, it can be taken to that particular manufacturer's outlet and made to work.

I think that the manufacturer has to assume some of the responsibility for the shoddy workmanship that goes on by the repair people in the industry. I think that maybe we have to tie the repair portion of the industry into the manufacturing portion, so that when you take your set to an approved repairman that approved repairman is also approved by one of the major manufacturers which, in turn, will stand behind the repairs that are carried out.

So if you take your set in and you get it back—as the member for Scarborough Centre has pointed out—and it hasn't even been looked at, you can then go back to the manufacturer and you can say, "I took this to your approved outlet and that approved outlet didn't do the job." The manufacturer will then rescind the contract between the two and do away with that outlet altogether. Maybe that way we could really come to grips with who is doing the right thing for the people of the area.

I might say to the member for Scarborough Centre that I was interested to find, in looking for information, that he is the only noted authority on the subject, according to my own records. Much of what has been written about it was in fact written by him. Much of what has been said about it was said by him. I looked, rather eagerly, to try to find some other person in the business who may have had something to say about it, but other than a story by one Martin Dewey, written in April 1972, I could find no other person who had written any articles about the shoddy repair service in the television end of the appliance business.

This says something, because I would have thought, with a year and a half having gone by since the election and recognizing that this is a matter of considerable concern, that the member would have been able to influence the cabinet to the point where perhaps they would have shown their concern for the people of Ontario by introducing some kind of appropriate legislation to safeguard them from these shysters.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time is now up.

Mr. Deans: I just want to say that I am frankly disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the member was forced to bring it in. It shows what a lightweight he is in the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton.

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of the principles of Bills 18 and 19. It did seem to me that the principles of the bills had so commended themselves to all speakers that further comment would be redundant. However, the hon. member for Wentworth, in his usual polite manner, has nitpicked in a way that usually takes place in clause-by-clause examination. I did gather from his remarks that he was somewhat in favour of the principles and the intentions of the hon. member for Scarborough Centre—

Mr. Deans: They still don't satisfy me.

Mr. Handleman: —but he wouldn't even grudgingly admit that he found the principles to be somewhat attractive.

Mr. Speaker, many of us remember, however vaguely, the pre-television era; and it is a constant source of wonder to me that this modern miracle has become so insidious a fact of our daily lives. Its effect is soporific, and apparently when we are deprived of this pacifier we tend to panic.

Many of the people whose sets break down immediately let their fingers do the walking in the yellow pages to find somebody, anybody, who will come to do the job and put it back into its usual efficient state. They select a name at random, and once again God help the innocent consumer who does this. Unfortunately, I suppose, we cannot legislate against that kind of thing. The only thing we can do is try to make sure the person he picks at random is properly trained, licensed and bonded.

The consumer may be lucky. He may choose one of the majority that are honest and qualified. Despite the words of the member for Scarborough Centre, I honestly do believe the majority of the people in the repair field are both honest and qualified. But he may be one of those tragic unfortunates who falls into the claws of one of these rapacious vultures who find their way into any remunerative calling.

Hardly a day goes by that this doesn't happen, and we see the letters to Action Line in the daily newspaper. There was one in the Toronto Star today—

Mr. Stokes: The hon. member is being nastier to the member for Scarborough Centre than the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Handleman: I don't know whether the hon. member for Wentworth wrote that letter, but apparently somebody did buy a television set, went to have it repaired by the authorized repairman of the dealer, who is a reputable dealer, and found that the repairman had gone bankrupt. Fortunately, in this case the dealer was reputable; he stood behind the product and had it repaired at his own expense, even though the warranty had expired.

It is regrettable that the Action Line columnists seem to have more success in dealing with these problems than the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Clement) is willing to undertake. When I receive complaints of this nature I suggest that they call the local Action Line. The Ottawa Citizen, which was mentioned by the member for Scarborough Centre, did an excellent survey to show what happens. Otherwise I can only say: "Sorry, buddy boy, you should have dealt with a reputable dealer," which is not a very good way of dealing with complaints.

If my own friendly TV dealer is listening somewhere out there in the far beyond, I would like him to know I consider him to be one of the good ones, because I have had problems and I have had them dealt with very well.

This again is an interference in what we consider to be the basic rights of the free enterprise system—and I am one of those strong proponents of that particular system. But free enterprise will destroy itself if it fails to reject those wormy apples, the bad apples, from its midst. When the private sector will not move to protect the public, then the state must move in and do the job. This is exactly what the hon. member has proposed.

I urge the sponsor of the bill to examine the clauses—particularly of Bill 19—to ensure that, if the government should proceed in the direction indicated, the testing procedure for qualifications would be more than simply paper examinations. Quite frankly, I don't care if the man has paper qualifications; if he can fix my set, I'm satisfied.

I agree with the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville—TV repairmen are only one of a large number of appliance repairmen. And appliance repairs, I guess, are second, in complaints only to the automobile industry, which far exceeds the rest of them; and we may be dealing with that sometime later in the session.

Therefore, I urge all members to support this bill, and consider its future application to other trades at some later time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I will support this bill. The consensus is so in favour of it that I don't understand why television, now being about 25 or 30 years old—it sort of coincides with the Conservative Party being in power—why this matter hasn't been enacted before this. I have to wonder why my hon. friend for Scarborough Centre isn't listened to more than he is.

We had the same thing with respect to the regulations for dance studios that he brought in, and the health studios, where we all agreed that the principle was right. And I don't know why they don't listen to the member for Scarborough Centre; they'd be a great deal farther ahead if they did.

Mr. B. Newman: He can come on over here.

Mr. Givens: I want to agree with my friend from Wentworth on this business of quality control. It's a rare exception today when you get an appliance—or you even get a piece of furniture, let alone an appliance—which is the way it's represented; that it really works. And you find on examining the guarantees and the warranties that they're like the fine print on an insurance policy; they exempt themselves from more things than they include in the product.

Mr. Deans: Right!

Mr. Givens: And I agree that we'd have less of this chicanery and rapacity that the hon. member for Ottawa referred to if, ab initio, the product was what it was represented to be and that it really worked—instead of just being a piece of machinery thrown together with a lot of labels on it and without the quality control that it should have.

I get a little suspicious when everybody heaps scorn on this poor television repairman. Now I know some television repairmen and I don't know any one of them who drives an Eldorado Cadillac, or a Lin-

coln Continental, or a Chrysler Imperial—I don't want to leave anybody out—or a Mercedes-Benz; but I do know doctors who do and lawyers who do—

Mr. Stokes: Lawyers! Lawyers!

Mr. Givens: —and accountants who do and dentists who do. So where are these crooked television repairmen who are feeding off us like vultures, like parasites. Let's not over-exaggerate with hyperbole what is being done to the public; although where it exists this petty larceny is very convenient. I sometimes wonder whether some of the letters that are sent into Action Line and some of the complaints that you hear about are as valid as they could be.

However, this sort of thing does go on and I agree with the hon. member for Scarborough Centre that it would probably be highly desirable if a compensation fund were set up—such as the legal profession has—where people could be compensated in cases where they have been flummoxed. And I also agree with the idea of bonding.

This business of repairs has become a very big business. I've been reading an article—none of the speakers before me have mentioned this; they have mentioned everything else and it's hard to think of something to say now which hasn't been said before—but the repair business in electronic equipment today has become as big a business as the sales business of electronic equipment itself. We find that for every $50 a year that a person spends on an electric appliance, he spends an equal amount of money on the repair or the maintenance thereof. That's a fact. It's become a very big business.

Mr. Stokes: Planned obsolescence.

Mr. Givens: Well, planned obsolescence or whatever the member wants to call it.

A lot of people who are in the business are one-man operations and they can't afford the time or they can't afford the expenses involved in making repairs they should, or in maintenance.

Now there has been a certain amount of self-government on the part of associations which have tried to rid the industry of the taint of the accusations that are made, but they haven't really been able to be that effective. They've tried to raise standards and to establish standards; and they've got a complaint board and so on; but nothing can succeed as well as a proper piece of legislation that requires this to be done.

You've got to understand today, with respect to electronic equipment, and this not only applies to television sets but also to the hi-fi industry, the tuners and the speakers, that there are people who will go out and spend thousands of dollars on this kind of equipment. This equipment is regarded as not only soporific, as my friend from Ottawa referred to it, but also very expensive equipment, which they put in their homes and which requires servicing. This is the sort of thing that should be covered as well.

The main point that I want to make is that a television repairman who has the opportunity to enter your home, to enter your living room, your recreation room, or your bedroom for that matter, should have some form of credentials when he comes to the door and there is a latch-key kid at home, let's say, or somebody at home who can't take care of himself.

I don't mean from a physical standpoint, but I mean someone who doesn't know how to deal with this person. I don't like to see a meter reader come in without proper credentials. Consequently, a person who has this kind of access to your home, to your castle, should have to identify himself. He should have the proper kind of bonding and the proper kind of credentials to indicate that he is licensed.

As I have noted before, electronic equipment today is extremely expensive. It isn't getting any cheaper; it's getting more expensive all the time. I think it is more important for a person who is a TV repairman or an electronics repairman of any kind to have these kinds of credentials than it is for an electrician to have them; and electricians have had these credentials for many many years, as you know.

So we're plagued with an industry where there are a lot of amateurs and where the stuff is becoming more and more complex all the time. You see these advertisements stating that they can do it cheaply and that they will repair your set for $2 an hour. In the long run, we know, this is very expensive; because cheap is expensive. If they louse it up for you, it's going to cost you a heck of a lot more to fix it, repair it or to get a new set.

There are a lot of good schools today which we didn't have 20 or 25 years ago; hence there should be no reason why this kind of legislation cannot be invoked to good purposes. The untrained person is the unfair competitor as compared to the trained man. His charge may be lower, but as I said be-

fore in the long run it's going to be much more expensive.

Then there is this whole business of coming into your home; this business of access, which I talked about, when he comes in and he has this opportunity to tell you that the machine has to go down to the shop. You have to make a quick value judgement whether this fellow knows what he's talking about or whether he's taking you for a ride. Nobody should be in this position, where there's a possibility of victimization. This kind of person should not have the kind of permit and the kind of licence and the kind of bonding that we've been talking about.

So, all in all, having said everything that we've said, and based on all the circumstances of the case that we have described here today, I think the member for Scarborough Centre should go into his caucus and tell them that the Liberals agree with him, the NDP agree with him, and his own guys agree with him. For once and for all, he should have this epitaph on his career, whenever it may end, that he should be able to come in and say, "Everybody in the Legislature here agrees that Bill 18 and Bill 19 should get the assent and the consent of this House and should pass into the laws of this magnificent Province of "Onta -ari -ari -o."

Mr. R. Gisborn: (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, supporting the final comments of the member for York-Forest Hill, that we can support the principle involved in the two bills, we have to ask some questions of course. I'll be quite anxious to ask some questions of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities as to whether it will entertain this kind of legislation, since it lies in their hands at the present time.

We will also ask why the Ministry of Labour has never considered the certification of electronics repairmen and servicemen in the past. I recollect some debate in the select committee in this field. There seemed to be realistic reasons why they didn't feel it should be brought under the Act at that time, and I can't recollect just what they were. But I feel very doubtful as to whether this kind of legislation will correct the ills that we have talked about this afternoon. I think we have to go back to the point made by the member for Wentworth—we have to look at the manufacturer. That's where the biggest ills lie.

It is a sweet little deal, he electronics repair and service industry. Some call it a cute little, sweet little racket, the same as new car servicing and the life insurance industry. Legal rackets — that's what they are; the three of them—legal rackets.

I wonder, when I see the advertisements for the new model cars that come out in September prior to the year of designation. They tell us that with all the new options, the car is 100 per cent better than the car you had last year. It makes me wonder what I have been driving for the last 15 years! What kind of junk was I driving?

We get the same in the television industry. New models come out and they have better cabinets and they are all automatic and we will have none of those problems that we had before. One wonders what happened to the model one paid $1,000 for two years ago.

We have to look to the manufacturer. We have got to have some way through government, to say to the manufacturer: "You must be able to produce a more simplified machine in the electronics field, one for which people don't have to call the serviceman and pay anywhere from $12 to $15 per a service call to correct the horizontal distortion that happens."

I have a combination machine, my first colour machine. I have had it now for a year and a half. I paid $1,000 for it. It wasn't the most expensive. It was a combination—

Mr. Givens: Ouch.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Must be nice.

Mr. Gisborn: It was a combination of radio and stereo and the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: It was only the second machine I have had in my life. Not many can say that.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Rich NDP! Boy, they have got the money!

An hon. member: I paid $400 for mine.

Mr. Ruston: He must be related to the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman).

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Anyone can make a million in that party.

Mr. Drea: I would never have believed that.

Mr. Gisborn: I spend my money; I don't hoard it like a lot of people!

Mr. Givens: The member is worried about succession duties.

Mr. Gisborn: I feel that I have been entitled to two television sets in the last 30 years.

Anyway, with that set they told me that I would have guaranteed service for one year. I said: "What does that mean?" He said: "If anything goes wrong with it, we will come down and service it—keep it operating—and the manufacturer will pay for it." I said, "That's fine. If I have you down once a month, it means I have got a bum machine and at the end of the year, I have got a real bum machine and you haven't fixed it! You have kept repairing it so it will keep operating." That's exactly what happens.

Fortunately, with mine, he came once a month for 12 months and there has been very little wrong with it since. In the last five or six months it has been working pretty well.

We had trouble with horizontal distortion and we could not find the adjuster knob for horizontal correction. There isn't one on the machine. We had the coaxial man come in and he fixed the colour all right but he said: "You'll have to get the repairman to come down and fix that distortion in the horizontal."

We called them and they said: "There is one there but you are not supposed to touch it." My wife finally got a little disturbed and she reached over the back and played with five of them. She finally found the one and she has it all fixed now. But it is a serious point—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The hon. member better get his wife licensed!

Mr. Givens: Get her licensed.

Mr. Gisborn: They have a sign on the back of these machines that tells you: "Danger! Don't touch machine." Then in little print it says: "Unless you pull out the plug"—then you can play with it.

On most of the machines you have to have a serviceman in to put a station indicator bulb in. Some of them are fixed to the point where you can't take the front panel off to get that bulb in. It has to be done through the back.

These are manufacturers' faults. As was said by the hon. member previous to me, we should get away from picking on the serviceman who is carrying out a job. God knows, there are as many of those around as there are real estate offices; you know, there is a radio and TV serviceman in every block. You don't see as many for general appliances, like refrigerators, because they don't go wrong so quickly. It is the manufacturer we have to get after. He has to produce a better piece of goods and simplify it so that people can make the adjustments and get away from this racket and the high costs of servicing TVs.

Mr. Stokes: Very well said.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the House I would just like to reiterate what the business might be tomorrow. I am not certain at this point in time if the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations will be able to return, but at the moment the first item will be Item No. 2 on the order paper, then No. 9 and No. 4, with the possibility of us running through Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11; if it is otherwise, we will return to the first item of business.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, would the House leader indicate what he is doing about Wednesday? There was some quandary about this last week.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We will not be sitting Wednesday this week, but we will be sitting tomorrow evening and Thursday evening.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 2, 1973

Support for physiotherapy interns, statement by Mr. Potter 409

Reorganization of Ministry of Health, statement by Mr. Potter 409

Communications policy, statement by Mr. Carton 410

Status of health official, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Good, Mr. Lewis 412

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon 412

Alberta natural gas, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. MacDonald 413

Appointment of Perry Ryan to OHI claims review board, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 414

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 415

Mercury task force, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid 415

Demolition permits, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 415

Removal of aggregate from Lake Erie, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Paterson and Mr. Bullbrook 415

Four-day school week, question of Mr. Wells: Mrs. Scrivener 416

Tobacco insurance, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Spence 416

Flooding in Hamilton, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Gisborn 417

Dial-a-bus system for Toronto, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Singer, Mr. Givens, Mr. Timbrell 417

Cost of health unit opening ceremonies, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Germa 419

Furniture supplies to government, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Reid 419

Quetico Park, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Reid 420

Royal visit, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. J. R. Smith 421

Illegal use of drugs, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Haggerty 421

Acquisitions of forest products companies, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes 421

Meat boycott, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Riddell 422

Fatal Accidents Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 423

Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 423

Flood Control Commission Act, bill to establish, Mr. Burr, first reading 423

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Miller, Mr. Burr, Mr. Wardle 424

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wardle, agreed to 442

Private Members' Hour 442

Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act and Consumer Protection Act, bills to amend, on second reading, Mr. Drea, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Deans, Mr. Handleman, Mr. Givens, Mr. Gisborn 442

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 454

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 12



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from the adult day centre, YMHA, Toronto, the Olivet Day School of Islington, and St. Vincent de Paul Separate School of Toronto. In the west gallery we have students from Allan A. Martin Senior Public School of Mississauga, and Haliburton Highlands Secondary School of Haliburton.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

PRICES OF FOODSTUFFS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food concerning the role of the Food Council in the present situation regarding the complaints about the prices of foodstuffs, particularly meat and milk. Is the Food Council authorized and budgeted to prepare the information that consumers seem to lack or, at least, pay no attention to, concerning the costs of production? Is the minister prepared to provide financing to the food council for it to become more of an arm of public instruction and information in the present circumstances?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I can't answer the question as to whether or not it's budgeted for. I do know that there were one or two reports prepared, I believe, two years ago and which were published at a previous time of comparatively stronger meat prices than had prevailed before that time. I can't really tell the member whether or not it's in the budget; nor do I think the service is available from the council. The service is available from an agency in the city, as I understand it, which does consumer shopping from a prepared list and compares prices week by week.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister tell the House whether the campaign at present in the advertising pages of the newspapers, and put out by the Ontario Milk Marketing Board, is paid for by the farmers or is there a government budget to assist in that? A question associated with that, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister not agree that one of the serious shortcomings in this whole situation is a lack of information, or at least the consciousness of the information that should be available on the part of the consumer relating to some of these costs at the farm level?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The cost of providing the information service, to which my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition refers, from the Milk Marketing Board is paid for entirely by the producers.

That's an information service, a promotional programme of their own, paid for by deductions by themselves; and I understand that the processors contribute to some extent, although I am not sure what the percentage is. There may be some input there by the processors, but I'm not sure how much. But there's no government money involved in that.

The service to which my hon. friend refers that should be provided by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food on various matters is available and has been made available to the press on numerous occasions in one way or another, but has not been printed as provided. There could be a variety of reasons for that—and I'm not blaming the press or the news media.

I think perhaps the Beef Improvement Association wants very much to have an increase in the levy that will be deducted for each head of beef animal sold, and I'm quite certain a good deal of that will go toward promotional work to tell the association's side of the story of beef production.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary, would the minister indicate to us whether he believes that the Ontario Food Council could be refashioned in such a way as to become a prices review board in the field of food? And

does he have the jurisdiction and authority to make such a revision of the functions of the Food Council?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MEAT BOYCOTT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another question of the same minister on a related topic, Mr. Speaker: Would he not agree with the contention that has been put forward, that by farmers holding up shipments of beef animals and other meat animals because of the present boycott, the results of the circumstances might in fact force prices higher and thus defeat the intent of those who are boycotting the use of meat?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I'm not sure what my hon. friend means by that statement. It's really more of a statement than a question, as I determine it.

I think the producers of Canada, both in western Canada and eastern Canada, acted reasonably wisely in not moving livestock to the market in the usual numbers this week. For instance, Mr. Speaker, if I may beg your time for just a moment, last week, when the threatened boycott was about to take place in the United States, there was a backup of livestock on the markets in the United States that had ready access to the processing industry here. As a matter of fact, something like 1,500 head of cattle came in up to Friday afternoon, when the offices closed. How many came on Saturday and Sunday, I am not sure; but I wouldn't be surprised if it was a like number.

Those cattle came in from the United States because they were not held back on the farms in anticipation of the proposed boycott; in effect they had to be moved, and they came into Canada. I fancy that our livestock farmers, knowing that this was happening, felt they would be much wiser not to unload cattle in particular on the market in Canada until they determined what the effect of the proposed consumer boycott might be.

With hogs it's a somewhat different story, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure anyone who is associated with the hog market at all knows that hogs have to be moved at relatively the same weight and stage of finish, which doesn't quite pertain as far as cattle are concerned.

I would think that until there is some determination made as to what the market will absorb, our producers, as ordinarily good businesmen, likely will not rush or panic to dump cattle or livestock on the market.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A final supplementary, with your permission, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister not agree that his department and the Food Council, which is an emanation from it, have something more to do than just play a passive role in the provision of information, and that in fact this whole matter is based to some extent on misinformation that has been made available? For example, would the minister not agree—

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Leader of the Oposition is making a speech now—order, order. The comments are actually a statement rather than a question.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Supplementary question—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, the question was: Why doesn't he think that his ministry has something more than a passive role to play?

Mr. Speaker: Well, in view of the nature of the original question and the comments given, I think that the supplementary hardly constitutes another matter of urgent public importance. There can be no further supplementaries. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth on behalf of the New Democratic Party.

IMPORTATION OF WORKERS

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Does the Minister of Labour think it appropriate that a company in Ontario should be bringing into the province skilled workers when there are, in fact, workers of similar skill unemployed in the Province of Ontario and available for work?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will comment whether it is appropriate or not. I did receive a call yesterday from a lady whose husband was a millwright. As you know, these people are here because of a federal

permit through the Manpower Department, so I don't think there is anything coming under our department that we could do.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Doesn't the minister feel it appropriate that he should make representation to the federal government to stop it bringing in employees to take the jobs of Canadian workers in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would be only too glad, Mr. Speaker, to make representation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The member should have stopped and thought that one out.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Wentworth had a supplementary question.

Mr. Deans: Yes, I did.

Mr. Speaker: I will permit one supplementary.

Mr. Deans: I want to ask the minister whether he is aware that, in fact, these people are being brought in on a short-term contract to do one particular job only, and that that job could well be done by members of a union in the Province of Ontario who have many unemployed workers on their rolls?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I am really not as familiar as I would like to be with the case. I will look into it, but surely my hon. friend wouldn't want me to discriminate in any way, shape or form. I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth. No further supplementaries.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I think we have pursued it sufficiently.

Mr. Renwick: —after all, there are jobs for people involved in it, so we can't question it in the Legislature beyond the point that the Speaker decides.

Mr. Speaker: We reviewed it sufficiently for the question period. The hon. member for Wentworth.

THREATENED ARMSTRONG EPIDEMIC

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Has the Minister of the Environment received any communication from the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) with regard to work necessarily to be undertaken in the area of Armstrong in order to avert an epidemic which appears to be in the making in that area?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there has been some problem about services in Armstrong and a number of other small northern communities. I have had no communication with the Minister of Health on this specific matter in recent days or months. I will be delighted to inquire into this.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that there is a danger of an epidemic because of the low quality of water in the area, as a result of contamination by the CNR in allowing fuel oil to escape and other matter from ground sources? Is the minister aware that the Ministry of Health has sent inspectors in and said that something must be done to avert an epidemic? In view of that, what will his ministry do to avert such an epidemic?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware that any contamination of recent origin was likely to cause an epidemic. I assume that this would be surface water runoff or a discharge of untreated sewage rather than diesel fuel oil, which is certainly not desirable in this district. It is not likely, to my mind, to cause any kind of an epidemic but, as I say, I will proceed with this matter.

It could well be, as perhaps the hon. member is aware, that the Minister of Health has the power to require remedial work to water and sewage just as the Minister of the Environment has for a different reason. It may well be that the Minister of Health is investigating to see whether such an order should be made. I will check into the matter and inform the hon. member.

Mr. Stokes: A final supplementary: Is the minister not aware that this is unorganized territory? Therefore there is no local presence that can take matters in hand and so we are employing the assistance of the ministry.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question previously asked.

FLOODING IN HAMILTON

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, in my absence yesterday a question was asked of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence)—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. On a point of order?

Mrs. Campbell: Is it not possible, Mr. Speaker, for the minister to speak so that we can hear him over here?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will be delighted to try harder, Mr. Speaker. At any rate, as I say, yesterday the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Gisborn) asked a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development as follows:

> In view of the serious flooding affecting the function of septic tanks on Beach Blvd., Hamilton, commonly known as the beach strip, would the minister have his officials of the water resources division immediately contact and co-operate with the corporation of the city of Hamilton in providing engineering and financial assistance to protect the health of the 1,000 residents involved in these homes?

The provincial secretary said, "Yes, Mr. Speaker, certainly with respect to the engineering; I can't be as categorical with regard to financial assistance."

I would advise the hon. member that a shoreline survey is being conducted by officials of my ministry's private waste and water management branch.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Might I ask the hon. minister if his reply constitutes all of those sheets? If it does, it should be a ministerial statement.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am simply enlarging on the answer given by the provincial secretary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If it is a lengthy reply I am sure the hon. minister realizes it should have been given in the ministerial statements.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps one minute, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right, one minute.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): When will the ministers learn the difference between a statement and an answer?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member never will, that's for sure

Hon. Mr. Auld: In all areas in southwestern Ontario where private sewage disposal systems have been seriously affected by the high levels of the Great Lakes, a study began on March 17 and is expected to be completed by the middle of this month. There are some 700 to 800 homes in the Hamilton Beach area on septic systems. A number of these systems have been damaged and no longer function as a result of the high water level.

Members of our private waste and water management branch are available to residents of the area and will provide engineering advice in co-operation with the local health unit. However, it appears that it is just not possible to solve individual problems in this area except by the installation of holding tanks. Discussions are being held between officials of the city of Hamilton and the local medical officer of health to determine the best course of action.

Mr. Speaker: When I called on the hon. minister I did not intend to cut the hon. member for Wentworth off quite as quickly as I did. He should have another question.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Is the minister aware that, in expert opinion, Lake Ontario's level will rise between 6 and 9 in. before July this year? Does he realize that that, just by the lake level increase alone, will mean severe flooding for a great many people along the shore of Lake Ontario? Will he alter his policy to allow those people to take preventive measures now, using the moneys available from the Province of Ontario which, up to now, have been available only through the municipalities? I mean the 80-20 arrangement.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, I think the point is a very serious one but I have not yet found categorical examples where municipalities have refused to act within that formula. If it turns out that we have any substantial number of municipalities which, for whatever reason, do not concern themselves with their own residents, I expect we will simply have to rethink the 80-20 arrangement and see whether

or not some other initiating group could supply the 20 per cent. The difficulty is that in many of these cases the legal title to the roads and works is in the municipality itself.

Mr. Deans: Is that for private residential or what?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Private residential homes don't fall within that formula.

Mr. Deans: What is the formula?

May I ask one supplementary question. Isn't it a fact that the emergency diking mentioned last evening by the minister's colleague from Lincoln (Mr. Welch), which does fall within the 80-20 formula, is applicable to private homes?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, full-time residential private homes. So in those cases—I've had a couple of calls—I hope that we can initiate municipal activity. If not, we'll simply have to see if there is some way of short-circuiting that programme. The member will just have to leave it until we see how serious it is.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question: What possible difference does it make who puts up the 20 per cent? Surely if there are citizens who have the 20 per cent to put up and want to safeguard their properties, it should make no difference to the ministry whether that money comes directly from them or out of municipal coffers.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Except from the administrative point of view, I think I'd have to agree. From the administrative point of view, it was put together as a package, if the member will recall. If that particular form or part of the package has to be isolated, I can only repeat what I said earlier, we'll have to assess its severity and see if we can develop a way around it.

Mr. Deans: Don't wait until they are flooded out, please.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

LABOUR DISPUTE AT DAAL PLASTICS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. In light of the recent unsuccessful mediation between Daal Plastics in Windsor and Local 195, and in light of the fact that Daal Plastics had signified their intention of closing their operation in Windsor, will the minister attempt to get the two parties involved together in an attempt to resolve the issue?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I will take this question under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

OIL SPILL IN KAMINISTIKWIA RIVER

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of the Environment: Could the minister tell this House if his ministry has yet discovered the source of the 30,000-gallon oil spill in the Kaministikwia River in Thunder Bay?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I haven't a final report on this. As I recall, the CPR have been doing some alterations and removing of buildings and wharves adjacent to their yards on the Kaministikwia River. Apparently this spill came to light when some of the structures were removed.

What we aren't aware of is whether it has been leaking for some time or it is just a leak caused by the demolition of some of these works. Further inquiries and investigation are going on at the moment, as I understand it, to see if we can locate (a) the source, and (b) the length of time that this oil has been escaping. As I recall, it is diesel fuel oil which is very difficult to get out of the river.

Mr. Stokes: Surely they should know where 30,000 gallons of oil came from.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think the estimate of 30,000 gallons is just that. That may or may not be an accurate figure.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary. The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: As one of the minister's regional engineers has been quoted in the press in Thunder Bay as saying that the escape—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please direct his question?

Mr. Foulds: —has been taking place for 20 years, does the minister not agree that his report should be up to date? What has taken the ministry so long to determine the source if it has been going on for 20 years?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, no one was aware that it was going on until very recently.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

SCHOOL BUDGETS

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Education.

In view of the very strong protest expressed by some 7,000 ratepayers and home and school members in the borough of North York yesterday, in relation to the very difficult budgeting situation in which the North York Board of Education finds itself—namely, that some $6 million will have to be cut from their estimates which will involve the firing or letting go of 600 teachers—is the Minister of Education prepared to do anything for the borough of North York to allow it to conduct a reasonable education system within the confines of that borough?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I think I should say first that if the hon. member assumes that the 7,000 people who are reported as being at those meetings were all opposed to the ceilings, of course this is a false assumption.

Mr. Singer: Well, at the meeting I was at, 500 were opposed.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Seven thousands people attended, but I have received phone calls from people who indicated that some kind of a snow job was attempted on the people there, intelligent adults.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The fact of the matter is that within the ceilings that are presently available it is possible to have an adequate quality education system.

Mr. Cassidy: It is always better than Tanganyika.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But, as the hon. member knows, I am meeting today with the Metropolitan Toronto school boards and some other school boards; I am going to listen to what they have to say, and I'll have a few things to say after that meeting.

Mr. Cassidy: We are still ahead of Alabama as well.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, does the minister believe it is an advance in the educational system if the North York Board of Education has to let go 600 teachers who are already hired?

An hon. member: It may very well be.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would say that I have never seen, and I don't think any of my staff have ever seen, a definite concrete 1973 school board budget for any of the Metropolitan Toronto school boards. It is all talk at this point in time.

Mr. Singer: The minister will see it!

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: I'll permit one supplementary.

Mr. Deacon: Would the minister consider making the grants unconditional to the North York board and leaving to the discretion of the board and local autonomy the decision as to how much they might wish to raise locally and spend, above the minister's estimate of what is required?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, that is the present policy of this government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

SUDBURY HOUSING INVESTIGATION

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that no ministry of the government has involved itself in the affairs of the Ross A. Shouldice subdivision in Chelmsford, and since this lack of involvement by the government has led to the absurdity of a $272,800 lawsuit against individual homeowners, would the Provincial Secretary for Justice direct that a full inquiry be held into the affairs in the subdivision and, further, that the terms of reference for such an inquiry include the fundraising activities of Ross Shouldice for the Conservative Party of Ontario?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to discuss the hon. member's question with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Government Services has the answer to a question previously asked.

FURNITURE SUPPLIES TO GOVERNMENT

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid) requested information concerning a statement on page 49 of the Provincial Auditor's report dealing with the purchase of furniture and equipment from one supplier and its affiliated companies.

Mr. Speaker, this was general comment in the auditor's report and was not specifically directed, I believe, at any ministry. The auditor certainly has not reported to me his findings relating to this matter.

I can only suggest that if the hon. member desires to pursue this matter further and requests more information on the subject, he can probably arrange to have the auditor provide the information at a meeting of the public accounts committee. I can only inform him of what I am aware of. I have no information from the auditor, and there's been no report to me relating to anything pertaining to my ministry. Whether this refers to my ministry or not, I cannot say.

I might inform the hon. member that Management Board recently approved a new furniture standards catalogue; this, together with our improved purchasing procedures, I hope, will go a long way toward avoiding any possibility of irregularities in the purchase of furniture in the future. This is a guideline catalogue to create a standard, and all purchases are to be made by public tender. I have a copy of the catalogue here which I will be glad to send over to the hon. member.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may: Has the minister ter made any attempt to find out why one company seems to have a monopoly in supplying furniture and equipment to the government? Has the minister made any attempt to contact the Provincial Auditor to find out what he meant when he said they had discovered some things of interest? Thirdly, does the minister not feel that one company being in a position to supply this kind of furniture and equipment, is not leaving the old system open to some kind of graft and corruption, and indeed this seems to be what the auditor's hinting at?

Hon. Mr. Snow: There are three or four questions there, I believe, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to remember them. First of all, yes, I did contact the Provincial Auditor, but was not able to get any additional information regarding this particular paragraph as it apparently did not particularly pertain to my ministry and is something that will be dealt with at the public accounts committee.

The other statements or suggestions made by the hon. member are completely erroneous, because this is one of the many suppliers of equipment, or office furniture. I read that paragraph several times and there is nothing to suggest that this company is the one and only supplier by any means.

Mr. Reid: The auditor's wrong then? The auditor's statement—

Hon. Mr. Snow: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, the auditor's statement in no way says that this is the one and only supplier. It says that it is one supplier and its affiliates. I can only speak regarding the last 13 or 14 months since I've been minister, but when we call tenders for the purchase of furniture it is normal that we may get eight, 10 or 12 bids for the supply of most items of furniture and the contracts are invariably spread around, because it's very seldom that one firm would be low bidder on numerous contracts.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: I think anything further on this would be superfluous.

The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

STUDENT AWARDS PROGRAMME

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. How much money is at present owed on the student awards programme and how much of this money does the government expect to recover?

Mr. Foulds: Read the morning Globe and Mail.

Mr. Gaunt: I read it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Then he has the answer.

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, obviously I can't give the figures offhand, but I'd be glad to report to the hon. member tomorrow.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Two hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce has a supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: In Saturday's edition of the London Free Press it was indicated that 35 per cent of this money would be recovered—

Mr. Speaker: This, of course, is a statement. Is there a question?

Mr. Gaunt: I'm coming to my question.

Mr. Speaker: The question should be first.

Mr. Gaunt: Does the Speaker want my question first? I'll rephrase it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has the privilege of asking a question, not making a statement.

Mr. Gaunt: Is that an accurate estimate?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Would the hon. member rephrase his question, please?

Mr. Gaunt: Is a 35 per cent recovery rate of that money owing on the student awards programme an accurate estimate?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I hope we'll do much better than that.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I will permit the member's supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the supplementary is this: Does the minister realize that many of the collections that he is attemping to get under way and the actions that he is attempting to take in court are, in fact, past the six-year limitation period under our laws and that he may well be out of time, because according to reports some of these loans are in default for seven years?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, the member referred to the money we are collecting. I presume he is talking about the government, through the collection agency.

Mr. Roy: Right.

Hon. Mr. McNie: I am aware of the fact that a great many of these go back to the very early days when the provincial government, not the federal government, was making loans and I would hardly think that they were not collectable for that reason. But I'll be interested in finding out if that's so. I would think that Mr. Spence would have made note of this in his very, very careful analysis of the budget.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain have a question?

GRANT TO McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Would the minister please explain how, in view of the cutbacks, a grant of half a million dollars has been appropriated to McMaster University for the renovation of Hamilton Hall to include, according to the McMaster News, a day hotel, which will be a place where students may shower or lie down and rest briefly during the day—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question? This is a statement.

Mr. J. R. Smith: —and which has previously not been available for students living off campus, and for the relocation of the two pubs on the university as well as other commercial space?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I can say with absolute certainty that there are no grants to McMaster University for funds to build the facilities he's talking about under the current moratorium.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

GOVERNMENT ACTION AGAINST DOW CHEMICAL

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment regarding the Ontario government's suit, announced in March, 1971, against Dow on behalf of the fishermen. Is it true that the government has not yet filed suit?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should properly direct that question to the Attorney General (Mr. Bales), who is in charge of the legal action. I know that there has been some delay because counsel for the province—

Mr. Singer: Yes, there has been.

Mr. Cassidy: Some delay! It is two years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —was appointed to the bench by the government of Canada and a new counsel had to be briefed. But perhaps the Attorney General could give the hon. members—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): What is the policy?

Mr. Cassidy: What did they give to the government's campaign funds?

Mr. Singer: We'll fix 'em.

Mr. Cassidy: How much did Dow contribute?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —a detailed statement as to where the action stands at the moment.

Mr. Singer: Yes, that will be interesting.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, may I redirect that question?

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the complete response?

Mr. Burr: May I redirect the question to the Attorney General?

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Mr. Singer: Try the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I'm sorry I couldn't hear the hon. member. Perhaps he'd like to take the floor and repeat what he said.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear myself. I think I was asking for permission to redirect the question to the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Mr. Good: Let's hear from him.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister for the Environment has indicated, there has been some problem as far as counsel is concerned.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As the hon. members may now know, one Charles Dubin, QC, was engaged by the government to prosecute its case against Dow.

Mr. Singer: Prosecute the case? Is it a criminal charge or a civil action?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I'm sorry, to carry the action against the defendant Dow. Certain proceedings have been taken.

Mr. Singer: That is better.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Certain motions and hearings have been held. Then, as the hon. members know, Mr. Dubin was appointed to the bench and, therefore, had to resign that particular assignment. Subsequent to that, it again was necessary to engage counsel, as the hon. members appreciate. It was important that the Attorney General retain good counsel. After some weeks of delay we have now—

Mr. Singer: Oh, of course! It certainly needs good counsel for that case.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The minister means if he waits long enough the problem will go away.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, that isn't our intention, unless the member means the mercury. We have now engaged John Robinette who, I think the hon. members will agree, is a good counsel.

Mr. Deans: Isn't he in line for a judgeship?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The matter is now in good hands and is proceeding.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the Provincial Secretary for Justice tell us if there has been a statement of claim filed and served? Has there been a statement of defence filed and served?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I cannot answer that question. That question should be referred to the Attorney General, but I think there has been.

Mr. Singer: No, of course not. I don't expect that. It would be too much.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think there has been.

Mr. Singer: Oh, the minister thinks so.

Mr. Reid: Would the minister find out for us?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London North.

PAY INCREASE FOR CORONERS

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Solicitor General and involves the coroners.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Walker: Could the Solicitor General inform us when the coroners will get a raise in pay?

Mr. Roy: An increase for the coroners?

Mr. Foulds: There is going to be an inquest into it.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it had been my hope that when the new Act is proclaimed in the very near future, at the same time the regulations would contain a change in the fee schedule. However, in light of the financial constraints which have been imposed upon many sectors of provincial activity, this will not be possible. It's a matter of regret to me, because I must in all honesty say that the coroners have made out an extremely good case. It has been some considerable number of years since they have had any adjustment.

As soon as there is any indication that financial constraints are over, it is my intention, in any event, I assure the hon. member, to pursue the matter because within the ministry the long overdue increase has high priority. I appreciate the fact that a number of—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Are you calling the members of the opposition to order, Mr. Speaker?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would hope that in the meantime the coroners would carry on their traditional excellent service.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I had doubts that the original question was one of urgent public importance. Therefore I shall not allow any supplementaries.

The member for Essex South.

ODC LOANS QUALIFICATIONS

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): A question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Is the minister planning to make changes in the terms of reference of the qualifications for Ontario Development Corp. loans to include basic food canning and packaging for firms in that business? Secondly, would the minister not agree, at a time when there should possibly be some levelling in the escalating cost of foods, that a change of this nature would be beneficial both to the farmers and to the public in general?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the first question, the terms of reference are being reviewed at the moment by the Ontario Development Corp. They will be broadened considerably to take into account all industries which are either operating in the province at the moment or would like to operate in the province. The guidelines and the new policies will be brought to this House, I would hope, within the next week or two so that the House will be completely informed of the extensive changes that we are making to both Ontario and Northern Ontario Development Corp.

Mr. Paterson: Could I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker? Has the ministry been in touch with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food specifically in relation to that particular industry?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, a simple answer to that is yes, we have.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

PENALTY FOR MISSING ASSESSMENT DEADLINE

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Revenue: Is the minister planning an amendment to the Assessment Act to provide a penalty for telephone and telegraph companies which fail to meet the March 1 deadline for reporting their gross receipts to the assessment commission of each municipality in which the company does business?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, if, as and when an amendment is decided upon by the government, the member and all the members of this House, of course, will be informed in due course.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's a matter of government policy. When government policy is made on this matter this House will be first to know.

Mr. Reid: The minister forgot his last line.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Doesn't the minister recognize the need for a change?

Mr. Young: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Surely the minister understands the pressing need of this so that municipalities can set their tax rates for the current year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I assure the hon. member that whatever is required in this respect will be attended to.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question to the minister: What conceivable excuse was there for not putting in a penalty in the first instance? Why this kindness in certain areas?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question, Mr. Speaker, is a rhetorical question. I don't know how to answer it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, no!

Mr. Good: The minister hasn't got a clue what it's all about.

An hon. member: That's terrible.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

POLICE SEIZURE OF COMPANY'S BOOKS

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Is the minister aware of why the police recently seized the records and books of Disney Display with which, according to the public accounts, his ministry did over 90 per cent of its display business last year?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of it but I'll take the question under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Natural Resources, who isn't quite out of the chamber yet.

Mr. Ferrier: Come on back!

ALLEGED USE OF STRIKEBREAKERS

Mr. Bounsall: Will the Minister of Natural Resources explain why the Ontario provincial parks folder was folded last week by strikebreakers at Brooker Trade Bindery, especially since he assured Mr. Charles Buhler, the president of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, in a letter last May that he, the minister, would, in placing orders in the future through his ministry or through subcontractors, take into account the strike situation at that firm?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I don't have the details of that particular matter before me, but I will get them and will report to the House and to the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

UNIFORM BUILDING AND FIRE CODES

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, whom we welcome back today. After so many years of study, does the minister not intend to introduce into this session a uniform building code and a uniform fire code to apply to all the municipalities across the province; and if not why not?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Well firstly, I thank the member for his kind words of welcome. I didn't realize he missed me that much.

Mr. Givens: We missed the minister.

An hon. member: He hasn't been here that much.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Secondly, the matter is currently before the municipal liaison committee for advice. Because of the very nature of the proposed legislation it must be co-ordinated with the municipalities across the province.

Mr. Singer: It then goes to a task force, then a select committee.

Hon. Mr. Clement: At the same time, I am aware that the federal government has made mention in the press of introducing legislation of a similar nature across Canada. However, I do hope to have our legislation ready for introduction into the House this session.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What—the board or the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Clement: The legislation.

Mr. Speaker: We have about 50 seconds left. The hon. member for High Park.

REQUEST FOR INTERPOL HELP

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Solicitor General: In view of the fact that Mr. J. J. Richards, the former Conservative candidate in Riverdale, has now fled from Canada after being caught by the Toronto police carrying out a massive vote fraud, will the minister request the police to ask Interpol to locate and pick up his associate?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, this is a police matter and I have no doubt that the police are giving it the attention it deserves.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is not pushing the matter with vigour, I take it.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Maeck, from the standing regulations committee, presented the committee's report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends to the Legislature that, in view of the committee's limited statutory power, regulations be referred to the committee from time to time for review and examination of their merits.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, is it possible to offer an amendment to that report at this time?

Mr. Speaker: There is no motion before the House, I would point out to the hon. member.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the report, if I might.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder—order please!

There seem to be a great number of conversations taking place in the chamber which makes it very difficult to hear the hon. members who are attempting to address the Chair.

Perhaps we could have a little more silence, please!

The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, the regulations committee met this morning, and at the meeting of the committee a decision was reached that by and large the terms of reference for that committee are without meaning, because all we can do is determine whether the regulations that are set forth are four-square within the terms set out by the Regulations Act.

We felt that there is very little for us to do in that respect, because the legal brains of the government have already determined that, and in their wisdom they have said that they are within those terms. Mr. Speaker, we felt that we should have something more to do than simply make that determination. So we would like, as the words say, to have the House refer to us regulations to be discussed on their merits rather than simply on their technicality.

However, during the discussion in the committee the majority of the committee felt that this resolution, this report, should be placed before the House; but my feeling, and the feeling of some of us, is that unless that business is referred to the House prior to gazetting it is again an exercise in futility.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Young: So our feeling is, and we want to register that feeling, that unless the regulations are referred to the committee before they appear in the Gazette, it is useless, because once they appear in the Gazette they are regulations.

The Gazette goes out, and the authorities concerned with enforcing those regulations know about them and start the wheels in motion to enforce them as they appear in the Gazette. After that it is useless for us to discuss them.

So I register that protest, Mr. Speaker, and point out to the House that unless this change is made it is a useless exercise for the committee.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, the comments of the hon. member are entirely out of order at this time. There is nothing out of order in connection with the proceedings in the House.

I have permitted him to make his point, but there is no motion before the House so there can be no debate.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that commencing tomorrow and until further order the House will not sit in the chamber on Wednesdays, such Wednesdays being reserved for meetings of the standing and select committees.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

COMPANIA SHELL DE VENEZUELA LTD. ACT

Mr. MacBeth moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Compañia Shell de Venezuela Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BEDS OF NAVIGABLE WATERS ACT

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Beds of Navigable Waters Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide a uniform interpretation of the deeds of property bounded by navigable waters, so that the high water mark shall be deemed to be the boundary of such property.

APPRENTICESHIP AND TRADESMEN'S QUALIFICATION ACT

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for the revocation of a motor mechanic's certificate when the person holding that certificate is found guilty of falsifying the certificate of mechanical fitness under section 58 of the Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

CONSUMER PROTECTION BUREAU ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves second reading of Bill 9, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Bureau Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I'm glad to see this bill brought in to confirm the action taken last year to shift this responsibility to the Ministry of Community and Social Services. In fact, even the title of the bill is misleading. It's been more of a counselling service with regard to consumer credit in the past. Certainly, by bringing it into the area of the other department this bill, in effect, cancels the present Act and makes a lot of sense. We support the bill.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, we have no comment on the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill? The minister.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I'm grateful to both opposition members who've spoken. The legislation does speak for itself and I don't think I have any other comments to add at this time. We'll transfer it, as has been pointed out, to the Ministry of Community and Social Services, and it will be a counselling service under this legislation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

COLLECTION AGENCIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves second reading of Bill 10, An Act to amend the Collection Agencies Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, again we support this bill bringing the credit unions under this legislation. It makes sense under the present approach to collection agencies in this province.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, we agree with the exception of the credit unions from the provision of the Collection Agencies Act.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to enter the debate? The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I have no particular comment except to expedite the work of the House and in committee. I notice two entities are excluded from the operations of the collection agencies—that is the business of collecting debts. Has it been, I wonder, up to this time deemed that the credit unions do fall within the scope and dimensions of the Act? As I read the section involved, there are numerous exclusions to the bill, ranging from lawyers to bankers; up to this time, have the credit unions thought themselves to be compromised or, in some way, caught within the terms of the Act?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to enter the debate?

The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that while I endorse the principle, anything dealing with any type of counselling for credit purposes or what we used to call debt counselling services in this province, has been treated with monumental disinterest by this government.

I would certainly hope that now this procedure is being put into the appropriate ministry—which, as a matter of fact, is the third one it has been in since 1967—the minister who is receiving these powers for the first time will take a sympathetic interest in the problems faced by organizations, both volunteer and professional, trying to do something about what is becoming a very imposing problem in our society.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have any comments?

Hon. Mr. Clement: The only comment I have with reference to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, is related to the inquiry raised by the hon. member for Lakeshore. I understand that a number of credit unions do their own collecting rather than place it in the hands of a collection bureau or a solicitor; representations were made to this effect, and accordingly this amendment was introduced into the House in this form. That's the only explanation that I am aware of.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

SECURITIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves second reading of Bill 15, An Act to amend the Securities Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, in principle we support this bill, because in effect it ensures that an order of the director stands, even though an appeal is lodged. It protects the public from a practice that the director might object to and may order ceased; in other words, the director's power continues to be effective until such time as an appeal is heard and the order is confirmed or reversed.

I do want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to object to the present powers and role of the Securities Commission in regard to being the investigator, being the one that calls evidence, the holding of non-public hearings, and being in the position of being judge—

Mr. Renwick: Order.

Mr. Speaker: I am attempting to get a copy of the bill so I can determine in fact if it is in order.

Mr. Deacon: —and executioner of all actions within this industry. It is the only place in this province where we seem to ignore simple justice. And I hope that this minister, when he confers powers like this upon the director, will also recognize the tremendous conflict of interest that prevails in the Securities Commission as it is now structured.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, this is a reversal of the normal procedure in most court proceedings which would indicate that when a matter is under appeal, the person continues free to carry on the activity which is the subject matter of the appeal. Indeed, we have a very clear example of that at the present time in Ross and the registrar of motor vehicles, where the Ministry of Transportation and Communications still acts as though that section of the Highway Traffic Act were in full force and suspends licences.

I point this out because it is a substantial change in procedure, even though there is added to this provision, that the decision will come into effect when it is made regardless of whether a review or appeal is taken from it, an extra step where that decision can be appealed itself and perhaps a reversal obtained of the decision.

Now it must be that there was a particular evil at which the minister wished to cure when he introduced this legislation. I think we should have a very considered statement by the minister before we reverse such an accepted practice in other judicial proceedings.

One can readily make the point that the member for York Centre has made: "Oh well, here's a situation where the public good requires that the decision of the director come immediately into force and remain in force, regardless of the fact that a review or appeal is taken, unless that question itself is decided by an intermediate body." We are obviously proliferating the procedures which

now have to be taken by any person who is affected by a decision of the director.

I perhaps thought when I first read the bill that it did seem to make sense, that there was a public interest involved in it and that the private interest must give way to it. But there are many questions—legitimate questions—of law and fact which arise, leading to a decision of a director which can, in fact, be in good faith disputed. Perhaps this should not be prohibited during the period that the matter is under review.

I suppose that the commission has brought to the attention of the minister certain specific glaring instances where the device of asking for a review or an appeal was used for the purpose of abusing the public interest. If that was so and the minister so states, we can see no difficulty in agreeing with the principle that is set out in the bill. But in the absence of such a statement, it would appear to us that the power of the director, being as broadly stated as it is in the statute, would appear to us not to require that it be of that overwhelming weight that the moment the decision is made that that decision should stand, regardless of whether or not an appeal is taken from it.

I again emphasize that the minister has provided that the order will remain in effect and that decision can be stayed by a proper application, but the reversal of a principle such as that cannot necessarily be answered by adding an additional appeal procedure. I hope the minister, when he speaks to this bill, would direct his statement to the point which I have raised about it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that in matters of securities legislation, particularly when the crunch comes and movement must be made with respect to stop orders, or with respect to the operation of the market itself in particular shares, that some immediacy or impact would be found, as has in the past been found necessary. Up to a point it would seem again, with the peculiarities of the exchange and with the securities market, that hasn't been applicable and it was found necessary and beneficial to introduce such a motivation into the present legislation.

I accord with my colleague in wanting that fact affirmed. What other reason would there be for the legislation itself?

I note that it is rendered somewhat innocuous by the very fact that the commission itself, overriding the director, or entering into the picture by way of an application, has the power to grant the stay. That's fairly close to the chest.

Of course, if that was exercised arbitrarily in any way, they would still be subject to the procedures of the civil rights legislation we passed in this House and to review again by the divisional court.

Then, on the second level of the appeal, in section 2 of this legislation, if the commission itself won't move, then a direct move may be made by way of an application or motion before the divisional court to grant this stay in certain circumstances.

I notice that the legislation has a certain exquisiteness about it, in portending against possible difficulties that may arise. I want to commend the minister and the drafters of the legislation in making specific reference and note of the changes and circumstances in an ongoing relationship with respect to the marketing of shares; it may be halted, or the commission may grant a stay and permit the ongoing relationship with the public. But a slight alteration in the motivation, in the way it is proceeded with, in the context of the shareholdings—any number of things can arise—and the commission then may re-enter the picture, place the stop order on by saying there has been a reorientation of the situation. First of all, perhaps new material has been supplied which gives ground for second thought in the reimposition of the stay—or rather the imposition of the order as it was originally—or there is sufficient alteration in circumstances that would bring about and make necessary, make highly beneficial to the public, the imposition of an order which would be a brand new order.

And even if the matter were before the divisional court, an unscrupulous operator would be stopped if he were seeking to masquerade under the fact that he had obtained a stay. He would nevertheless be hit by the new order that would some into effect and act as a prohibitive move to the marketing of these shares.

Mr. Speaker: Any other member wish to participate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, the bill is indeed an important one and I was hopeful that we could go right through and have it become effective as soon as possible. The problems are very obvious as to what could occur if this legislation does not have third reading and royal assent almost immediately.

As I understand the Statutory Powers Procedure Act, the Securities Commission was exempt from the provisions of that Act until April 17, 1973; and I refer my learned colleagues to section 25, subsection 1 of the Statutory Power Act of 1971, which reads as follows:

> Unless it is expressly provided to the contrary in the Act under which the proceedings arise, an appeal from a decision of a tribunal to a court or other appellate tribunal operates as a stay in the matter, except where the tribunal or the court, or other body to which the appeal is taken, otherwise orders.

This requirement, Mr. Speaker, would effectively frustrate the Ontario Securities Commission on many occasions, since through launching an appeal, a cease trading order, for example, would be automatically stayed until such time as the appeal was heard.

In the interests of the public, this situation cannot be allowed to continue; because the person making the appeal—the appellant—may well not intend to proceed to perfect his appeal, but might take advantage of this as a method of continuing to offer in the market shares which are not in the best interests of the public; and in fact, it may be almost a fraud they are attempting to practise on the public, which gave rise to the original hearing.

That is the rationale behind it. As I understand the Statutory Powers Procedure Act, that is why we must have this particular amendment. Certain safeguards have been built in and I am sure my friends—they have already made mention of them—agree with those safeguards being there.

If, for example, the commission was in error or acting with malice—or any of those other things that hopefully it would not demonstrate—but should one of those things rise to the surface, then the person against whom the order has been made has the right, of course, to proceed before a court in order to have the stay order lifted. It then would be up to that person to demonstrate to the court that an error mala fides, or something of that nature, was demonstrated by the commission. Again I repeat and urge the House to appreciate the urgency of this legislation in order that no frauds or infringements of the securities legislation can continue. The interest of the public, I submit with the greatest respect, certainly far outweighs the interest of any individual promotor or developer. But I do point out to the House once again that we think the safeguards are legitimate and we think that they are obviously necessary.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

CERTIFICATION OF TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves second reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend the Certification of Titles Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I have a comment or two to make on these funds that are placed aside, basically trust funds under the terms of the Land Titles Act and the Certification of Titles Act. Since they're guaranteed, of course, all these titles must be guaranteed by the government, by the Office of Land Titles. Then, if they make a mistake, they must rectify the same or have the wherewithal with which to do so.

I wanted to bring to the minister's attention that in this area and in the area of the sheriffs of the various counties there has been of recent date some resistance to claims made against these funds. I think maybe the land titles case is a bit different. The minister can perhaps straighten me out on it. The sheriff's office, for instance, on his funds and his bonding of funds, works through insurance companies which have indicated an unwillingness to meet the executions.

The sheriff has not vouchsafed to the person making application for them. In other words, the sheriff has made a mistake in his office. He has indicated that the title is clear. Then he subsequently learns that there is an execution, there has been some difficulty, of which the minister should be aware, in the sheriff's meeting that obligation—not through the sheriff, but through the insurance agencies that are supposedly standing behind him in these various contexts. This has come to my attention through the legal profession. I believe there is something mentioned in the same head with respect to the land titles funds which are supposedly available for this particular purpose.

I would like the minister, if he would take a moment out, to give me an indication of how the funds are handled here. As I recall it, there is a very small sum of money. It is not very great in terms of this government's

funding. I would say $200,000. Is that money in a trust fund? Is it immediately available? Is it held by the government? In other words, is it part of the consolidated revenue of this province or is it earmarked for a specific purpose and set aside? If so, how is the interest derivable from these funds made available either to the fund itself or to the government as a whole? In other words, in short, how are the funds handled?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate in the debate? If not, the hon. minister. I doubt that the last comments actually pertain to the principle of this bill. However, if the minister wishes to answer, he may.

Mr. Lawlor: Dead on!

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question directed by the hon. member for Lakeshore, as I understand it, there are approximately $1 million held in this fund, not $200,000. It fluctuates and it grows. It's held in a trust.

I understand that a substantial portion of the income earned is used for surveys throughout the province—that is, municipal surveys that are required and are by statute to be funded by the province. I made inquiries some months ago as to whether the amount being held in the fund was sufficient and it became almost academic, as I understood our discussion at that time, because if you set aside on an actuarial basis the sum required, there would be many, many millions—if not hundreds of millions—of dollars that would be sitting there earning income but not be available for the general revenues of the province.

As I understand it, as the fund does grow transfers are made out of it from time to time. It is kept somewhere in the neighbourhood of $1 million and the income is used for this municipal survey assistance.

I might add that no insurance company, of course, is involved with that particular fund. I believe that the member's question touched upon sheriffs having malpractice insurance, but there was no suggestion that this one was associated with or managed by any insurance company.

Mr. Lawlor: I wasn't sure of that, thank you.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

PARTNERSHIPS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves second reading of Bill 8, An Act to amend the Partnerships Registration Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I have only a few short comments and questions on this bill. I take it that what the minister is seeking to do under the legislation is basically to bring it into computerization; that he is removing from the various registry offices throughout the provinces the power of receiving partnership registrations of all kinds and is placing it within central registry.

I take it that this will be accomplished, in the minister's opinion, by Jan. 1, 1975, is it?—well, some date in about 18 months, I made a note of—and that the thing would operate by way of some kind of telecommunications system perhaps from local offices, legal offices of one kind or another, to a central registry.

I also take it that advice with respect to the full operation of partnerships, the names of the partners, the amounts of the contributions and whatever other information including addresses—which he has gone into here rather more thoroughly than has been the case up to now—would be available from this single, central computerized operation.

That seems to be the general purpose of the legislation, apart from making minor changes with respect to the registrar himself.

This, and the next following bill, which has to do with limited partnerships, seems to switch some of the control, some of the functions, over to the department of insurance and the supervisor of insurance. I find that rather curious as to these echelons of authority that are exercised and I hope it is not in any way supernumerary. I hope the minister is very cognizant of the fact that we have sufficient bureaucratic entanglements now within the filing registration system of the province, and I hope that this would be a streamlining rather than an added complication, which at this time I humbly see it as being, as this programme develops into the computerized future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have only two comments. I have always failed to understand why the Partnerships Registration Act was limited to persons engaged in trading, manu-

facturing or mining, which is the provision he is re-enacting in one of the early sections of the bill, which states: "Persons associated in partnership for trading, manufacturing or mining purposes shall cause to be filed a declaration". The Limited Partnerships Act, with which we will be dealing in a few minutes, is much more broadly stated, at least it would appear to be so. It provides for:

> Limited partnership for the transaction of any brokerage, financial, mercantile, mechanical, manufacturing, or other business in Ontario, except banking, the construction or operation of railways and the business of insurance.

Those, presumably, are excepted for constitutional reasons.

I would suggest to the minister that unless there is some very real reason the language should not conform between the two statutes he would give consideration to amending the Partnerships Registration Act to use the broader scope of language which is set out in the Limited Partnerships Act. It does not appear to me, when we have two statutes dealing with partnerships, that the requirements for filing should apply to a different set of circumstances under each of them, and lead to the question as to whether or not it should fall within one but not within the other Act.

The second one is a matter which I'm sure the minister can clear up but which I can't quite understand. That is why provision is now made that when a corporation files an annual return—or any number of corporations file annual returns—it is now not going to be necessary for corporations engaged in business, in partnership, to file under the Partnerships Registration Act. I think it is probably an oversight on my part but I don't understand that particular provision.

I would ask the minister to explain the reason if it is other than what must appear to be the case—that there is something in the Corporations Information Act which requires a disclosure with respect to the partnership arrangements of corporations among themselves.

I would ask for that explanation because otherwise it would appear to me that whether a partnership is made up of individuals or an individual and a corporation—in which case, as I understand it, it is subject to the Partnership Registration Act—the same provision should apply when all of the partners are corporations; or, if the sole proprietorship provisions are being used, the corporation should register under the Partnerships Registration Act as the sole proprietor if it is carrying on business under a name other than its incorporated name.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the inquiries raised by the member for Riverdale, firstly, it is my understanding that when all the partners are corporations it is mandatory each year, when filing under the Corporations Information Act, that they disclose the fact that they are carrying on business, or trading, mining or manufacturing under a name other than their own or indicate a plurality of membership and so forth. They must file that at that time.

By these two bills—and my remarks, I think, are pertinent to the Act we're discussing and, perhaps, with some tolerance from the Speaker, I'll just touch on the Limited Partnerships Act, too—the responsibility will be seized in the companies branch for very obvious reasons, one of them being the matter I have just touched upon.

The suggestion raised about the broadening from trading, mining or manufacturing referred to in the one statute and what would appear to be a rather broader description in the Limited Partnerships Act, is a matter that has not escaped the attention of the companies branch, so I'm advised by my staff. I believe that the member can rest assured that it will be enlarged in due course, perhaps even at this particular time. I do query it; I think a lot of these things are just traditional. We cite these matters of trading, mining or manufacturing and want them there and yet really the question is a very valid one in my mind. Why would it be restricted in the one Act to those three things while in the other it seems to be much broader? I don't want this construed, of course, as an undertaking on the part of this government, but as a personal wish on the part of this minister.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister would permit a question. I realize the minister would not want to make a statement without discussing it at length with his cabinet colleagues.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, the minister would not want to take a serious decision on to himself.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Not on something as earthshaking as that.

Mr. Renwick: But I do take it to mean that under the Corporations Information Act annual return, which requires a declaration by a corporation as to any other partnerships into which it may have entered, you can go to the companies information office at 555 Yonge St. and, by searching under the name of the partnership, find out the names of all the member corporations of that partnership? This is, of course, the case when you go to the registry office at the present time and search under the name of the partnership; you then find out who the partners of that partnership are.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that can be done physically right now, but we hope to have that effective by Jan. 1, 1975, so that you can search at 555 Yonge St. for that very sort of thing.

Mr. Renwick: Then for a period of time it appears that one would not be able to make that kind of search in the Province of Ontario, because of the enactment of this provision?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I'll undertake to respond to that when I have definite advice, but that is my understanding as it exists right now.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves second reading of Bill 7, An Act to amend the Limited Partnerships Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, there are some features in this bill which we like. We like the matter of the amendment to provide for recording the place of service rather than place of residence, which makes sense. We like the matter of not requiring certification and the matter of clarifying the wording under section 12, so that it's more reasonable.

What we don't like in this bill is a further trend to having all our Acts made so insignificant that the power of the bureaucracy by regulations is really to provide and enforce legislation that they determine to be the right legislation, instead of giving to and leaving in this chamber the power to set the laws of this province.

Here we have in section 1 the removal of the forum so it's prescribed by regulation rather than by statute. We also have in a new clause (g) further information that is required according to regulation.

We have already had a report from the regulations committee of this Legislature today indicating how they are powerless at this time to do anything to intervene as elected members in very important aspects—in fact, the most important aspects—of the legislation we are supposed to have control over in this chamber.

We are therefore very much opposed to the changes in the Act to do with the regulations, but otherwise we do agree in principle with the improvements set out in this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have just one comment. I've always been curious as to the extent to which this Act has been used in the Province of Ontario as a method of carrying on business. I must say that I have never had occasion to use it myself and I don't know of any of my colleagues who may have.

I know that in the State of New York some version of this is used for promoting theatrical shows and productions in order to preserve the limited liabilities of those who are participating in them. But I was just curious, now that we are dealing with this bill, as to whether the minister has any information of the number of limited partnerships which are presently registered in Ontario and how extensively it is used.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Lakeshore could make his remarks before the minister replies.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, the limited partnership concept is a curious bird, to start with. When corporations and individuals get together, some of them may have a general liability, each partner in the normal situation being responsible for all the debts of the partnership, whether acquired by him or not in the course of business, simply by reason of being within the partnership. It's a way whereby individuals may contribute funds to a partnership and keep themselves clean, being responsible only to the extent of the contributed funds and staying out of the arena

of court proceedings for the acts of the partnership, perhaps done with the utilization of those funds.

I suppose it is a necessary device in contemporary business; I think it is an interesting question to know just how extensive the utilization of the limited concept is in this province. By and large, it is a fairly unpalatable notion. If people want to operate in this particular way, I would think that the limited company concept is the proper way in which to contribute funds; then we have built-in limited liability. But as a sort of limbo operation, like a Janus figure facing both ways, we have introduced and have in operation this particular beast of burden.

Rather than prolong the discussion with respect to driving it into committee, I would like the minister to tell me, if you will permit, Mr. Speaker, what the exceptions are in section 2 with reference to section 8(a) and section 15(a). I was tempted to look this up prior to coming into this House today, but encountered almost insuperable difficulties in running down the hare. I would like to know the nature of the exceptions that are written into that particular section.

Secondly, I would be interested in learning why these time limitations are set up. Up until this time, this kind of partnership would normally set its own termination of the partnership. Now it is mandatory within the legislation to set decisive times at which they run out and must be renewed.

They are fairly severe with respect to those in existence at the present time, because the cutoff date is the date in 1975; anything after that has a five-year duration. What is the rationale and purpose behind that, and wouldn't it have been simpler in a way simply to leave matters as they are at the present time under this particular legislation?

The only other matter that should have a bit of comment is the fact that the use made of a certification by a notary public, which is in the previous legislation, is being wiped out by this particular legislation. Again, I am not quite sure of the raison d'être of that move. Is it a matter of expediency? Is it awkward to have the certification of documents by a notary public? Just why did the minister delete the poor beggar?

Mr. Speaker: If no other member wishes to participate, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I personally have never drawn a limited partnership document, and I take it from the questions raised by the hon. member for Riverdale that perhaps he has had a similar lack of experience in dealing with limited partnerships. It's my understanding that at the present time in the Province of Ontario we have approximately 100 limited partnerships registered. The whole rationale behind this matter is that a select committee some six years ago brought in a recommendation for centralization of the storage and retrieving of information pertaining to partnerships so that one search could be done rather than a search by counties, as is the present practice, insofar as partnerships are concerned.

I am advised that once this legislation is approved, a partnership registration will be able to be conducted in Toronto or at the area registry office—the local registry office—as soon as the information is filed in Toronto; that is, the companies carrying on business in this form that are about to be incorporated over the next year or so. But that information will be available immediately it is filed; it will be available to the general public.

The five-year cutoff is really for the purpose of clearing out partnerships of one kind or another that perhaps became insolvent or, in fact, never operated. There are some 225,000 to 250,000 documents stored here in Toronto relating to partnerships and limited partnerships, many of which were prepared and registered prior to the turn of the century.

I would venture an opinion that a substantial number of those businesses are no longer carrying on business, or no longer active. The cost of rent of storage and preserving the documents is high. If they serve little or no purpose then I suggest that this may have been one of the reasons that the select committee in 1967 took the position it did in recommending the central registry. The renewal each five years will indicate that the partnership is in effect; that it is alive and the business is being carried on.

I am sure that the member for Lakeshore shares with me the concern that I have had in the past—and I am sure any practising lawyer has had—when someone comes in and wants to register a partnership and wants to make sure that no one else in the province is carrying on under this name. The physical cost of conducting a search in each and every county within the province would be prohibitive with time delays and other facts.

By having the central registry, and in effect carrying out the recommendations of the select committee of this House, then one search would produce the information required in order to answer clients.

Insofar as the exceptions are concerned, I didn't catch the gist of a question. I would be grateful, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Lakeshore would repeat his question dealing with exceptions.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, it's a substitution for sections 6 and 7 of the existing legislation. Since the provisions of partnership registration except section 8(a) and subsection 2 of section 15(a), which are subsequent to the 1970 consolidations, and the regulations thereunder, I want to know what those exceptions are? Generally the provisions of the partnership registration apply to the registration of documents; the forms that are used would be in accordance with that particular legislation. But the minister has excepted certain things and I am not quite sure why.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, section 6 to sections 8(a) and 15(a) refer to the grandfather clause available to partnerships until Jan. 1, 1980. This clause will not be available to a limited partnership because of the possibility of its abuse. A limited partnership is a sophisticated form of business organization and taken with the proposed wide-scale publicity to be given to these amendments, ignorance of the new requirements is extremely unlikely.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT CLAIMS ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves second reading of Bill 17, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see an improvement specifying the time within which the evidence of insurance must be provided as a 72-hour period rather than just "a reasonable time," which was too vague. We are pleased to see that suspension does not necessarily mean that it is possible for someone to get an automatic reissue of a licence on application and that there is some power to prevent that if it is desirable.

But what we do question here in this bill is the implication of shifting this Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act to the Superintendent of Insurance. Is the government saying that it is now going to be making this into government insurance? Is this a back-door method of changing the annual premium from $25 to possibly $200?

This party agrees that everyone in this province should be insured and we have pressed the fact that this motor vehicles accident claims fund is not sufficient protection to those who suffer damage as a result of motor vehicle accidents. I urge this minister to recognize the implications of this change and to recognize the need for the introduction of compulsory automobile insurance throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker: I think there is nothing in the principle of this bill in that connection.

Is there any other member wishing to participate in the debate?

The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, the legislation transferring the responsibility to the Superintendent of Insurance is not in any way to be considered a move toward insurance for automobiles in this province being mandatory, but is required following the transfer of the administration of the Act to the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

It was always under the responsibility of the registrar of motor vehicles, as the hon. member knows, and the Superintendent of Insurance is representative of the fund in actions brought for recovery from that fund and was the logical individual in whom that responsibility should be lodged.

There is no move toward government insurance or anything of this nature. It was a recommendation of, I think, the Committee on Government Productivity that it be transferred into my ministry and accordingly the Superintendent of Insurance was considered to be the individual best suited to monitor the supervision and operation of the fund.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 7, An Act to amend the Limited Partnerships Act.

Bill 8, An Act to amend the Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill 9, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Bureau Act.

Bill 10, An Act to amend the Collection Agencies Act.

Bill 15, An Act to amend the Securities Act.

Bill 16, An Act to amend the Certification of Titles Act.

Bill 17, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act.

MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moves second reading of Bill 3, The Ministry of Government Services Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Perth.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on Bill 3, referring to the Ministry of Government Services Act. Generally, this bill is, I guess, a matter of housekeeping in respect to the reorganization of government departments and certainly it's necessary to bring the Ministry of Government Services into focus so that it is compatible with other legislation.

I noticed in the minister's opening remarks, when he introduced the bill, that it authorizes the implementation of certain recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity. I was disappointed to see that the minister was not able to include more of those recommendations included in that interim report, No. 8.

In checking over this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I notice there are a number of new sections proposed in Bill 3, particularly section 5 which states that:

> The ministry shall be operated as a common service agency for the government and its activities shall be directed toward providing the ministries and agencies of the government with services in support of the programmes of those ministries and agencies.

This is similar to what was recommended in the Committee on Government Productivity report when it stated that the availability of common services should be centralized. It went on to say that this centralization is desirable because performing property services requires a range of skills which cannot be spread efficiently among other ministries. Hopefully, this efficiency will be experienced.

Section 6, I notice, outlined the responsibilities of the minister and this section, of course, is very similar to the former section 17 of the 1970 statute. I was somewhat alarmed in particular with section 6 (3). This, I believe, has been added and reads:

> Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (2) the Lieutenant Governor in Council may, for such period and under such terms and conditions as he considers suitable, assign any of the responsibilities or powers of the minister under this section to another minister.

As I read this section it seems to me that it allows the Lieutenant Governor in Council the right to assign any of the responsibilities in that section to any other minister. While considering this section, I recalled that a few years ago this ministry introduced a bill which would have allowed the responsibility to be given to practically anyone in the then Ministry of Public Works. After much objection from the opposition this bill was withdrawn, leaving the power with the minister where we, in this party, feel it should belong.

As this bill has been presented with recommendations from the Committee on Government Productivity, I wish to quote from that report that it said it found neither great difficulties nor dissatisfaction with the system of funding the government's capital construction and major renovations and repair programme through the Ministry of Government Services. This ministry has the experience and expertise to supervise this important programme. Retention of this responsibility by the ministry would, I believe, Mr. Speaker, exercise a broad supervision not only by the Management Board but by this Legislature.

I know in the past few weeks or so we have seen such a case where Ontario Hydro decided to acquire a new office building which will be built and then used by it, and, of course, this was not put out to tender. This agreement was reached on a so-called proposal basis. Without going into any details on that particular situation, I would presume that this section could give at some future time the right by order in council to any minister to acquire or build any such building, on a proposal basis. So, in order to control the use of public funds, our party feels that it's very much opposed to this section.

I realize I should hear from the minister to find out if I am correct in what is stated in this section. If I find this is so, I can assure him that we in this party will continue to try to have this clause deleted—if not now,

during clause-by-clause debate in committee of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker, also on section 7, this is a new section that states that the minister may charge for commodities and services provided under this Act. I'd like to just ask the minister, and he might explain, why it is "may" and not "shall," because I believe this was also suggested by the Committee on Government Productivity. In Section 19(a) of the repealed Government Services Act, 1970, the Lieutenant Governor in Council could make regulations to establish a central purchasing and supply board. Under the new legislation, section 17(c), I believe it is, this has somewhat changed. I would like an explanation from the minister in this regard as to what change he sees in purchasing and also if it gives a broader power for disposal of any goods.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I want to be brief because I don't purport to understand all of the implications in the bill. I think it's a major bill if one looks at it in the light of the recommendations which were made for the overall reorganization of the government. I would hope that during the course of the remarks by the minister on the second reading of the bill, he would try to provide some kind of vitality for the bill which he has presented before us.

Anyone reading this bill would have no conception of the important role which the Ministry of Government Services plays in its relationship with the Management Board and, in turn, in its relationship with all of what are termed in the productivity reports "the client ministries." I take it, and I assume it to be so when the minister said that it was for the purpose of implementing a number of the recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity, that the Ministry of Government Services, acting within the framework of the guidelines and policies decided upon by the Management Board, will play a major role in controlling the sense of cost responsibility for the programmes which are initiated and are in force in the Province of Ontario throughout the various policy ministries.

There are very substantial recommendations in the report with respect to the ways in which those costs will: (a) be adequately disclosed; and (b) will provide the kind of controls which up to now have been lacking in terms of the cost of a particular programme insofar as its physical space, accommodation and equipment provided through the Ministry of Government Services are concerned. I take that to be one of the pivotal recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity, and I assume that it is being implemented by this bill.

I would like to have the minister's comment. I assume it will be given in assuring tones, that the problems which arose respecting the acquisition of real property by the former Department of Public Works have been corrected to the extent that the royal commission on the Niagara Escarpment lands and the Gertler report reflected adversely upon the then ministry.

Perhaps the minister will forgive me for refreshing his memory when I point out that on page 99 of the report of His Honour, Provincial Court Judge Bennett, he says in his conclusions that the province paid too high a price for the 506 acres.

> The Department of Public Works should have obtained an appraisal from a recognized expert in the field of appraisement before entering into negotiations with the Caledon Mountain Estates Ltd., as discussed in detail under question 5 of part IV.
>
> Armed with such an appraisal in the form of bracket figures of $1,200 to $1,500 per acre and by the employment of the kind of forceful and hard bargaining which is necessary in the public interest and which was not evident in the bargaining to reach the figure of $1,450 per acre, in my opinion the government negotiators would have achieved a lower price within the bracketed figures which may well have resulted in a substantial total saving for the treasury. Greater care and vigilance were demanded of Public Works in this transaction.

And the other comment was:

> The Department of Public Works was also negligent in the fall and spring of 1968 and 1969 in connection with the attempted purchase by the government of 170 acres of the Trenwith property. The negligence consisted of not reporting on the request of the Department of Lands and Forests to acquire the acreage within a reasonable time and when Public Works did report it, it did so erroneously. As indicated in part IV under heading 5, the negligence may have been costly.

I noticed in reading the report of the Committee on Government Productivity that they have very high praise for the skills which

are within the Ministry of Government Services and which were formerly within the Department of Public Works, as it was then known. But I would suggest that the minister should respond to us now, and not in the tone of carping criticism, to indicate quite clearly that the acquisition from the private sector of the lands, premises and other fixtures comprising the real property, whether by purchase or by lease, is being carried out with the kind of expertise that we would expect of a government ministry charged with this kind of public responsibility and which has now centralized within it this very demanding obligation to provide the services to all of the various client ministries within the government circle.

We do have a major concern as to the criteria under which the government moves into the marketplace for the purpose of acquiring the kinds of buildings that have been acquired recently, either by purchase of land and construction or by lease, for the purpose of providing the accommodation to meet the demands put upon the ministry by the various client ministries within the government that are charged with the policy programme responsibilities.

I think it does not go unremarked that although it was stated that the programme was extremely tentative and there wasn't anything very real or substantive about it, the Premier (Mr. Davis) the other day, in conjunction with the minister, had to capitulate totally and withdraw the whole of the building programme which was announced between Bay and Yonge in the massive piece of property which has been acquired over the years by the minister on behalf of the government of the Province of Ontario.

I notice very clearly in the bill that there are provisions that there must be tenders in some of the areas in which are set out the ways in which the government is required to carry out contracts for construction, renovation or repair of a public work. But we have no indication that there is any kind of protective assurance that the public interest is served in the most economical way by the way in which the Ministry of Government Services acts in the private marketplace on behalf of the people of Ontario for the purpose of acquiring the lands and the structures which it does acquire from time to time.

I am quite prepared to recognize the problem of moving into a private market area to acquire this kind of accommodation, but certainly there is nothing which would indicate to us that there is that kind of vigilance which is required to make certain that what is acquired is acquired at the most economical price. The only occasions where we have had an opportunity to look into the question would indicate that by and large a better deal could have been obtained.

That is not any imputation of gross mismanagement at all, but it is quite clearly an indication of a lack in the ministry of the kind of tough bargaining which has to take place when a minister of the Crown is dealing in a very highly sophisticated and tough real estate market, particularly when it centres within the Metropolitan Toronto area. That is a matter on which I would certainly hope that this minister would comment.

There is very little in the bill which deals with the way in which commodities, as they are described in the bill—that is, I suppose, in a lawyer's term, all other movable property which is purchased by the ministry—are to be acquired or the protection which the public treasury has in the routines and procedures which are to be used for that purpose. If I read the Committee on Government Productivity properly, those guidelines are supposed to be developed and go forward to the Management Board and the Management Board is to establish those particular procedures and routines, and presumably to some extent—but I am certain it is always to a very limited extent and usually in such legalese that very few people will be able to understand them—some of them will appear in regulations.

But when you consider the immense purchasing needs of the government of the Province of Ontario in the field of commodities, then it seems to us that there must be, structured within the Act setting up the Ministry of Government Services, some indication of what the guidelines are. I don't think it is sufficient, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that certainly we will try to get the best price and certainly we will work out the procedures which are best designed to achieve that purpose.

In one very limited sphere, and that is the sphere of the construction, renovation or repair of a public work, there is a tender operation. But so far as I read the bill, and so far as I can tell, there is no indication anywhere of the extension of the tender system as a mandatory matter by this ministry for the purchase of the immense amount of commodities which is required to be purchased in the course of a year by the ministry.

As I say, the bill itself is a rather lifeless document. It's very difficult, when one reads the responsibilities of the ministry, to get any conception of the vital and crucial role which this particular ministry plays in the government reorganization which in some of its areas, particularly with respect to the provincial secretaries in the various fields, has tended to fall rather flat on its face.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that of the various stages of the reorganization dealing with the control of costs of the government of the Province of Ontario, this ministry is the focal one. I don't presume to create any impression that I have read in detail all of the reports of the Committee on Government Productivity and know them. There were three reports.

There was the initial interim report, No. 1, dealing with the setup of this particular ministry and having something to say about important matters. There were some further references in interim report No. 3 but the major alteration in the method by which the policy departments, the policy ministries, will be required to establish accounting procedures with this ministry about their space and equipment needs seems to me to be almost a minor revolution with respect to the accounting for the costs of the programmes in the Province of Ontario.

I refer, only briefly, to the recommendations which are set out not as recommendations but in some of the explanatory references in interim report No. 8. This states:

> We are proposing that programmes include within their budgets an amount for rental whether or not they are housed within government-owned facilities. It is to be hoped that a practice may be worked out whereby occupancy costs might be reviewed in the context of other costs for each programme. We suggest capital expenditures by the Ministry of Government Services should be contingent upon prior approval of rentals which would be paid to the common services ministry from within operating programme estimates. At present, there have been very few forces at work to make the programme managers more aware of the costs of the property resources required by their programmes . . . Public Works provides accommodation rent free to the programmes including utilities and maintenance.

It goes on at great length to indicate quite clearly that there is to be not only vis-à-vis the public but vis-à-vis the policy ministries of the government a pretty hard-nosed attitude by the Ministry of Government Services with respect to the rent to be charged; with respect to the equipment and supplies to be furnished; with respect to the way in which depreciation charges and amortization charges are to be established.

In fact, when we look at the estimates of a particular ministry and we look at a specific programme we may, for the first time, be able to get some overall sense of what the cost of that programme is in itself. We may, then, be able to get to some point where we can say the costs of that programme with respect to the benefits which it provides for the people of the Province of Ontario are out of line; they're not adequate and they're not sufficient. There may well have to be further economies with respect to the costs in order to increase the benefits; or there may have to be very real thinking about the possibility of abandoning a particular programme because of the excessive cost of the programme when related to the benefits.

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that if this is followed through properly this minor revolution may, in a sense, bring back to this chamber the importance which it has in our system of government as is stated in a trite statement within interim report No. 8—that is, the assembly voting the moneys for the particular programmes of the government. Certainly up to now when we've approved estimates with respect to programmes we've had no real sense of what the cost of those programmes were.

But we cannot perform the function of the Ministry of Government Services, and in that sense we need the support of the Ministry of Government Services on this side of the House if we are going to be in a position where we can say that there is an effective, tough control of the costs with respect to accommodation, equipment, supplies and other physical attributes needed for the purpose of carrying out a particular programme; and that includes, as the committee on productivity has stated, also charging the client ministries with the cost of provision of specialized services from this reservoir of highly skilled and talented people which the minister has at his disposal.

There is also a very clear indication in the committee's report—but again there is nothing in the minister's bill which would indicate to us the criteria upon which he decides to whom he is going to contract out a wide range of services, which it is recommended in the report be contracted out rather than to be performed within the ministry itself.

And there is an extremely wide range of services now being contracted for.

Again, we have no indication that something in the nature of a tender system, a modified tender system, a tender system within certain limits, is to be used for those purposes.

So, while we have this very limited statement in the bill with respect to the construction, the renovation or repair of a public work, and we have a tender system involved in that, yet masses of other purchasing activities of this minister's department are entirely free from any publicly stated guideline either in this Act, or in the regulations; or anywhere else that would indicate to people that you can't just come to the trough of the government for the sale of goods and services to the government simply because you happen to be friends of the government. After all, after 30 years, who isn't a friend of the government; but the few of us who sit on this side of the House.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): I thought the member was a friend.

Mr. Renwick: And therefore it makes it extremely difficult for us here to perform our functions unless the minister is prepared to join with us in riding herd on the government to make certain that there are proper tendering systems within all of the range of the immense purchasing power of the government.

Those have been just a few random thoughts which concern me very much about the ministry. The bill would certainly not give any indication of the pivotal role which the ministry does play and, as I have said, the minor revolution which it may create and may actually provide. I emphasize this, if I may, Mr. Speaker, repeating myself only once for emphasis on this particular point.

Mr. Singer: Once more. Once more.

Mr. Renwick: It may well be that this minister and the role of his Ministry will in fact give some meaning to the debate on estimates with respect to individual programmes as they come before the assembly in order that the moneys can be voted.

Now, I would hope that the minister would deal with any number of those major issues which I consider I have tried to raise in this debate.

I would like to make one other comment—because it is of specific interest to us here in the New Democratic Party—that in the area where the government is contracting for services in the cleaning and maintenance field that it is not, in fact, contracting out at prices for those services which result in people working for the contractors at an abysmally low wage. That is one of the real fears which we have.

Certainly it was not a very affluent life when one was a cleaning person on the maintenance staff of the Ministry of Public Works. But we would like to think that there are some guidelines that are required of the contractors to make certain that the people who do the cleaning and maintenance work under contract arrangements are themselves in turn properly paid. Indeed, we as a government would of course insist that it be done through contractors who employ only union labour. But that, of course, would be too much to ask of this ministry at the present time.

There is an alternative which the minister could adopt, and that is to provide that contractors contracting for that kind of service should pay once and a half the minimum wage, or even twice the minimum wage, and provide a decent living for those who work for the contractors under contracts provided by this government.

That's an addendum to my remarks. I hope the minister will deal with some of the major items which I raised.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I share with my colleague from Perth and with the hon. member for Riverdale substantial concern about the content of this Act. I, too, am unable to put it into context with the various recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity, unless, of course, under the guise of a new Ministry of Government Services Act the minister and the government are going to pretend that they have carried out these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, as one reads through the statutes, one has to come to the conclusion that the powers given are so broad in their context that this minister or any other minister can do pretty well as he wants to do, notwithstanding all the recommendations. The so-called restrictions are limited in their scope, and are limited in their language. The permission in section 6(3) to allow the minister to assign any of his responsibilities to any other minister—

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, not the minister.

Mr. Singer: All right, the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The permission to assign

any of the responsibilities to any other minister surely defeats the whole series of statutes and recommendations that we have dealt with, that have been the subject of various discussions and bitter debates and which, theoretically at least, have been remedied by the passing of new statutes.

But, periodically, Mr. Speaker, there creeps in a general provision such as this one, or the one that they rushed through last June in the wee small closing hours of the morning, which gives them power to acquire land, as in north Pickering, and sell it to anybody they want. That one just snuck through as a housekeeping bill.

These things, periodically, are put into statutes and are passed by the House with these powers, notwithstanding all of the fine words in McRuer or in the COGP reports or in the reports of royal commissioners. All these things are paid lip service to but, in fact, the statutory authority bears no relationship to the commitments made by the government.

For instance, even as repeated here, the power of expropriation for this minister is as broad as it can be. Once the land has been acquired for government purposes, if the government comes to the conclusion—and it coud be the same day—that it's no longer required for the use or the purposes of the government, the land can then be disposed of in any way that the government sees fit, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

I don't really believe, Mr. Speaker, that the additional seal of the Lieutenant Governor in Council makes the thing any more pure at that point than it would be at the beginning. I don't think that the Lieutenant Governor in Council reviews it at any great length. What, in fact, this kind of exercise of power means is that there is a taking away from the Legislature of additional power and there is permission given in statute to allow the breach of these great principles which are ennunciated so loudly and so clearly.

What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is the use and abuse of expropriation powers, and this statute does nothing to limit them at all. This statute and the statute I referred to that was passed last June are part and parcel of the same kind of thinking. We pay lip service to tenders but the necessity for tender calls is in respect of contracts for construction, renovation or repair of public works.

It is very fascinating, Mr. Speaker, that even on proposal calls, the kind of proposals that my leader was objecting to aren't dealt with in this at all. The proposal system can go on. The government is not even compelled at this stage and in this statute to make available to the Legislature the kind of method by which it is going to determine what kind of a proposal it is going to accept; or who it is going to accept it from; or whether the proposals are made available to the public generally or to the people who are able to submit a proposal.

Those things continue to remain government secrets.

Hon. Mr. Snow: We have no secrets.

Mr. Singer: Yes, indeed they do. I would like the minister to indicate to me when he gets to talk just how and where there is any compulsion on government to reveal proposals to us. If there is why then, in face of the repeated requests made by my leader and others has the government neglected to table the various proposals they have referred to in the House as has been asked?

The best we could get out of the Premier was a grunt.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't have the power.

Mr. Singer: No, of course, the minister doesn't have the power. The best we could get out of the Premier was a grunt and we got nothing from the minister at all. There is nothing in this statute that says the Premier has got to do anything more than grunt. No! It continues to be secret.

How can the minister read the report of the Provincial Auditor and not concern himself with the looseness of managerial procedures which have resulted in the waste of many millions of dollars belonging to the people of Ontario? Then he has the nerve to bring before us a statute like this one which applies no control.

Mr. Speaker, the more I think of this Act, the more carefully I read it and the more I listen to my colleague from Perth, the more convinced I am that this Act is nothing more than another pale shadow intended to impress various audiences, to which the government representatives are going to talk, that apparently the government is doing something.

We had the COGP and it made recommendations. Now we have a statute that says exactly what it recommended, except that it doesn't say that! Mr. Speaker, there are so many escape clauses in this Act which negate all the high-sounding principles one can find, that I don't see any way at all in which we can support this Act that's presently before us.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to address himself to this bill? If not, the minister.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to the remarks which have been made by the hon. members.

Basically, this bill does replace the old Public Works Act. The Ministry of Government Services was created by the Act last year with the re-organization of government, but this new bill brings the bill up to date. Under the old Public Works Act my ministry was responsible for a great many odds and ends which have now been transferred to other ministries, such as hydraulics and different things which are now part of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

The member for Perth commented on some specific sections on the function of the ministry. It is certainly a common service ministry that supplies common services to all the operating ministries within the government under the direction and approval of policies established by the Management Board. We are doing centralized purchasing to the degree that it is economically feasible to purchase centrally. Of course, we are carrying out the traditional role of the Department of Public Works of constructing all the buildings for the operating ministries but not for the Crown corporations.

Considerable remarks have been made pertaining to section 6, subsection 3, the assignment of duties of the minister by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to another minister. I think I can explain this, Mr. Speaker, by two examples—they are the only things I can think of at this moment—where two particular responsibilities that might be considered to be the responsibility of my ministry have been assigned.

One is the purchase of drugs and medical supplies. This has been assigned to the Ministry of Health by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, as it certainly seems more feasible and more economical to have the expertise of the Ministry of Health look after the purchase of drugs than for my ministry with centralized purchasing to set up people with this knowledge of the particular product and duplicate a service that is already available within the government.

The second item that I can think of—these are the only two that I can think of that have been assigned—is the purchase of automobiles. My ministry does not purchase automobiles or trucks; the purchase of these has been assigned to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton). Traditionally, his ministry has been the ministry purchasing the largest amount of equipment and vehicles; it certainly has the expertise already there to carry on this practice. It is now buying, I think, all the vehicles for all ministries and also for the Ontario Provincial Police.

Now, the hon. member for Perth referred to section 7, charging for services under the Management Board of Cabinet Act. This is something that we are certainly implementing, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Riverdale referred to this at some length in his remarks.

All I can say is that I think I almost agreed totally with everything he said in this regard. We are certainly initiating, as recommended by the COGP report, the charge-back principle. Personally, I want to see every possible service that my ministry supplies charged to the programme that is benefiting from that service, or purchase, or rent for the building or land that is purchased—whatever it may be—so that when we look at the estimates of the operating ministries, we are able to see exactly what the cost of that programme is.

I am the first to admit that under the present and past method of government accounting, this has not been possible. We are implementing this as quickly as possible and will implement it as quickly as possible, although it is impossible—with the amount of volume we have—to start off with a full chargeback on all services. We will implement these over a period of time.

Now, there was some remark made regarding section 17(c) and regulations prescribing the manner under which government purchases, disposal and storage will be carried out. Mr. Speaker, as far as our purchasing is concerned, I think I can almost unequivocally say that all purchasing of anything of any significance whatsoever is done by public tender—certainly all our construction projects, all our maintenance projects; unless there is such a thing as an emergency, which is covered in the Act, and I don't believe we have had to use that provision.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): How does the ministry regard proposals? How about the school of the blind?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The school for the blind; wasn't that on a proposal basis? Have there been any buildings built on a proposal basis?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I don't want to—if the member puts those questions to me during the debate. But I will say that my ministry does not enter into proposal calls, and—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister's predecessor defended it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: We enter into construction management contracts but not proposal calls. We do enter into leaseback contracts—but we advertise these publicly—by public tender and the tenders are opened publicly. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, about three or four months ago we called tenders in the city of Thunder Bay for the new courthouse there on a leaseback basis, where we owned the land. We called for these public tenders for a contractor to build and operate the building and lease it back to us.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Hydro should do the same.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I believe we got about eight or 10 tenders on that bid. They were opened publicly and published, for anyone who wants to see them, and the contracts for the leasing of that was awarded to the low bidder. Just yesterday or the day before I signed the authorization for a similar tender call for an office building in Thunder Bay, on the same basis—public tender call. Everyone has the opportunity—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister ought to write a letter to the chairman of Hydro and advise him of the procedures.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Everyone has the opportunity to bid and everyone has the opportunity to sit in the tender room when the bids are opened and see exactly where each bid stacks up with the others.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Except Ontario Hydro!

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. members that we are implementing the public tender call procedure almost to the last degree that it is possible. Granted, if you want to buy a $10 item it is pretty difficult to go through the expense of advertising for tenders for it. We have to be reasonable. For instance, the other day we purchased computer cards for several different ministries, put all the orders together into one bulk purchase, called public tenders, opened them publicly, and then the different ministries will be supplied from this bulk order. We use the tender procedure for the disposal of real estate or the disposal of, I guess you call them, tangible assets.

Even down at our Mimico yards there, when we have old used furniture for sale, surplus supplies of all kinds, or scrap metal, these sales are advertised and a report comes to me when the tenders are received and opened in public and then the awards are made. When we have a surplus piece of real estate to sell we have it appraised. If the local municipality has an interest in it, quite often we sell to the municipality at appraised value. We will not sell at appraised value to the public, but we advertise publicly and everyone has a chance to bid on any property that is being sold.

As I see our ministry under this Act, Mr. Speaker, we will be operating more like a corporation than the former Department of Public Works has operated. We are, of course, responsible for the purchase of all real property, with some exceptions; Transportation and Communications still purchases land for rights of way, and Environment still has a certain area of purchasing of rights of way and easements that it does for its operations.

We are in charge of property management, we are in charge of the construction purchasing, and as of about 40 minutes ago we officially took over the centralized computer services for the government, and we will be operating this computer centre on a charge-back basis to the other ministries. This is within the reference and the recommendations of the COGP.

On our real estate purchases I want to assure the hon. members that we have, I think, some of the toughest negotiators in the real estate business. We do a great deal of purchasing and leasing of land. We have our internal appraisers for appraising properties we are going to purchase. Also, on all purchases of any significance at all we use the services of an outside appraiser, and in some cases, if it is a large purchase, we will get a second opinion from an outside appraiser so that we have two outside appraisals on such a piece of property we are buying.

I think we have considerable expertise in the realty services branch of the ministry, and the staff there are doing an excellent job according to the guidelines we are operating under at the present time.

As I mentioned, we call tenders for our leaseback properties; we also call public tenders for all our commodities; and we will

be implementing accounting procedures in the ministry so that the costs of the items my ministry is responsible for will be visible in that programme.

This goes along with recommendations that are also made on page 71, I believe, of the report of the Provincial Auditor, where he draws our attention to certain cases—three in particular, I think—where, at the request of a ministry, my ministry leased space for a period of time, then the client ministry did not occupy the space for the full period of time and in some cases we ended up having some vacant space.

I think it would be a great incentive to the programme managers and the operating ministries if they were responsible in their budgets for the space that we rented for them, and this is being implemented.

Cleaning contracts also were mentioned, Mr. Speaker, and of course we tender publicly where we enter into contracts for cleaning. We are doing a great deal of this type of work by contract at the present time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about Ontario Place?

Hon. Mr. Snow: We still have hourly paid staff in quite a number of our buildings. We are not really phasing these down at all, but on most new projects we are entering into contracts.

I might say, regarding Ontario Place, that my ministry is no longer responsible for its maintenance. That is now a Crown corporation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Like Ontario Hydro, Ontario Housing, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education—a whole list of things that should come under this ministry's jurisdiction if it worked as efficiently as the minister describes it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I won't argue with the Leader of the Opposition on that point, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The vice-chairman sits up at the back there—

Hon. Mr. Snow: We have the expertise, and if the Crown corporations within the government wish to make use of this, we would be only too happy to provide them with our expert services.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister should be pretty careful, he is getting away with murder.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The hon. member for Downsview—I wonder where he is now; he was here—mentioned something about the Expropriation Act. Certainly we have expropriation powers, Mr. Speaker. We very seldom use them.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): They shouldn't have them for private industry.

Hon. Mr. Snow: They are broad powers. My ministry, like any other, of course, operates under the Expropriation Act passed by this Legislature. The hon. member for Waterloo North says we should not have them for private industry, and I am really at a loss to know what that remark is supposed to mean because we certainly do not go around expropriating for private industry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, some of the municipalities do. What about Oakville?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't recall the municipality of Oakville doing any expropriation for private industry.

Mr. Good: They do out in Cedarwood.

Mr. Lawlor: Etobicoke did.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I can't be responsible for what municipalities do, but certainly as far as my ministry is concerned, the expropriation orders that I have signed at the request of other ministries in the 14 months I have been minister, have been very few and basically refer to recreational lands we are purchasing for the Ministry of Natural Resources, including the expropriation of the Sandbanks property, which I signed a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And Bronte Park!

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Bronte Park!

Mr. Speaker, we've purchased most of the land now, or practically all of it, for Bronte Creek Provincial Park and we have not had to resort to expropriation yet, but I'm rather prepared to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Prepared to? What about Pickering?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I'm rather prepared to do so to finish off the last one or two.

Pickering, Mr. Speaker, does not come under my jurisdiction.

Again I must stress that my ministry does not use the proposal call method. I'm not saying I disagree with it in all applications, but I do for the type of work for which I'm

responsible and I don't use it. We go strictly by public tender.

Mr. Good: The minister defended it when he was on the OHC board, right down to the letter.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did, when I was on the OHC board for two years. We used the proposal call method, and for that particular type of operation it works very well.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker, we'd like it to go to committee.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House, Mr. Minister?

Agreed.

FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves second reading of Bill 66, An Act to amend the Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1973.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just a comment or two. It appears this bill extends the jurisdiction of the ministry—what is it, to grass fires?

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Grass and brush fires!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And brush fires—something like that.

There's some indication the minister might want to make some changes in the wording of the bill. It might be appropriate if the minister made some comments about the bill.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Well Mr. Speaker, if I may, there are no—

Mr. Speaker: These are opening comments I presume?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Beg your pardon?

Mr. Speaker: The minister may have a chance to reply after other members have spoken.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Does anybody else want to speak before I wind up?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I didn't know the minister had to be wound up.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, I'd like to speak on the bill.

I can recall making that trip up to northwestern Ontario; back in 1968 or 1969, I believe. I was talking to fire departments in northern Ontario, and in particular one in Kenora. I was talking to a gentleman there about fires and he said: "Well, the biggest problem up here is fighting forest fires and grass fires on land belonging to the Crown." I said: "Who pays for this?" And he said apparently, or at least this was the information I received at that time, they received no remuneration for going out and fighting fires on Crown land.

I was just wondering if in bringing in this amendment today there would be some funds available to fire departments in municpalities in northwestern Ontario and northern Ontario, or any place in the Province, that looked after forest fires? Are there such grants or is assistance made available to them; even in the purchase of equipment?

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to address themselves to this bill? The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Just two remarks, Mr. Speaker: One of them is the curious wording of section 2 which says "the minister and the Crown in right of Canada." It sounds as though they are legislating, somehow usurping, their jurisdiction.

I certainly think that should be reconsidered and reworded. How can they impose their mandates on the Crown in the right of Canada or any other province? They say that an agreement may be set up between their ministry and these other jurisdictions, but the way in which they say it I find to be, to say the least awkward, and possibly unconstitutional.

The second thing I want to mention and have a response from the minister on, is why the legislation is retroactive to Sept. 1, 1971? What purpose is behind that?

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well Mr. Speaker, if I may just explain. There are no significant changes in the principle involved in this

amending bill. The purposes of the bill are twofold.

Firstly, an internal reference in subsection 2 of section 5 is corrected. That is just an error in numbering.

Secondly, the wording in section 19 respecting agreements with municipalities and others is brought in line with the wording of the provisions respecting municipal obligations in section 21. If the members will look at the old bill they will notice a discrepancy here. Under the latter provisions the municipalities in fire districts, subject to an agreement, are obligated to extinguish at their expense the grass, bush and forest fires within their limits. The principle contemplated by the existing section is that the municipalities' obligation can be amended by agreement, and the revised wording would bring the two sections in line in providing uniformity in the provisions.

Mr. Lawlor: It is nice that the minister can tell the federal government it may enter into an agreement with respect to fire-fighting.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, there are occasions when this is required on our border areas.

Mr. Lawlor: That's not the way the minister worded it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We think this wording is the correct wording.

With regard to extra funds available, if a special condition does exist where there is an emergency situation, then we can move in with our own forces and our own assistance. But we don't have funds available, say to assist a municipality—

Mr. Haggerty: What happens then?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —but we have the services and the wherewithal to move in with our equipment. In many cases we do this where the municipality requests this emergency assistance. It's always available to them.

In getting back to the retroactive section which the member for Lakeshore questioned, I will say to him that this is a correction in the revised statute, and of course it has to go back to Sept. 1, 1971, when the revised statutes were printed. This is the reason for the retroactivity.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed to committee of the whole House, perhaps I might inform the hon. members that as required under standing order 27 and standing order 28, this being Tuesday, I have received one notice of dissatisfaction with the answer given to one oral question since last Tuesday. That was the notice provided to me by the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy), who has provided me with notice that he was dissatisfied with the answer given by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) to a question about the French-language school situation.

In accordance with the notice, it is my obligation to inform the hon. members prior to 5 o'clock as to which notices will be dealt with at the adjournment of the House. Therefore, at 10:30 this evening, I will deem a motion to adjourn to have been made, we will proceed with the discussion of this particular item, and the hon. member may have five minutes to present his case, and the hon. minister may have five minutes to respond.

Clerk of the House: The second order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES ACT

House in committee on Bill 3, The Ministry of Government Services Act, 1973.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions, comments or amendments on the first five sections, and if so which section?

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4, subsection (2):

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Would the minister comment briefly on the office of the Queen's Printer in light of the change which took place in the Committee on Government productivity's report about that office?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Chairman, the title of the Queen's Printer is now held by the Deputy Minister of Government Services for the purpose of control of the imprint and copyright of any documents of the government of Ontario. The actual function, formerly assigned to the Queen's Printer, of being responsible for the printing for the government is now, as

recommended by COGP, under the jurisdiction of the director of printing services.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, does this mean—this is in connection with the same clause—that the Queen's Printer, who is responsible for the sale of books, continues to have no influence or direction over the amount of printing that takes place?

I think I have raised before the House the problems met by many people in this province when they are trying to get copies of Acts that are out of print. The Queen's Printer bookstore have told me in the past that it is very frustrating to them to repeatedly have to tell people various Acts are out of print. Nothing is done about it because the particular ministries don't seem to care if their Acts are out of print.

As a result, people don't have copies available to them at a price that the government deems to be the price, which is the cost of printing. Surely this poor supply of copies of necessary legislation is not going to continue under the revised organization? Could the minister give us some information as to how he is going to streamline the shoddy performance of the past?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, I don't agree with the hon. member's remarks at all.

Mr. Deacon: I am talking about the bookstore next door to the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Through the government bookstore we do try to make available to the public as many government publications as possible. There is no doubt there are times when publications do run out. One never knows for sure how popular a particular publication will be.

Sometimes too many are run and I guess there have been cases when we end up with a lot of surplus material that is a cost to the taxpayer and is worthless to the taxpayer, if no one wants it.

In other cases, when a ministry asks for the consolidation or the office print of a particular Act, they must decide what the demand will be for that Act. The director of printing services looks after the printing of it, but we cannot add to that order on our own.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, surely when any normal business is operated, it goes to its sales outlet to get an idea of what the market for any product is likely to be? Isn't that the best source of information as to the likely sales?

Of course, I think it should be in consultation with the ordering ministry in the case of the Queen's Printer or the printing services branch the minister is talking about. But to have the control of the quantities to be printed continue to be under the various ministries will perpetuate this lack of awareness as to what the real demand is. The demand doesn't come into the ministries, it comes into the Queen's Printer bookstore or wherever those orders are directed. I do suggest that the minister revises the present system and gains some awareness of what the real market is from the source that is far more aware of demand than anyone else; that is, the Queen's Printer bookstore.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, we certainly take all these comments into consideration. The only member I have had a complaint from regarding availability is the particular member who has just spoken. I don't really think that a clerk in the bookstore should be my source of information as to how many copies of a bill we should print. I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) who is responsible for the Warble Fly Act knows a lot better than the clerk in the bookstore how many copies of that Act might be supplied.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): All the warble flies want one.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As we are a common service ministry we do the printing as requested by the other ministries and charge them for it.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 4 stand as part of the bill?

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Section 5, Mr. Chairman, really contains the thrust of the argument we are advancing. It is one of those broadly worded sections that appears to say a lot but means very little. The section says:

> The ministry shall be operated as a common agency for government and its activities and shall be directed towards providing the ministries and agencies of government with services in support of the programmes of those ministries and agencies.

The key words and the copout words are "shall be directed towards providing." That means if you are in the mood to direct them to provide they shall provide; and if you are not in the mood to direct them to provide they shall not provide.

I gather while I was out a few moments ago the minister indicated that this government doesn't believe in proposals. If there are proposals for various schemes — they could be Hydro asking for proposals; or the Workmen's Compensation Board asking for proposals, or Ontario Housing Corp. — the minister seems to want to wave a magic wand and convince us that the things that Hydro or the Workmen's Compensation Board or Ontario Housing do, are none of the responsibility of the ministry.

It was just the same when we were talking about central purchasing. Eric Silk, the former commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police said, "Go away and don't bother me about your central purchasing. I am going to buy my uniforms and I am going to buy my cars. Just don't bother me or I'll quit and I'll embarrass you." The government left him alone and not one of them was prepared to take him on.

This section further enshrines that ability to carry on with this same kind of nonsense. This section is a copout section. This section empowers the minister to avoid the kind of responsibility that he is going to tell the people this new Act gives to him. I say he can't suck and whistle at the same time. Either he has to accept the responsibility or he doesn't accept it at all!

If the minister is going to have a statute with sections like section 5 in it, why worry about the Act? He is just going to carry on in his own merry way, doing what he wants when he wants to do it; when it is not convenient or for some other peculiar reason, he's not going to do it at all.

The minister apparently questioned my reference earlier to the Act to amend the Housing Development Act. I don't see why there should be an expropriating authority that has a wider power than is contained in this Act. Why doesn't the minister bring the housing authority within this Act? Why doesn't he extend the principle in section 5 to the actions of all government departments and all government agencies? With this in mind, Mr. Chairman, I am going to move an amendment to section 5 to this effect:

That the words "be directed towards providing" be deleted and the word "provide" be substituted as those words appear in the third and fourth line of section 5.

I so move.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to speak further about my colleague's motion. In response to some interjected questions during the debate on second reading, the minister implied that he was taking a firm hand with all of those areas under his jurisdiction. For example, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education had its own autonomous and independent board, therefore he would have nothing to do with its requirements for land or buildings. The same with the Ontario Educational Television Authority. Although he didn't respond to it directly, by failing to respond, apparently in his mind Ontario Hydro fell into precisely the same category.

Although I felt that he was staking out a personal position of some strength when he emphasized more than once that he in his ministry had never had anything to do with the proposal method of deciding what company got to build what facility, at a further interjection the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) indicated that the minister seemed to have changed his views, since when he was a member of the Ontario Housing Board he was the one who, in this House, defended the proposal method which the minister then said worked very well as far as housing authorities and housing facilities were concerned.

My colleague from Downsview says you can't suck and whistle at the same time. I'm not exactly sure that that is so. But particularly in this case it appears that the minister is trying to have his cake and eat it too, if the analogy is any more direct, because on one occasion he is prepared to support the proposal system, and now as minister—and I am very glad to hear him say this—he indicates that it has no role whatsoever in the acquisition or the building, the development, of so many of the facilities that do come directly under his jurisdiction.

In the amendment put forward by the member for Downsview, he actually uses the very words of section 5 when he refers to providing the facilities for the ministries and agencies of government. In other words, in the wording of the section as it now is, the responsibility of the minister is at least directed toward providing uniform facilities for all of these agencies which, in the debate we have just completed on second

reading, the minister is indicating are autonomous and separate from his authority.

I personally believe that he himself is convinced that under the Ministry of Government Services—for the sake not only of efficiency but uniformity in policy directed toward the acquisition and the establishment of public facilities, particularly public buildings—there definitely should be the very concept that is put forward in the amendment brought forward by my colleague. In other words, the minister should not simply be moving toward the provision of these uniform facilities but it should be a matter of policy that under the direction of this minister, who as a political person is responsible through this House to the people of Ontario, we would have the uniformity that is so obviously desperately needed in this province.

During the previous debate the vice-chairman of Hydro, who has just taken a seat behind the minister, made some interjections about Hydro's situation in this regard. He might want to take part in the debate to justify Ontario Hydro's decision to use the proposal method, not the competitive tender method, for the building of the $45 million new headquarters just a stone's throw from this very chamber.

I believe that the member for Downsview has put forward an extremely important amendment, one that is a matter of principle. I sense the minister agrees with the amendment put forward and I would say to him that this is the sort of thing the government is going to have to take under consideration and enactment if it is going to restore the kind of confidence in the community that I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, has been lost recently by revelations pertaining to the emanations of government which should be, and in fact are, brought under the jurisdiction of the ministry by the very wording of section 5 as it now is, "ministries and agencies."

For example, the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board as an autonomous—well it isn't autonomous, but as an agency of government, went ahead with the deal with Fidinam, of which we have heard so much, when it should have been the Ministry of Government Services which essentially made the decision to provide the facilities needed by that board. They should not be empowered to negotiate those facilities for themselves. They should be centralized here with a minister who is publicly responsible and readily accessible to criticism in this Legislature and in the community.

I would hope that he would consider supporting the amendment, because if he does not it will be necessary in our support of the amendment to divide the House.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further? The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: I think, Mr. Chairman, that we would support the laconic amendment of the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: At least it is not unctuous.

Mr. Renwick: That will send you to the dictionary, Mr. Chairman. I think it is fair to say that the Committee on Government Productivity was very weak when it indicated the grounds upon which it excluded from the Ministry of Government Services the various boards and commissions of agencies to the government which it did exclude. It's for that reason that we think the amendment is very well proposed and very well taken, and we will certainly support it.

However, on this particular section of the bill, I would like to ask the specific question as to whether or not the ministry is going to be the landlord of the client ministries and agencies of government. There is no reference to that term in here and the provision of services does not generally include within it the relationship of landlord and tenant.

Yet the very thrust of the Committee on Government Productivity's report is that it will be the landlord, and it uses those terms. For example it states that the Ministry of Government Services as the landlord would be required to meet these demands efficiently and to the satisfaction of the tenants, referring to these demands as meaning the amount and quality of space requested by the programme managers. The reference is to them as tenants and to the ministry as landlord.

Or has that recommendation been dropped and is it not going to be implemented? If so, why isn't there some specific reference to it within this omnibus power-granting clause of the principal function of the minister?

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister wish to reply to this now before we have further questions?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Although in principle I probably do not dis-

agree with the intent of the hon. member for Downsview in his amendment, I cannot accept it because it would be an unworkable situation to have such a rigid wording in the Act as is proposed. My ministry is not able, nor would it be advisable in so many cases, to supply all services or a specific service for a ministry.

I say we are certainly moving towards the supply of as many common services as we possibly can for all the ministers.

To reply to the member for Riverdale, we certainly are moving forward on this landlord-tenant relationship. As I said—and I believe he had left the chamber when I was replying before—

Mr. Renwick: I am sorry I did.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —it is certainly my intention to put the costs that are now buried, if you wish to use that word, in my estimates. I want to see those costs go into the ministry and the programme that is benefiting from these costs.

We will be implementing this as quickly as we possibly can, but I cannot accept the amendment, because it would mean that my ministry must supply each and every individual service to each and every ministry in each and every location throughout the Province of Ontario, and this is not possible.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have another question and I think this is the appropriate section to raise it under. The question is with respect to the guidelines that the minister operates under when he contracts out for services with respect to the work which is done for the contractors.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, I know exactly what the hon. member is—

Mr. Renwick: I'm talking about the wages that are paid to the people who work for the contractors; and what standards the minister requires of the contractors in the contracts which are let for the performance of services.

Mr. Chairman: Would this not be more appropriate under section 13, when we're dealing with contracts?

Mr. Renwick: Fine, yes; that would be a very good place to do it.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Riddell) wish to make a comment? Right! We'll place the question then.

Those in favour of Mr. Singer's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Is it agreed that we shall stack this along with any other possible amendments?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Stack it; right!

Any other comments, questions or amendments then up to section 10?

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Chairman, I was still just wondering about section 6, subsection (3). The minister made a few comments in reply to my original comments on this section; and he just came up with two small reasons why this section was put in. They were regarding the purchasing of drugs by the Ministry of Health and the purchasing of cars, by, I believe, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. Right?

To me, if this is all it entails, I would still like to press the minister to withdraw this section from the bill. To me, it does nothing other than pass that power to another minister and could eventually lead to some—as I stated earlier—some type of power given to another minister in designing or constructing a building. The minister may say it is impossible; but it could happen in the future. I would like to ask the minister again if he wouldn't consider withdrawing that section.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman. I understand the hon. member's concern; but I feel that it is absolutely necessary to have that section in the Act. I have mentioned two examples, which I think are very good examples. There may be others, but they don't come to my mind at the moment. But I can see very well where there could be some other area of responsibility the Lieutenant Governor in Council might wish to assign to another ministry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I may just comment further on that section. The examples the minister gave, I suppose, do sound reasonable; that the Ministry of Transportation and Communications should buy the cars. Although I would expect the Solicitor General would buy more cars through the requirements of the police—more than even the Ministry of Transportation and Communications—but maybe they buy more trucks, or something like that.

Even to suggest that the Ministry of Health should have the responsibility for buying

all the drugs; well, that sounds rational. Maybe the Minister of Agriculture and Food, should be buying all the food for the various emanations of government.

I think that a certain argument could be given to disperse almost all its purchasing powers; and yet I think a compelling argument can be made for centralizing all the purchases under the direction of this minister. It may well be that somebody would be seconded from the OPP; or their advice would be sought. But the decision to purchase and the responsibility for the specifications and the approving of contracts should be — and I think that this is agreed on all sides — centralized under one political authority; and that is, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Government Services.

Maybe it's difficult for the minister to persuade certain rather persuasive personalities that he does business with, or deals with from time to time, to give up those powers—which perhaps in years gone by were even more significant than they are now. But all of the reports, and even the statement from Mr. MacNaughton, in his first incarnation as Treasurer, I believe, where he opted for the concept of centralized purchasing, stated that it was with the very understanding that whether it was uniforms for policemen or anything else, it was extremely important to examine the specifications, to approve the specifications and to open the various bids in a public way—in the way that the minister describes as happening in his department now.

There is nothing to inhibit the minister or those people who work for him, who are getting all the advice they need or all the advice that may be forced upon them by various other ministries and individuals within the emanations of those ministries, but I certainly think that this subsection (3) is a mistake.

I sense that the minister agrees with me that the simplest way to bring to heel those people in the various emanations of the government, who work at a level much less exposed to the glare of publicity than the minister does, would be to say that the Act requires him to set out the specifications and the method whereby the bids are opened and approved, and to take the political flak if any flak is flying. Otherwise, the confidence of the community in the purchasing procedures has been undermined, and still is seriously undermined, by the very procedures that the minister is afraid to take unto himself.

I agree it would be quite a move for him to remove this subsection (3), but he does know that it would fall directly into line with the policy statements made by previous Treasurers and other people in the government who certainly were in a position to enunciate policy.

I regret that the minister has not shown strength among his cabinet colleagues to insist upon this for their good and that of so many of the other emanations of government, and for the sake of seeing that the proper procedures are followed and that they are uniform in every purchasing responsibility of government.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, we do have established procedures for purchasing. As I've said before, it's just not feasible for us to do all centralized purchasing. But we have established—I'm sure it is completed now; we were working on it, but I think it is in operation now—a common purchase order form that can be used by all ministries throughout the government. So we are working on a standard form.

We have a standard procedure for purchasing, but to remove this clause and say that we cannot assign certain responsibilities to other ministers, Mr. Chairman, I'd say it's just not workable, although I understand what the members who have spoken for it are saying.

I think we can use the expertise of other areas, such as the Minister of Transportation and Communications for the buying of vehicles.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He buys for the OPP.

Hon. Mr. Snow: That's right. He buys for the OPP now.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Snow: And I buy the lawn mowers, if that's what hon. member is worrying about.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Does the minister buy them from Clarence Duke?

Mr. Martel: He just supplies them, doesn't he?

Hon. Mr. Snow: If this type of expertise can be used in the grouping of orders, whether the Minister of Transportation and Communications buys the automobiles or whether I buy them, I'm satisfied with the procedures being used. We are getting the best possible value. The Minister of Trans-

portation and Communications also awards contracts and deals with a greater dollar volume of construction in a year than I do. So he has the expertise in this area—

Mr. Singer: Who buys the uniforms now that Eric is gone?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I'm sorry, I don't know. I can't reply to that.

Mr. Singer: That's why it would be worthwhile taking subsection (3) out. Then the minister would know.

Hon. Mr. Snow: In any case, Mr. Chairman, institutions such as the School for the Blind at Brantford must buy their vegetables, eggs and meat from local suppliers. We can't centralize the purchasing of that here in Toronto, and it would be ridiculous to do so.

Mr. Singer: They would have to buy them all from Queen's Park—

Mr. Deacon: The minister seems to be very confused on this whole question of basic responsibility for the way in which we buy things. It's a matter of allowing each ministry—as he just suggested in the School for the Blind in Brantford—to do their own buying. Of course it's necessary for them to do it, but if we are going to be consistent with all the minister has been talking about under the Committee on Government Productivity, he should be prepared to take responsibility to see that the proper procedures are carried out.

What this section does is remove that responsibility and assign it to a minister — we have no idea who it is—and he does it by regulation. Time and time again we find this same type of legislation coming in where it is by Lieutenant Governor in Council regulation, and this is what we object to.

Mr. Chairman: Shall subsection (3)—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Yes? The member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: I would like to address a question to the minister. I hope I may be forgiven, being somewhat ignorant as to the powers of other ministers, but one of the things that concerns me, apart from that which has already ben said, is that if this power is relegated—if I could put it that way—to another minister, are there ministers with power to further relegate this authority down the scale to directors or others? I have not had an opportunity to ascertain that. Can we be assured that this is in fact, not the case?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, the assignment of responsibilities is by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The Lieutenant Governor in Council can, by order-in-council, perhaps on recommendation from Management Board, state that a certain minister is responsible for a certain responsibility. Of course, that minister then must be responsible for that responsibility. He is naturally going to have his public servants perform the duties for him.

Mr. Singer: Why don't they do it in his name, rather than directly?

Hon. Mr. Snow: They would be doing it in his name.

Mr. Singer: Oh, no. Is the minister aware of what section 16 really says?

Hon. Mr. Snow: We are not talking about section 16 are we?

Mr. Singer: No, no. But my colleague asked for the minister's assurance that what is set out in section 16 really wouldn't happen.

Mrs. Campbell: That's right.

Mr. Singer: And the minister explained that it wasn't going to happen. Now that the minister has made that interesting explanation, I draw his attention to section 16 where deputy ministers, and/or any body else really, can do it if they get the authority. And it would not be done in the name of the minister; but would be in the name of the deputy minister or any officer or officers. So you can go all the way down to the janitor and give him power to award contracts if you get an order in council.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): The minister didn't know it was there, did he?

Mr. Chairman: Shall this subsection stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Singer: Oh, no.

Mrs. Campbell: No.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Chairman: I'll put the question.

Those in favour of section 6, subsection (3) standing as part of the bill, will please say "aye".

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Some hon. members: Oh!

Mr. Singer: Isn't that ridiculous? What a perversion of that so-called venerable position. We'll never vote for you again.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you!

Shall we stack this along with the earlier vote?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): They are really decrepit over there. Surely they can get on their feet when they lose a vote.

Mr. Chairman: I must say I'm to blame for that. I sort of sneaked that question in.

Mr. Singer: Oh no; the government was asleep, as usual.

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any other comment, question or amendment to any other section of the bill?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a comment about section 8, subsection (3).

Section 8, subsection (3) says "Any disposal by the minister of real property or any interest therein by way of grant or lease or otherwise is subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

In my remarks in the second reading debate I indicated that it would be advisable if even that provision be tightened up very substantially. I pointed out to the minister that there was a variety of statutes which have different provisions. There was the statute—which was Bill 13 in 1972—that was, as I say, sneaked through in the wee small closing hours of the last session.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Attorney General (Mr. Bales) did that.

Mr. Singer: Yes. It allows land obtained under the Housing Development Act to be disposed of on such terms and conditions as the minister may determine. Even the Minister of Government Services must admit that provision goes far too far. It hasn't even the very refined restrictions that this minister as asking for himself—approval of the Lieutenant Governor and a determination that the land is no longer required for government use.

I asked the minister to tighten these up. He has refused, so there is no point proposing an amendment which would ask him to do something he has already refused.

What I am proposing at this point, Mr. Chairman, is an amendment to section 8, subsection (3), which will override the provisions sneaked through by the Attorney General in the Act to amend the Housing Development Act. Therefore I move that in section 8(3) the word "minister" be deleted and inserted in lieu thereof the words "the ministries and agencies of government."

If that amendment is accepted by the minister—and I think he can do no less because surely the minister would want this Act which he brings in to apply to all phases of government—it would successfully override that very sneaky piece of business the government carried out when they put through an Act to amend the Housing Development Act.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Singer has moved that in section 8, subsection (3), the word "minister" be deleted and the words "the ministries and agencies of government" inserted.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I might make some comments about the amendment of my hon. friend from Downsview, you will recall, the wording of section 5, that is the wording put before us by the minister himself. It calls for his supervision over the ministries and agencies of the government.

In other words, there is no policy established which leaves the agencies—and a number of them have been referred to and in fact listed here this afternoon—without the supervision of the Ministry of Government Services. If there was ever a place where such supervision and uniformity in the application of the law was needed, it is certainly in this particular area which governs the application of the sale, the lease or the handling otherwise of government properties, particularly land.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that the statute to which the member for Downsview was referring and which was designated Bill 213 in the last session, An Act to amend the Housing Development Act, gave great new powers of expropriation and sale of government lands to various government emanations, particularly the Housing Corp.

You may also be aware that it was introduced at the end of the session with the appropriate assurances from the various ministers, including the Attorney General himself, that it was in fact not an expansion of the already tremendous powers of government having to do with expropriation.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the government does have these powers of expropriation, but it has not got the power to expropriate land which can then be sold for private purposes. It is surely reasonable for the minister to consider the amendment put forward by the member for Downsview in light of this variety of powers that have been granted to the various emanations and agencies of government.

The argument for them to be generally supervised by the Ministry of Government Services is unanswerable; and this would provide the kind of general supervision which surely every member of the administration, including the Attorney General, would support.

This matter has been brought to the minister's attention, I am sure privately as well as publicly, by a number of citizens in the Pickering area and elsewhere. The impression is widespread that the government, through subterfuge, got the very powers that are necessary for them to proceed with that policy of buying up in every case possible, and by expropriation where necessary, lands in Pickering, in the new town—that used to be called Cedarwood, they are now calling it North Pickering—and then for the subsequent sale of those lands to private entrepreneurs. And not for public housing or rent-geared-to-income dwellings or anything like that, but simply for the profit of private entrepreneurs.

Now these powers ought certainly to be curbed in the very rational and thoughtful way, the useful and democratic way, that is put forward by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, surely the members of the House should give it their careful consideration and support; and frankly I would like to hear the Attorney General's views on it.

Mr. Chairman: Does anyone else wish to speak to this amendment?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, I can only accept responsibility in my bill for the disposition of land or of real property under the power or under the jurisdiction of my ministry.

So I cannot consider the proposed amendment, which would be a matter of government policy. Accepting such an amendment would be giving my ministry powers beyond those which it has at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question? Those in favour of Mr. Singer's motion will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Mr. Renwick: Well we will want that stacked.

Mr. Singer: We do.

Mr. Chairman: Five members stood up, so it will be stacked.

Any other comments, questions or amendments in a later section of this bill?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, to section 10.

Mr. Chairman: Section 10? Anything before section 10?

Section 9 agreed to.

On section 10:

Mr. Renwick: Would the minister give some indication of his answer to my question about the rates of pay that he requires to be paid by contractors when he contracts out services to be rendered, principally in the cleaning and maintenance field?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, we do not have any definite requirements or qualifications in that type of contract. We do in the construction contract; it comes under the Fair Wages Act, or the Government Contracts and Fair Wages Act is the wording I think.

This does establish a minimum wage that must be paid under those contracts and it is set out by the provincial Ministry of Labour, in conjunction with the federal Department of Labour, based on the basic construction wage for that particular area. But our maintenance contracts do not come under that legislation.

Mr. Renwick: I take it that what that means is that if one has some clout, such as the people in the construction industry have, one gets some protection; but if you don't have any clout you get no protection, is that about it?

Doesn't the minister think that this is an area where he can do a great deal to standardize and to raise the level of wages of

people engaged in providing that kind of service?

You see, the government in this field can provide the kind of leadership which is essential. It is not as though they are the only contractors in the field, the only people who contract out these services. There are an immense number of other business concerns which contract out cleaning services in offices across the whole of Metropolitan Toronto.

It is one of the most depressed areas in which people can be engaged. And one of the reasons for this is that it is off-beat. In other words, it takes place when people aren't around; nobody is terribly interested in the level of wages which are paid or conditions of labour or the hours which are worked.

I'm suggesting to the minister that this is one of the areas where, in consort with his colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon), he can certainly make certain that at least the minimum requirements of the Employment Standards Act are met, and where he can make certain there is some punishment provided, or some penalty imposed on the contractor who fails to meet those levels.

In addition to that, there is a very real opportunity in this area for the minister to do something over and above the minimum requirements with respect to labour in the Employment Standards Act. I think this is a significant role for the government to play in this particular field.

I re-emphasize what I said at the beginning of my remarks: These people generally have no clout. Many of them are recent immigrants to the country. Many of them are women who are trying to supplement the family income. For many of these women it is the only job they're able to get for the purpose of providing for their family's support. These people who require something more than to be dealt with only through the avenue of complaint available to them—complaining through the employment standards director of the Ministry of Labour.

I would ask the minister if he would consult with his colleague, the Minister of Labour, to see whether or not something can be done to have this government set the standards. Across Canada, and in parts of the maritime provinces particularly, it was the railways that provided leadership in raising the level of wages.

I'm suggesting in a very minor way that it's possible for this ministry in that field to set the kind of standards which other business enterprises will then respond to—I believe willingly; but if not willingly, then unwillingly—and assist in raising the conditions of what can only be described next to the security guards operation in the province, as people being employed at subsistence or lower than subsistence wages. I would invite the minister to give me some assurance that he would at least discuss the matter with his colleague.

Mrs. Campbell: Is the minister going to respond to that question before I put one?

I wonder if the minister could explain to me two functions with reference to contracts. First, the construction contracts. Does he set the specifications for these construction contracts or are the specifications set, by the ordering department as it were?

Secondly, when people are moved from one location to another—and this is partly following what the hon. member for Riverdale has said—who is responsible for the working conditions under which people are placed when a move takes place? I would point out specifically, the removal of people from the OHIP offices on Yonge St. to Overlea. Would that be something this department would be taking care of, or would it be the ordering department, because I can't follow it in this statute as proposed.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, I'll respond to the two hon. members.

Firstly, the comments regarding labour rates made by the hon. member for Riverdale. I personally do not accept the fact, or the suggestion, that the government should necessarily pay higher rates for services than private industry.

We are very competitive in the market. We call tenders. We give everybody the opportunity to bid. We do not have a minimum wage clause in the contract for cleaning services. I don't think it falls within the purview of my department or my ministry to set the minimum wage rates for the Province of Ontario. That is the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister of Labour. Whatever rates he and the government establish, of course, my ministry would have to live with. As I mentioned before, we do have the so-called Fair Wage Act, the Government Contracts, Hours and Wages Act, with which I personally disagree. I do not think we should have that Act on the statutes of this province any more.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Because the minister comes from the construction industry, that's why! He's the wrong minister for that job.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I just think that it's a complete muddle up of the Labour rates. The industry is organized to the state today that I don't think there's any place in Ontario where anyone is exploiting any construction labour.

Mr. Gisborn: The government opened the door for the exploiters though.

Hon. Mr. Snow: To answer the other hon. member, the specifications for construction contracts, for the materials and the quality of the workmanship, are basically set by my ministry; but of course with the consultation of the client ministries. The operating ministries are clients to my ministry, the same as a company would be the client of an architect. The architect sets the specifications within the guidelines established by the client ministries. In our case, we establish the specifications within the guidelines of the client ministries, but having the expertise in this area we have a considerable input in recommending the proper specifications.

The hon. member mentioned working conditions and moving of employees from one building to the other. I'm afraid that falls outside of the responsibility of my ministry.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 10 stand as part of the bill?

Carried!

Anything before section 16?

Mr. Renwick: Section 13.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale on section 13.

Mr. Renwick: Is the minister satisfied that this is an adequate ambit for the only section of the bill that contains a reference to the tender operation that he is engaged in? It's a very limited operation when it relates only to construction, renovation or repair of a public work as areas where there is an obligation to call tenders. Is there any other indication, either by regulation or elsewhere, that he is going to deal with the tender question on commodities in other areas?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, it's not in this bill, but it is certainly in the specific policies of my ministry that within reason all purchases are by tender, whether by invitation or by advertisement. We do use the invitation tender system at some times if there is some urgent requirement for a particular material. We keep on hand a list of the people who normally bid and do certain types of work.

In fact, even when there is an advertised tender call I think a memo is sent out to many people advising them, because sometimes people will miss seeing an advertisement in the newspaper.

I know in one particular case where we were calling a demolition contract, although it was advertised publicly I think about 25 demolition contractors were notified that this job was open for bids.

We do have it in this Act, stating that we do not have to call tenders, really, for estimates where the work is less than $10,000. But I assure members we call tenders for jobs sometimes for a few hundred dollars, even in the construction or repair field. In the case of an emergency, where we must get work done immediately, I would report this to the House in accordance with the clauses in the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Does section 13 stand as part of the bill then?

Section 13 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

On section 16.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I don't see any necessity for this section at all. Whatever is going to be done should be done only in the name of the minister and it shouldn't be done in the name of the deputy minister or any officer or officers of the ministry.

Certainly nobody really expects the minister is going to do all of these things himself personally, but what we are providing here is a vehicle whereby the minister can slough off what should be his democratic responsibility. I don't see, really, what you achieve by allowing the Lieutenant Governor in Council, by order in council, to say that these things can be done by the deputy minister or any other officer or officers.

As I suggested when the original Act went through, this kind of section would allow the eventual delegation of responsibility to the lowliest hourly-rated employee you have.

The minister is going to say "We would never do that." Maybe you wouldn't ever do it, but why should the responsibility be

taken away from the minister? That's where the responsibility lies. That's where it should continue to lie and I can see no reason at all for the continuance of section 16 in this statute.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to move an amendment, but I advise you that we are opposed to the inclusion of section 16 in this Act.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we are equally opposed to it. It is an old argument and there has been no cogent reason ever put forward by the government since this matter was first raised some years ago. I don't know why the government must insist on having this power of delegation in the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, another point on that. The minister has made the point previously that he is not going to establish personally the tenders and look at all the land and open the envelopes and so on; and no one is suggesting he do that.

We are quite prepared to vote money for him to hire people to do these things for him, but when the statute formally delegates the authority it simply means that the minister is no longer responsible in the eyes of the law.

If it doesn't mean that, he does not need this section in order to hire people to put stamps on the envelopes and open the envelopes, and maybe even give him advice as to which tender is the lower or lowest or that sort of thing.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that there is a serious misunderstanding on the part of the minister and some of his colleagues who have felt over the years that this section should be included. If you are, in fact, delegating the powers to expropriate land and decide on purchases, this is a terrible thing and something which surely you, yourself, would not support. If you are simply hiring staff to do certain jobs under your direct or indirect supervision, then of course we would support you in it. I can't see why this section is needed; and it should not be included.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Chairman, I believe if we go back to page 1 of the bill, somewhere it says the ministry shall be under the direction of the minister. Certainly I don't read this section 16, in the same way as the hon. members who have spoken. Of course, I haven't got my QC yet.

Mr. Singer: That's a good excuse.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As far as this is concerned, there is authority to delegate authority to carry out certain duties within the ministry. I think it is only 100 per cent necessary and certainly I don't think any delegation of authority relieves the minister of the total authority for the ministry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You already have the authority.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You do not have the ability to delegate without this delegation of authority.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 16 stand as part of the bill?

Those in favour of section 16 standing as part of the bill will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Shall we stack this along with the others?

Stacked.

Is there any other comment, question or amendment on any later section of the bill?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Might I, on a point of order, make a suggestion to the House leader, through you Mr. Chairman. If it is his intention when the vote is called to have the whips go out for 15 or 20 minutes, maybe we could vote at 8 o'clock?

Mr. Singer: Do you want to vote now?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I rather thought we might return to the Throne Speech debate this evening.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, we can vote right at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I prefer to call the vote now.

Mr. Chairman: I think if everybody holds their seats, a very short bell might be appropriate, if I might be so bold as to suggest it.

Call in the members.

We have to ring the bells for a few minutes.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Let's vote now.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

Order please. We have four matters to be determined. We will have to place these separately because the voting will be different.

Mr. Singer moved that in section 5 the words "be directed towards providing" be deleted and the word "provides" substituted therefore.

The committee divided on Mr. Singer's motion which was negatived on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 30, the "nays" 37.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost. Section 5 shall stand as part of the bill.

The committee divided on whether section 6, subsection (3) shall stand as part of the bill, which was approved on a stacked vote, the same count as the first vote reversed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion carried, the section stands as a part of the bill.

The committee divided on Mr. Singer's motion that in section 8, subsection (3), the word "minister" be deleted and the words "the ministries and agencies of government" be substituted therefor, which was negatived on a stacked vote, the same count as the first vote.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost.

The committee divided on the question of whether section 16 stand as part of the bill, which was approved on a stacked vote the same count as the first vote reversed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion carried, the section stands as a part of the bill.

The committee divided on reporting Bill 3, which was approved on a stacked vote, the same count as the first vote reversed.

Bill 3 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moved the committee rise and report and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

It being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Prices of foodstuffs, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Renwick 459

Meat boycott, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. R. F. Nixon 460

Importation of workers, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deans 460

Threatened Armstrong epidemic, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Deans, Mr. Stokes 461

Flooding in Hamilton, questions of Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Auld: Mr. Gisborn 462

Great Lakes flood damage, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Deans 462

Labour dispute at Daal Plastics, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. B. Newman 463

Oil spill in Kaministikwia River, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Foulds 463

School budgets, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Singer, Mr. Deacon 464

Sudbury housing investigation, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Laughren 464

Furniture supplies to government, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Reid 465

Student awards programme, questions of Mr. McNie: Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Roy 465

Grant to McMaster University, question of Mr. McNie: Mr. J. R. Smith 466

Government action against Dow Chemical, questions of Mr. Auld and Mr. Kerr: Mr. Burr, Mr. Singer 466

Pay increase for coroners, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Walker 467

ODC loans qualifications, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Paterson 468

Penalty for missing assessment deadline, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Young, Mr. MacDonald 468

Police seizure of company's books, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Deacon 469

Alleged use of strikebreakers, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Bounsall 469

Uniform building and fire codes, question of Mr. Clement: Mr. Givens 469

Request for Interpol help, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 470

Presenting report, standing regulations committee, Mr. Maeck 470

Compania Shell de Venezuela Ltd. Act, bill respecting, Mr. MacBeth, first reading 471

Beds of Navigable Waters Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 471

Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, bill to amend, Mr. Drea, first reading 471

Consumer Protection Bureau Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, second reading 471

Collection Agencies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, second reading 471

Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, second reading 472

Certification of Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, second reading 474

Partnerships Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, second reading 475

Limited Partnerships Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, second reading 477

Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, second reading 479

Third readings 479

Ministry of Government Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. Snow, second reading 480

Forest Fires Prevention Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bernier, second reading 488

Ministry of Government Services Act, bill to amend, reported 490

Recess, 6 o'clock 502

No. 13

Ontario

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1973

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 3, the Ministry of Government Services Act, 1973.

Bill 66, An Act to amend the Forest Fires Prevention Act.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has become one of the best known areas in the world. The Metropolitan Toronto area and this system of government have been studied by people from all levels of government from many countries. The advent of the metropolitan form of government in 1953 by an Act of this Legislature set this area on the road to becoming a great city complex.

Every year we have some 40,000 to 50,000 more people here in Metro and this, of course, causes great strain on all the services required. At the heart of this expanding area is the city of Toronto. I know it is a desire of the people of this province that their capital city should be one of which they may be proud. A great city is not only a great place to live in but a great place to visit; a city that provides a good living and a good environment for its citizens.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): But one wouldn't want to live there!

Mr. Wardle: It is most important, however, that a city be well planned and a suitable place in which to live, work and raise a family.

Mr. Stokes: One wouldn't want to live there!

Mr. Wardle: One of the most important decisions of the Toronto city council in 1962 was a decision to build a new city hall. Two of my colleagues of that time are with me now in the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, $28.5 million seems to be a lot of money and it did seem to be a lot of money in those days.

The decision of the council was an outward and visible sign of faith in the future of this city and this province. Since that decision was made the old armouries on University Ave. were demolished and a new courthouse was built. Following this, private industry built in downtown Toronto and many old or obsolete office buildings were replaced by new structures.

All this is helping to make Toronto's downtown a pleasant place to work, for leisure and recreation. It is most important, however, that any development—public or private—make a contribution to a better and a more vital city.

This, Mr. Speaker, has been recognized in the past few days in particular by this provincial government. Many American cities have been faced with the problem of people leaving their homes or businesses in the central core for the suburbs. In the mid-town area numerous stores have become either vacant or boarded up and obsolete buildings are standing empty.

In many American cities a person would not be safe visiting these areas after dark. At a dinner some time ago I asked a visitor from an American city what impressed him most about Toronto and his answer was that he and his wife walked a downtown street without feeling in danger after dark. He said this was not possible at home. It seems most important that people should be able — not only in the downtown area but in all areas of this city and province—to walk on their streets without fear.

I welcomed the decision of the Metropolitan Toronto police force to initiate a programme of two-man cruisers and to have

more men on foot patrol in our neighbourhoods. The new communications network of the Metropolitan Toronto police will enable them to respond within seconds to a call for assistance from a citizen. At the present time the system is so overloaded that calls take a number of minutes and we realize the necessity of having the police department respond to a call for assistance as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that it is most important that a city be well planned. I have certain quotations and information from a magazine called "The Plain Truth" of December, 1970, regarding some American cities. This article points out the increasing problems being faced by big cities all over the world.

On the other side of the Atlantic one half of all Britons are already living in seven great multi-city chains—London, Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool and Newcastle and they are crowded cities. Britain has 50 per cent more people per square mile than teeming, populous India. Some 55 million Britons are compressed together on a small island only three-fifths the size of California.

On this crowded island London is but a small area, yet one-sixteenth of the British people call this city home. Tokyo, Paris, Calcutta are other teeming world metropolises. All have big-city problems of congestion and pollution. City planners admit they have little or no control—especially in the United States—over limiting the size of these cities. Of all the world's major and medium cities only London, New Delhi and Brasilia could be said to have made any real progress in this area.

There is a reason why people flock to cities in such uncontrolled numbers. Those coming to cities or already living in them expect to find greater rewards, not increased trouble. People leave an area because they hope to live better somewhere else. They look to cities and suburban centres to provide them with higher-paying jobs, increased cultural opportunities, greater education benefits and more freedom of choice in lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker, at this particular point in the development of this Metropolitan Toronto area we should have in mind the words of the Chinese philosopher, Confucius, who said—and this is a true saying, Mr. Speaker: "A wise man learns from experience; a wiser man learns from the experience of others."

From this article I read first of the experience of New York City, a city that is said to have now become uncontrollable.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): All sayings are true sayings, because somebody said them.

Mr. Wardle: Some other cities in the USA also have problems, problems that do not appear to have a solution, and I hope we here in the Metropolitan Toronto area can benefit from their experience.

I read, Mr. Speaker, a few columns from page 6, of this particular magazine:

> More than one million taxpayers have fled New York City. As a result, the possible tax revenue is diminishing. For those hardy souls with a city address the tax burden has doubled in 10 years. For those who can afford to leave, there frankly isn't much incentive for staying. Meanwhile, the New York City slums are literally becoming "disaster areas." Said one senator: "Expert witnesses predict the city will add 75,000 potential homeless annually for the next 15 years." This was likened to 15 major hurricane disasters sweeping across New York City each year.
>
> There is a paradox in all this. Even though homeless individuals are added to the city's woes, approximately 130,000 apartments and houses have been left to rot in the city within the past five years.
>
> Other cities are suffering a similar "ghost town" fate. In Detroit, buildings are being abandoned at the rate of over 500 yearly. Cleveland finds itself with an added 800 empty apartments and houses yearly. In Philadelphia the rate is 25,000 abandoned dwellings per year. Chicago comes out with a figure of 1,800 structures a year suffering a similar desolation fate.
>
> While houses are being abandoned, the streets are getting more crowded than ever. Today, the vehicular pace in downtown New York City is a pace of six to eight miles per hour. In the horse and buggy year of 1907 the rate of travel was a speedier 11.5 mph. Meanwhile, major cities are increasingly plagued by violent crime. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, chairman of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, warns that "violent crime in the United States is primarily a phenomenon of large cities. The 26 cities with 500,000 or more residents and containing about 17 per cent of the total population contribute about 45 per

cent to the total reported major violent crimes."

The six cities with one million or more residents—of which New York City is chief—have 10 per cent of the population and 30 per cent of the crime.

The rate of reported New York City Crime in 1968 was 21.8 per cent above that of 1967. Street crimes rose even more dramatically. Robbery was up 50 per cent on the streets of New York.

Americans used to sing about the "Sidewalks of New York." Today, you can get yourself robbed, mugged or killed on those same sidewalks. . . .

This pinpoints the biggest problem of New York City — or any other city: the human element. New Yorkers, like other city dwellers by and large have lost their human compassion and their desire to help others.

The reaction of an out-of-towner quoted below illustrates this tragic big-city problem:

"When I first came to New York it seemed like a nightmare. As soon as I got off the train at Grand Central I was caught up in pushing, shoving crowd on 42nd St. Sometimes people bumped into me without apology; what really frightened me was to see two people literally engaged in combat for the possession of a cab.

"Why were they [city people] so rushed?

"Even drunks on the street were bypassed without a glance. People didn't seem to care about each other at all."

The problem — the effect of the city on the human mind—is increasingly the subject of concerned experiments and studies.

As an example of what can happen in the type of city where people just don't care, I would like to list the case, which we all remember so well, of a young woman by the name of Kitty Genovese. She was chased by an attacker and, after repeated attempts, finally killed. Many people saw what was going on and could have come to her aid, but none did. Where will all this end?

Mr. Speaker, many people are pessimistic about the future of cities of this type. As John W. Gardner, a former chairman of the Urban Coalition, said: "Our great cities have lost command of themselves and their futures . . . They have reached the end of their rope."

But why haven't we in this city or in this country taken the necessary steps to solve the city problems? We have the records of cities of past ages; ancient Rome, medieval cities, the cities of the early industrial revolution should all have served as examples of everything wrong with our urban way of life.

Former US Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney said, "In too many cases the city lacks a clear definition of what it is or ought to be." He asked: "What is a city? Does anybody know?" What is a great city?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Come up to Owen Sound. We'll show him!

Mr. Wardle: Foreseeing the crush of future population growth, a committee of public officials in the United States has recommended that the United States build 110 new cities, and these are said to be ideal cities of 100,000 people each. Ten other cities also are planned that will contain at least one million people each.

Mr. Speaker, how may people in this Legislature know what is an ideal city? What is their hope for their city? What is their hope for their own town or village? Does anyone have a clear definition?

We cannot start with cities as we know them. We know the failures of cities. So we have to decide first what the future should be, but bearing in mind what is a suitable city, having in mind the quality of life.

Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sargent: Not Chairman—Speaker.

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Speaker, I hope the planning boards of the government departments—be they provincial, metropolitan or city planning departments—responsible for the planning of the cities and towns of Ontario, will always bear in mind the human element so that the cities, towns, villages and the rural areas of this province will become enjoyable places to live and work and play.

Mr. Chairman, I should like—

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, tell him who you are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Speaker, I should like finally—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wardle: —to bring to the attention of this House a matter of great concern, I am sure, to the people of this province.

Mr. Singer: Oh, no doubt it is.

Mr. Wardle: I believe it is of urgent concern. This matter is the utilization of the large tracts of recreational land we have in this province. I welcome in the Throne Speech the intention of the government to provide a parkway belt system from Dundas in the west to Oshawa in the east.

Mr. Foulds: The road to Oshawa is paved with good intentions.

An hon. member: Don't worry about it.

Mr. Wardle: This parkway belt will provide for the orderly channelling of services and utilities, which are the essential support system of urban life, while preserving open space for urban communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is so important as we see the cities and towns of this part of the province becoming larger. It will offer welcome green spaces and provide much-needed enjoyment and recreation for the people of this part of the province. As I mentioned before, the use of recreational land, both Crown land and land in private hands, is very important to our future. I understand that Crown land may be leased rather than bought by people who are not citizens of Canada. This does not seem to prevent—

Mr. Foulds: Even those who are not citizens cannot buy Crown land.

Mr. Wardle: —non-Canadians from buying up recreational land in Ontario from private owners, or from tax sales.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Did the Chairman of the Management Board write that speech?

Mr. Wardle: The recreational lands in Ontario are now under great pressure, not only from residents of Ontario but from our neighbours to the south.

Mr. Singer: The government should make him Treasurer.

Mr. Wardle: The population of the United States of America is now 210,361,000—

Mr. Foulds: And 473.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wardle: —and nearly 50 million of this number are along or close to the border of Ontario. States like Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York, Michigan, Minnesota and Illinois are all within short driving distance. Much of our recreational land is already owned by Americans, and as the land in the United States becomes more and more urbanized, Ontario will be a prime target for buyers bidding higher and higher for choice recreational land. The effect of this, of course, will be the driving up of prices, and the young families with children living in Ontario—

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Control the price of land.

Mr. Wardle: —will not be able to compete in the purchasing of a cottage or land on which to build a summer home.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Land banks.

Mr. Wardle: A family in Ontario should have the first right to buy available recreational land in their own province.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That's right. Tell the government that.

Mr. Wardle: I am not referring to commercial or industrial land that may be purchased by non-Canadians and used for those purposes. We have a great heritage here in Ontario, with a good part of our province undeveloped.

Mr. Cassidy: We should sell it to the Americans?

Mr. Wardle: However, steps should be taken for restriction of the sale of recreational land to non-Canadians.

I am speaking only of a restriction on the purchase or resale of recreational lands to anyone but Canadians. I believe we need legislation to prevent non-Canadians from purchasing recreational real estate in the Province of Ontario.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Sock it to them.

Mrs. Campbell: I rise, Mr. Speaker, with some trepidation in this my maiden address in this House—

Interjections by hon members.

Mrs. Campbell: I do so, Mr. Speaker, because I have listened to the Areopagiticas which flowed so eloquently from the golden voices of the orators of this council, with legislatures—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mrs. Campbell: It takes me back.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Next thing we know, we'll call her Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Campbell: Not a chance, Mr. Speaker.

So I was of the opinion that perhaps by the content of what I would have to say I might make up in some small measure for my inadequacies as an orator. Then I met with my leader (Mr. R. F. Nixon) and I was advised that protocol made it almost impossible for me to enter into anything of a controversial nature which might provoke any disturbance in those opposite, at least, in this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I have found that walking the streets and knocking on doors did not physically fit me for the acrobatics in which I now find I must engage if I am to be able to find a point in time when I may put a question. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that I may be forgiven if I do make some references which might, at least, be mildly disturbing although I shall be as gentle as possible in my discussion about the proposals in the Throne Speech.

One of the things which has concerned me — and I am delighted that my friend, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Wardle), shares to some extent my concern — is what appears to be a lack of that very quality of humanity and of human warmth in the proposals from government. I am concerned, deeply, that apparently there is an intention to continue regional government proposals without referral to the people who are involved in the regions and deeply concerned and anxious and frustrated at their lack of a voice.

Surely it is important for us to stop and think of the effect of what amounts virtually to closure; not permitting, for example, the people of Streetsville to be fully heard. This was a position which was taken by the Ontario Municipal Board, an appointed body, and confirmed by the cabinet. Surely if we are proceeding in this direction we can only look for further distress, further concern and further problems?

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there has been adequate communication with the people across this province on the effect of the new formula of assessment and the way in which the residential burden is being increased. Oddly enough it is not only by assessment but also taxation, which is a strange phenomenon in our society which doesn't appear to take place in the United States where so often people in cities increase their assessment in order to keep the tax rate down.

Coupled with this and the fact that the policies in planning and the thrust in planning seem to be taking the autonomy away from the local municipalities, and the fact that the term of office has been cut, it is pretty obvious that the local municipality cannot plan those sophisticated plans which they are really required to do. In two years I really don't think Metro, with or without the assistance of this government, will even resolve the problem of garbage disposal.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not it is the policy of this government that the Ontario Municipal Board should be sitting discussing proposals in a portion of the city which falls within the riding of St. George, and treating the people who appear before it as citizens with contempt and certainly with an obvious bias. I am wondering whether this is a policy of government or whether perhaps one might consider looking into the matter.

I had hoped with all my soul that in this House there would be introduced in this session a modern and enlightened piece of legislation which would bring our family law into the 20th century. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that of course there is a Law Reform Commission but surely someone must direct the priorities of that commission? It does seem awful that we are functioning in our family courts today under legislation which probably has not greatly changed during the lifetime of most of the people — even including me —sitting in this chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I would have asked the question—as I say, if I could have developed my acrobatics more speedily—when the city of Toronto, being charged with administration of justice, led the continent in the provision of pre-trial counselling services, why, when the province took over administration of justice, was this eliminated apparently on the report of a civil servant who, according to my information never even discussed it with the judges involved in that court?

I won't say, Mr. Speaker, that the pre-counselling service effected reconciliations in

any great number. What it did achieve was the opportunity for two people to separate with some degree of friendliness and to prevent the children of a marriage from becoming guided missiles between two warring parents. Today, Mr. Speaker, the judges in that court are truly intake workers and there is no way that marriages can be protected or assisted when that pre-trial counselling service is not available.

It also strikes me as strange that at a time when we have tickets of leave in this country for convicted murderers, the only way in which a judge of this family court can enforce an order is by committal to jail for contempt of court.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Good point!

Mrs. Campbell: I would certainly urge that this government show, as the hon. member indicates, its concern for humanity and give some priority direction, if that is possible, to the commission.

There are many other areas of concern. If we look at the city itself, we see the difficulties of group after group. Be they teachers, be they students, be they nurses, all of them are confused and uncertain because of the confused and uncertain policies enunciated to date.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I was most grateful to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) for his announcement as to the stipends for interning students. However, I wonder if he knows just what is the position of the nurses in the hospitals today in Toronto and across the province. If they are in their course now and in hospital training they cannot find out even this simple fact—and they've asked me and I can't find it out, Mr. Speaker: "If we miss one eight-week rotation in our course where are we? Do we have to go to a community college and start all over again? Our course is gone." Yet even on that simple question the hospitals advise that they do not have the answers.

Surely this oversight, if that is what it is, ought to be corrected. If, Mr. Speaker, the ministry in question is not aware of the answers, I would hope that those answers would be forthcoming soon, because these young nurses training in hospitals have sufficient tensions without having to face up to this type of uncertainty.

We have been told—at least the students have been told—that tuition fees will not be increased. But they have not been told, as I understand it, what the policy is with reference to the loan ceiling and whether or not that is to be increased.

It seems to me that when we are trying to keep our young people in post-secondary education, partly on the basis of a very real and proper philosophy of accessibility, but also perhaps at least in some part to keep them out of the labour market until we can sort out some of our basic problems, surely they are entitled to know that the ground rules are not going to be changed from under them from time to time. If we have difficulty planning fiscally here, I think we should be filled with sympathy for the student who needs to be able to plan and cannot do so at this time.

I have perhaps one further observation, Mr. Speaker. It is sad to me to notice with what frequency we look across at blue chairs. I am afraid I cannot always see the rest of the government benches on this side. I try.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The member is not missing anything.

Mrs. Campbell: I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the increasing momentum of government, other than through this legislative process. It concerns me deeply. I would hope that there would be enunciated at some point a return to the policy of discussion and debate with some input from this side in the important decision-making processes. I would hope that we would return to the use of the standing committees so that the bills could be more readily debated and understood. I would hope that we would not be asked to approve bills without adequate notice and adequate opportunity to discuss them.

Mr. Speaker, I trust in what I have said, in what I hope you will find to have been a brief maiden speech, that I have made some points which will be heard and discussed during this session, and that have not transgressed too deeply against the protocol of the situation of this moment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, it's been some months since we have had the opportunity to have a little chat—actually four months since we had that terrible evening, you may recall, which caused you so much pain and difficulty, and for which I apologize for embarrassing one of your con-

frères. But more of that later. I was very impressed by the previous speakers tonight. Of course, they have a great deal of experience at city council. Unfortunately, I haven't had those opportunities to polish my deliveries, but I have polished deliveries of a different type. So you'll excuse me.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): The member got wound up in his umbilical cord on that one.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you. I want to compliment the previous member (Mrs. Campbell) on her maiden speech. I will try, as she has done, not to irritate anyone in the House because I understand that is the proper way to do things, sort of mid-season as we are with no elections coming up, not even any by-elections.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Not now.

Mr. Shulman: So I, too, shall restrain myself and be completely apolitical, Mr. Speaker, more or less. I would like to compliment you. I don't have many opportunities to do that so I want to take this opportunity of complimenting you on the way you have been conducting the question period for the last two days. We appear finally to have returned the question period to the members. It's a welcome and long overdue change for which I and many other back benchers thank you.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Now for the bad news.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): I often wondered why you had that high-backed chair, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Before going into the major subject of my speech, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk very briefly about the most recent business venture into which I have entered, with your help and presumably your approval. As you know, I have opened a bookstore down in room 215 in the north wing, which is doing very well; we have sold out three times and had to reorder. I understand that, being in this building, I am exempt from business tax and sales tax—

Mr. Givens: What about "sin tax"?

Mr. Shulman: And sin tax—due to your control of the building, and I thank you for that. We are doing very well.

I thought it might be of interest to the members this evening if I could read into Hansard certain portions of the two books which we are now selling so that all of them could realize the enterprise in which we are all now associated, since it is taking place from our building.

I have here the two books, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps later in my speech, if there is time this evening – the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) has asked me to try to talk as long as I can because he doesn't want to go on tonight; so perhaps we can fill in the time by reading those two books. Usually it is the other way around. Usually he says, "Shut up." "Sit down." "What's all this nonsense?" But finally he has seen the error of his ways and he realizes that what I have to say is of some importance; so I am going to try to please my hon. friend as much as I can this evening.

Mr. Speaker, on a more serious note, tonight I want to continue the series of speeches which I have been giving since June 1970 about organized crime in this province. But before I turn to that particular subject, I want to come back to the book business again.

Last Tuesday was an average day for crime in this city. According to the statistics, two persons were wounded, 20 others were beaten up; citizens reported four robberies, 50 burglaries and 100 other major crimes. In addition to these, last Tuesday there were 100 automobile accidents causing 40 personal injuries and there were 80 juvenile offences.

And while all this routine mayhem and pillaging was taking place in Toronto, a squad of Toronto's finest was swooping down in a key raid on a major crime taking place in this city. They went from bookstore to bookstore, Mr. Speaker, seizing some books—ones that were really dangerous to the peace—and warning store owners that they faced criminal charges if they did not remove other books from their shelves.

The squad that was responsible for this great piece of police work was headed by Sergeant of Detectives Van Fleet, carefully followed by Detectives Fenton and Reynolds. And they bravely carried out their duties in this. They didn't flinch at any of the bookstores as they went in and read the books, got excited and seized them.

Mr. Speaker, Toronto is one of the most fortunate cities in the world because of its police force. Thanks largely to the efforts of our former Chief of Police, Jim Mackey, our force is honest, it is reliable and it is so efficient that our crime index is among the lowest of all North American cities. Toronto is one of the few large cities in the free world where a citizen can walk with safety anywhere and at any time.

This having been said, notice must be taken of a disturbing trend since Chief Mackey moved to another field, one in which unfortunately he has not been quite as successful as his former field. The crime rate is now rising astronomically, largely because of the problems which are imported from the USA and associated with speed and heroin. This has been largely unpreventable.

However, associated with this has been something bad that was preventable, and this is a loss of respect for our police, which is not the fault of the men on the beat. Many instances come to mind, and perhaps the most ludicrous was the Keystone Kop behaviour of Chief Adamson in the Lastman case, followed by Mel Lastman's revelations of the low standards of our police equipment. The behaviour of the police commission in the case of the site of the police tower shows an obduracy that is disturbing.

But the most recent incident, the book seizure, indicates a loss of common sense that makes one wonder if we are not rushing toward the US police-versus-the-public image instead of the one which we have had for so many years here of the police helping the public.

To aggravate matters, we have the horrible coincidence in this province today of having a man in charge of the police forces in the person of the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko), who has shown a unique inability to cope with any of his previous posts. His actions and remarks since his new appointment have done nothing to change the previous image of ineptness, and his comment just a few weeks ago about the CISO indicates his complete miscasting in his role as civilian head of our police. The retention by the Premier (Mr. Davis) of his present Solicitor General makes one give serious thought to the intelligence and judgement of the Premier of this province.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): He should actually be in charge of the blood bank.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, that's a job he wouldn't be bad at.

If, for political reasons, the member for Bellwoods must be kept in the cabinet —and I recognize that there are some political reasons for keeping him in the cabinet, he serves a very important function there; he does deliver a certain block of votes— surely if this is essential under our system he should be put in a less sensitive post? After all, let me think, he couldn't do much harm—

Mr. Laughren: Health?

Mr. Shulman: —in Tourism. My confrère suggested Health, but I'm afraid I can't agree there. He couldn't do much harm in Tourism. We have had a succession of non-doers in that job, and no one seems to notice the difference. But surely he has to be removed from his present job as Solicitor General? The only good aspect of his present position—I recognize this and for this I am thankful—is that his actions and his comments will undoubtedly hasten the end of the present government and for this one must give certain points.

Well, what is to be done? There is still one ray of hope in this particular cabinet, in this particular field, and that is in the person of the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr). Now, it is true his star has faded badly and in recent months he has had to eat a lot of the words that he spewed at us across the floor.

Mr. Breithaupt: "Polluters must pay."

Mr. Shulman: Yes. We don't talk about non-returnable bottles or things like that any more. He sits quietly in his chair and he is a little embarrassed.

When he is asked a question he has become very cabinet material-like, because as we saw the other day when they asked him a question—and we all knew what he really thought about police action on the day he was asked about it—the poor man, because he has no authority really, had to squirm around and really take no position at all. But yet, despite his present low status, despite his present fall in the esteem of the Premier, he still has the respect of all parties. He still has the potential for moving back into some job with some responsibility—perhaps Solicitor General or Attorney General—and out of the thinking job he has now, where one is allowed to think but not do.

We on this side of the House are very anxious that neither our police nor our Justice department slips any further in public esteem, and I am appealing to the Provincial Secretary for Justice—I am sorry he is not here, but I am sure he will read my remarks —to step in, because there is a tremendous gap that has opened at the top. We happen to have the sad association of a chief of police who is not particularly adept, let's say, at public relations for one thing, associated with a Solicitor General who is not adept at anything. This is bad for us, it is bad for everyone, and it is particularly bad for the police.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to the subject which we have discussed on a number of occasions and that is the problem of organized crime in this province. I note with some dismay that I don't have the full front bench that I had for my last speech. Perhaps there is some explanation for that, but I will come to that a little later, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to turn to one aspect of Mafia activity which has not been previously discussed publicly or in this House—and I use the word Mafia advisedly, I may say. This is the racket involving the smuggling of young Italian men from Calabria and Sicily into the United States and it is being done through Toronto. Information which I shall give you today has all been known by our Department of Justice for some considerable time, but to this date no one has been charged in this country.

I don't want to take credit for this speech, Mr. Speaker. I want to give full credit to the Toronto Star for gathering most of this information. I want to thank them for not printing it until I had an opportunity to deliver this speech in the House today.

Perhaps you will understand that the Toronto Star assigned one of their best reporters to dig up this material, and I know he worked very hard. He travelled to the States and spoke to a number of police officials both in the United States and here, which was the basis of the material which they gathered. The Star's a tiny paper and it doesn't have room for too much to get in each day. I presume that is the reason it hasn't been printed yet. Anyway, I guess they can print it tomorrow.

Mr. Breithaupt: That adds veracity because the member is giving it.

Mr. Shulman: Well, this way they can say, "Shulman said it in the Legislature."

Mr. Breithaupt: Oh! The headlines are already set up.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps it's that way. I am going to deliver the Toronto Star's material with gratitude to the three reports of the Star that I see sitting up there. I trust they'll be equally kind to me at least.

I'm going to give all the material which they presented, plus a little more. I'm leaving out one or two names of people. I'll discuss these people without names. The reason for this is that the material about these people was received from various police officers in this city, but not by me directly, and I don't wish to use the names of these people who do not have any charge against them, inasmuch as I don't have the facts myself.

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): The member has learned something.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste Marie): He has come a long way in four months.

Mr. Shulman: I'm afraid that the members opposite have learned nothing. I may have learned something in four months; they have learned nothing.

The material that was given four months ago was all based on material I had developed myself and dug up myself. This is material dug up by the Toronto Star. That is why I am not using names. I know members opposite will not understand the difference, but afterwards I'll take them aside and I'll explain it more slowly. Forgive me, because the other members will probably want me to go ahead.

I will be mentioning a number of names and these are people who have actually been caught in serious crimes, either involving the smuggling of immigrants into the United States—caught by the Americans, let me say —or else they are involved in equally serious matters involving the smuggling of heroin.

Mr. Speaker, organized crime always steps in to fill an illicit need on which a profit can be made. In this case, in the immigration racket, here's a dual need. The first aspect is the poverty and the high unemployment in southern Italy which encourages young men to emigrate to seek their fortune elsewhere. The second is the need for cheap labour in New York in construction and the need by the Mafia for button men.

Button men, in case you're not aware, Mr. Speaker, are the low men on organized crime's totem pole. They are the men who carry out the unglamorous jobs of collecting, driving and distributing. These aren't terribly glamorous any more, particularly since certain recent movies have been made. The unfortunate thing is—and I speak from the point of view of the persons concerned—that the sons of the persons involved in organized crime don't wish to follow in their fathers' footsteps. Instead they all want to be doctors or lawyers or accountants.

The hon. member: And Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. Shulman: And cabinet ministers, as someone has suggested.

This has produced a serious labour shortage in the field of organized crime. You have still lots of people who are willing to sit up

at the top and say, "Herb, do this". But there aren't too many who are willing to go out on the road and do the really hard stuff that's necessary.

So this particular shortage is being filled by importing men from Europe. Because legal immigration from Italy to the USA is almost impossible, this is now being done illegally, largely through Toronto, practically entirely through Canada.

The scheme is very well organized. Recruitment is done through travel agencies in the city of Calabria. They charge an all-inclusive fee, ranging from $350 to $1,000, depending on what the traffic will bear. For this, all costs are covered and the immigrant is promised work in construction or in a pizzaria in Long Island or in New York.

I want to digress just for a minute. There was a story in the Toronto Star last month on Feb. 24, 1973—a fairly long story. For some reason, the name of the reporter isn't on top of the story. It's called a special report. I guess in the rush to get it to the paper, they left the name of the reporter off.

In any case it describes the number of aliens sneaking into the US from Canada in total. It mentions, for example, that last year the figure for persons actually caught at the border was up to 3,745; this is from all nationalities. Many of them are from the Caribbean; many of them are from India or from Pakistan.

I don't want to waste a lot of time by going into this story in detail. This gives the general description of the smuggling racket into the States without going into the specifics which I'm going to talk about tonight. For any who are interested they can read that article; I shan't repeat it.

Now, coming back to Calabria, after the would-be immigrants to the States contact the travel agent in Calabria, they are flown to Rome and they are then flown from Rome to Toronto. When they arrive at immigration —they have been well rehearsed before they ever left Italy—they say that they are tourists and they are here to visit a relative for a period of 30 days, which is perfectly legal. They've been supplied with the proper papers and there is no problem for bona fide visitors coming to this country to visit.

These men are all supplied with the names of supposed relatives—they are not really relatives—whom they are prepared to name to the immigration officers. In addition, in case anything goes wrong, they are given the name of a contact in Toronto with whom they may get in touch. They are instructed when they leave customs to carry a large Sicilian toy donkey so they will be recognized. In fact, they are then met by the Toronto representative of this ring. We'll come to him a little later.

The Sicilian immigrant is now supplied with a US resident alien card, carrying his photograph. These are supplied by a firm of printers and the appropriate photograph is glued in. They are also supplied with the legitimate, borrowed identification of a US citizen. If the immigrant is caught, the person who has given the identification reports that it has been stolen or that he lost his identification.

This part of the scheme is very easy; there has never been anyone from this group stopped from coming into Toronto. There is apparently no difficulty in getting them into Canada.

The immigrant is now taken across the US border in one of several ways. A large number are driven to Windsor and then by the tunnel across to Detroit during the rush-hour; apparently this is fairly simple. From Detroit they are flown straight to New York.

Some are taken across the Niagara River by motor boat, although that is not too popular because one of them was caught that way a short time ago, and a few enter by switching tickets with US citizens on the Maid of the Mist. That is interesting. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) mentioned this a couple of years ago and there was great laughter in the House when he mentioned the Maid of the Mist as I recall.

Actually, that's quite a legitimate enterprise. One can board from either the Canadian or US side; if one boards from the Canadian side one has a Canadian ticket and must get off on the Canadian side and vice versa. The way it works is that simultaneously they have someone board from the Canadian side and someone board from the US side. They change tickets in midstream, one might say, and then the immigrant gets off on the other side.

However, this is not the way that most of the men are taken across the border. Most are driven by car from Toronto down to the Quebec-US border and they are taken across on a back road. That is described in some detail in the Star article so I won't go into that.

Two ways are used. Most of the back roads down there are not patrolled; there are just too many of them. There is a gismo in the road that sends off a signal which indicates

when a car goes across. Then the department rushes people down to take a look. The way they get around this is they very often have these men walk across. Then they go across in the car and meet them on the other side and drive them from there.

Very few are caught at the border because this has been worked out over the years and it's a fairly efficient operation. Interestingly enough, they are picked up by the dozen in New York and from there sent back to Italy.

According to Mr. Joe D'Amico – he's an investigator for the US Immigration and Naturalization Bureau – and according to Mr. Dennis Dillon – who is the head of the federal strike force against organized crime and racketeering for New York State, and he's in the justice department in Brooklyn – there have been several thousand Italians smuggled in this way via Canada in the past three years. Furthermore, they said this was the way that the Gambino family of New York got its recruits. The Gambino family is the family that is the most prominent at the present time in the New York field of organized crime.

There are many illegal immigrants caught each year by the US Border Patrol; I'll just mention that last year the number was more than 3,000. According to D'Amico those from the Caribbean and Asia usually talk freely when caught. However, the Calabrians are too frightened to talk. They all give the same story, that they were walking on College St. when a chap came by and offered to take them to see New York for a visit. The reason they do not tell the truth is that they have been warned that if they do talk they will be found in Italy, back in Calabria, with their testicles in their mouths. I'm told this is not tasty.

Once in New York, the new immigrants have no difficulty getting work as labourers but some, a significant percentage, go into the protection rackets, into extortion and into shylocking. This new influx of manpower has resulted in spreading these evils into New Jersey and, for the first time, into Long Island.

Who is responsible for this smuggling ring, and why has nothing been done about it? The second question is easy. Basically the problem is that all of these immigrants enter this country on a 90-day visitor's visa and they all leave within the 90 days. The RCMP knows the name of the Canadian ringleader –in fact, of the international ringleader, who is a Canadian–but he has not been charged. I'll explain that shortly.

According to police sources, the entire immigration racket is run under the authority of one Montreal family of hoodlums that has had a great deal of press recently, the Cotroni family. But that is the general supervision. Who are the active ringleaders themselves? Only small fry actually take part in the running across the border. The big shots usually stay out of that, because they can get caught. Just a few months ago, one Montreal policeman taking three Calabrians across was caught by the US Border Patrol. The police force in Montreal has now fired him.

On Aug. 22, 1970, one Nicola Collucci, aged 29, who lives in Toronto, was caught in a motor boat off Grand Island in the Niagara River attempting, with two other men, to smuggle a teenaged Italian girl into the United States.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A girl button man!

Mr. Shulman: To the girl, unbutton men.

Collucci was released after he made a deal with the US Immigration Service that he would testify against the others in the ring. They made the mistake of releasing him after he gave his word. He then returned to Canada, but of course promptly reneged on the deal, and that was the end of that. No one went to jail as the result of catching them redhanded.

Collucci is a naturalized Canadian citizen. He's known by the Toronto police and the RCMP to be tied to organized crime groups in Toronto and Montreal.

The man who was in charge in Toronto was one Tomasso Buscetta. He was born in Palermo and lived there for a number of years. But he had to leave Palermo suddenly in 1963 because, unfortunately, he had a little accident. He filled a car with dynamite, intending to blow up several Mafia leaders from a rival family. Unfortunately, he parked it in the wrong place, someone came to investigate; and in the confusion that followed, it blew up and seven policemen and two bystanders were killed.

Buscetta felt it was unhealthy to remain in Palermo; so he came to Toronto. He came here under the name of Manuel Lopez and he was using a Mexican passport. He lived here for two years from 1963 to 1965, during which time he developed a heroin and immigration trade from Toronto to New York.

He went to the States in 1965 but came back to Toronto in April 1970, using the

name of a naturalized Canadian citizen; and while using this name he procured a genuine Canadian passport under this name. From here, he travelled back and forth to New York using this passport. Late in 1970 he was arrested on a trip to New York City, where he was charged on two counts of smuggling aliens from Canada; but the charges were drawn up faultily and he was dismissed on a legal technicality. The Americans were a little upset with Buscetta and they promptly charged him again with extortion, together with another man by the name of Rosario Gambino—he's a cousin of Carlo Gambino's—and they had been going around to Italian businessmen in New York threatening dire things would happen to them unless they paid for a certain amount of protection.

Buscetta put up bail, or actually had a bondsman put up bail, but decided not to wait for trial. He fled to Brazil and he promptly went into business in Brazil. Shortly after that he was arrested for smuggling Italian labourers into that country. He was then deported to Italy where he is now serving 14 years for the Palermo bombing.

After he had to leave Toronto so suddenly the post was left vacant, one might say. During his Canadian smuggling operations, Buscetta was followed fairly constantly by the undercover squad of the RCMP. He was seen meeting with three very interesting Canadians; one is a Montreal butcher—I'll tell you more about him later; one is a certain man named Guido Orsini; and the third was a fellow by the name of Frank Cotroni. More about those men later.

Buscetta had a deputy and this deputy was a chap by the name of Vincenzo Cuffaro, also a Torontonian; at least he lived in Toronto—he wasn't a Torontonian. Unfortunately, he disappeared in late 1970 and it is the belief of the police that he was murdered by rival gangsters. He was the enforcer and he was known as an extortionist.

They were the leaders. Now we come to the current leaders of the racket. The present chief of the ring in Canada is a Montreal butcher in his late 30s. He has no convictions against him. At the present time he is up before a Quebec court on charges of having possession of stolen bonds but that case hasn't come to trial yet.

He is Sicilian born. He lives in Montreal mostly but he travels frequently back and forth to Toronto. He originally organized the racket from Montreal but he now runs it from Toronto because most of the immigrants are now flown from Rome directly to Toronto rather than to Montreal.

Last year, the RCMP gathered a great deal of evidence against this man. They went to the Department of Justice and asked for permission to charge him.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): On a point of order. I'm not clear, Mr. Speaker, on what the member said when he got up. The Star gave him this article to present to the House and he implied that the paper didn't want to take the chance of being libellous and that they had given him the job of presenting this to the House. I'm wondering if he is in bed with the Star that the paper won't print the thing? I'm not clear on how he gets to be so that he could ruin a man's reputation if the Star won't. The Star will print it tomorrow, sir.

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Sargent: He says that the paper won't take the chance but it will let him take the chance in the House here.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): There's no point of order there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That sounds like a point of order to me.

Mr. Sargent I think we should define, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The member's speech comes later!

Mr. Foulds: He didn't want to speak tonight.

Mr. Sargent: I think he should define just what the deal is with the Star.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the deal?

Mr. Sargent: What is the deal?

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park, please.

Mr. Shulman: There can't be any ruling on this. It's not a point of order but I'll explain it to the member.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): That gives the member for High Park a little more credibility.

Mr. Shulman: The Star, let me say, is not aware I'm giving this speech tonight. The Star gathered the material. Let me say I'm not giving it with or without its permission.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Is the member asking a question? I'd be perfectly willing to answer any questions. Is the member asking a question?

Mr. Sargent: I am not sure he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Shulman: I'm not sure the member knows what he is asking. I will make it quite clear this speech is not being given with the Star's permission. I have the material. I'm not even sure if the Star is aware I have the material. I suppose by now it is aware.

Mr. Sargent: The member told us!

Mr. Shuman: The member should go back and read Hansard. I gave the paper thanks for not printing it. I chose my words very carefully but I'm quite sure that the brass of the Star right now is gulping hard, I assure the member. If I'm in bed with the paper it's without its knowledge. I snuck in, one might say.

Mr. Foulds: Did the member for Grey-Bruce not detect a note of irony in his voice at the beginning?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: It's a fairly big outfit to sneak into bed with.

An hon. member: It is a very big bed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The paper had to consent.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Please carry on. Let's get this thing on the road.

Mr. Shulman: I lost the trend of my story.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Well said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foulds: Well done, Mr. Speaker, it was a perfectly timed observation.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I lost the trend of what I was saying. I am going to go back to the beginning and start again to make sure that no one missed anything.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: You are a credit to the chair.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that I am not spoiling anyone's reputation. There is only one person who is alive and who has never been convicted of a serious international criminal offence, and I am using a pseudonym for him. I am describing him as a Montreal butcher, and I want to make that very clear.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Call him Mr. X.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I could call him Mr. F, that would be all right.

An hon. member: Call him Mr. Sargeant.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): Maybe that is why the price of beef went up.

Mr. Foulds: Call him Roy for "king".

Mr. Shulman: At the end of last year the RCMP had gathered a great deal of information against this Mr. F.

Mr. Foulds: "Roi", for Mr. King.

Mr. Shulman: They wanted to lay charges against him and the charges were actually drawn up. They were charging him with "conspiring with a person or persons unknown to circumvent the Immigration Act." They went to the Justice Department and asked for permission to lay these charges. The Justice Department refused permission because they stated in their opinion the charges would not stick.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: That applause wasn't for the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman); it was for the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Mr. Shulman: Also, apparently it was the feeling that any damage that was being done by these acts was not being done to Canada, it was being done to the United States of America and as such they couldn't get too aroused about it.

The RCMP officers who were involved in this investigation were very upset at the time of the ruling. They are still very upset at this ruling because, of course, they worked in close co-operation with US police authorities and if this co-operation is to continue it can't be just a one-way street. American authorities have complained for some years that they have not been getting co-operation from our authorities on a number of these international crime matters.

Mr. F works very closely with two men whom I am going to name because I can't hurt their reputations anyway; they've already been completely destroyed. Those two men are Guido Orsini, whom I mentioned previously, who is aged 38, and Mr. Frank Cotroni of Montreal.

Orsini has two minor convictions so far; one is for possession of a Quebec Liquor Board seal. And he was convicted in the USA for crossing the border illegally. He was caught on a back road while he was smuggling aliens into the United States and was given a suspended sentence for this. Orsini is currently up on charges of possession of $9 million worth of heroin in Montreal.

The other man, Frank Cotroni, is a capo in the Cotroni family.

He is a brother of Vic Cotroni, whom we all have heard so much about from the Montreal crime commission hearings. He operates a talent agency and he travels frequently between Montreal and Toronto.

Well, this is the racket: It's a smuggling racket, in which we aren't really being hurt terribly, except that we are helping organized crime; it's the Americans who are suffering the brunt of it. But we are very foolish if we think that this type of crime, once it gets entrenched on that side of the border, can be held there. It spreads back across; we've seen this time and time again. We see it now in the current construction rackets; we see it in the layoffs with betting; we see it in all the other rackets that came up through Guelph and through Hamilton.

It's rather important that we co-operate with international authorities to stop this now because it is growing very rapidly. What can we do? I accept the Justice Department's ruling that the charges won't stick, and if they do stick, they are of such a minor nature that the person will barely get more than a slap on the wrist. But there is one thing that we can do. The one thing that organized crime hates is exposure, and the one thing that the persons involved in organized crime hate is exposure.

I have got up here for four years running and pleaded with various Attorneys General and the various Ministers of Justice and the various Prime Ministers to hold a royal commission into the problem of organized crime in the construction industry. Finally they are doing it, and they have taken down, let me say, good terms of reference. I presume we'll have a good commission counsel—I certainly hope so. They are doing the right thing here, and this is going to solve this problem for some years to come. But it took the government such a long, slow time to get around to it.

Now, here is something which the government can nip right in the bud with a royal commission. This is the way to handle this type of problem. It's really the only way the government can handle this type of problem. For once the Conservatives are not involved. We don't have any names of people attending parties, or details of any money passing hands. It's all being done—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): We didn't the last time either.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I'll come to that in a minute. We'll be back at that before the evening is over.

Mr. Foulds: Does the minister want to open that up?

An hon. member: Don't go away yet!

An hon. member: Stay around!

Mr. Shulman: I am asking the Provincial Secretary for Justice—I am glad that he is now in the House—to pass the word to his two more potent confrères, the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) and the Solicitor General, and perhaps one of those two men who have the ear of the Premier could see that something is done so that next year we don't have to have a lot more material from American authorities to bring up here that embarrasses us all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, enough of new things in the organized crime field. I hate to do it, but I am going to go back to the speech I gave back last—

Mr. MacDonald: The House leader invited this; he provoked it.

Mr. Shulman: I wasn't going to do it, you see, but the House leader has invited me to do so and I can hardly refuse.

You may remember, Mr. Speaker, I ran into some serious difficulty here when, in the course of detailing the problems involving organized crime in the construction industry, I identified the present Attorney General as having attended a party at the home of one of the principals involved in these crimes. In actual fact, as it turned out, he was not at this party; it turned out it was his associate, his partner on the front bench, the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond). But as a result of this gross error the Conservatives—you may recall the evening and the days that followed—did make some noise, Mr. Speaker, and they were a little annoyed with me. In fact, it went so far that the Premier of this province rose and said I should resign my seat,

which I offered to do if he would have a by-election, but that didn't appeal to him very much. So we didn't have any by-election and I didn't resign my seat.

Mr. Roy: The member lost his seat. He lost his seat on that one.

Mr. Shulman: I lost my seat?

Mr. Roy: No, the NDP lost one seat and we got three seats more.

Mr. Shulman: Well, that's possible, but I somehow have my doubts.

Mr. Cassidy: Don't be too cocky about that!

Mr. Shulman: I somehow have my doubts.

An hon. member: Worry about your own.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is instructive now to look back and see what really did happen. I think it must be obvious to the dullest-witted Conservative backbencher that I did not make up this story.

Mr. Breithaupt: The member is not going to name names there!

Mr. Shulman: No, it's not necessary, we can look about.

An hon. member: Don't overestimate them.

Mr. Foulds: They're not asking him to name names this time!

Mr. Shulman: I think it's obvious to the dullest-witted backbencher that I did not make up this story, because that could have only led to my own embarrassment, to my own downfall let me say.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: And that didn't happen.

Mr. Shulman: In actual fact the information was given to me by a man who had been supplying considerable and continued reliable information about crime. Now why would this man make up this story? This is quite fascinating. It could only lead to a—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It sounds like a whitewash.

Mr. Shulman: It sounds like a whitewash?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Whitewash, putting the blame on somebody else.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, I am not going to put the blame on someone else, I am bringing it right back to this chamber, right back to this chamber.

An hon. member: Where it belongs.

Mr. Shulman: Let's face it, Mr. Speaker, there was no more sense for him to make up this story than for me to make up this story. He is a licensed private detective in the province; he depends on the goodwill of the Attorney General's department to keep his licence. Why would he make up a story like this about the Attorney General, which he knew I was bringing to the House, which he knew I was going to expose, when he knew if it was denied that I would name him as the source? Why would a man like that make up a story like that?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Why would the member introduce a bill on ethics, for goodness sake?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Well, we have a number of witnesses to prove that; there is no question on that matter.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, I'll admit a little in a moment.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Remember the last time the member made a speech, the trouble he got into?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I am glad that the backbenchers and one of the frontbenchers are getting a little nervous. I noticed before when we were talking about Sicilian immigrants they weren't too nervous, but when we come back to the Justice department they get a little more nervous. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can find out why that man made up that story, because—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Maybe the member didn't pay him enough.

Mr. Shulman: —I wasn't exactly content with the results of what had happened that night, and I had certain documents which this gentleman had given me. He couldn't deny the documents because they were there, his name was on them.

So I decided, since we do have an Act in this province which covers private investigators, I decided to go down to the office of the OPP which controls private investigators

—and this is some considerable time ago—and told them that I wished to lay a charge under section 24 of the Act, which says that a private investigator may not reveal any information which he has received in the course of his investigations to any person who has not been hired by him.

I had all these documents to prove, (a) that I had received the material from him; (b) there was no question that he had procured these documents in the course of working for certain unions, and for a group called N3. I asked the OPP to hold a hearing to determine whether or not this man should be allowed to continue to hold his licence.

I really wasn't interested in his losing his licence. That is not too important one way or the other, because he is really small potatoes. What I was really interested in was whether the Attorney General of this province or the Solicitor General or our very righteous slipping Provincial Secretary for Justice—not slippery, slipping—would really be willing to allow that hearing to be held.

I went down there and I said to the OPP officer in charge, Mr. Butler, "I have no question of your integrity. I am really curious to see whether you will be allowed to go ahead with this hearing."

He said, "Don't you worry. We are going to hold this hearing. You have given me the evidence and we are going to proceed. We are going to have the hearing, do not worry."

I said, "Frankly, I don't think that hearing will ever take place, because the Attorney General of this province will never allow that hearing to take place."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been no hearing.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Because the member didn't have any evidence probably.

Mr. Shulman: The evidence consisted of hundreds of pages of documents. There was a witness who saw those documents being passed. The witness gave an affidavit to the OPP that she saw these documents being passed; but there is no hearing being held.

Is the Provincial Secretary for Justice saying that there was no proof? Is that what he is saying tonight?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't know anything about it. The member's idea of evidence and that of the police are always different.

Mr. Shulman: Right. What is the name of that man who washed his hands, who wanted to know nothing about it? I think it was Pilate Kerr. That was it, Pilate Kerr. The Provincial Secretary for Justice knows nothing about it. His confrères know about it and we—and I, George—know why there is no hearing, why there can be no hearing, because the story of that night in the Legislature can't really be told in full.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Don't you "George" me!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something else about that night, something that I didn't know until last Sunday. Something very fascinating happened that night. I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker; the government knew in advance I was going to give that speech. They knew what was in it. Why didn't they forestall it? You will recall that when I began my—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Really, this is getting more amazing every minute.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Why would we know?

Mr. Shulman: Why would the government know? Well, that is interesting.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister asked the question. The member for High Park will now answer it.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister of Agriculture and Food has asked me the question why would they know? That is interesting. We will come to why they knew.

You will recall that when I began my speech in the Legislature that fateful night the Conservative front bench was surprisingly full. Here I am doing very well. I have got five on the front bench. It was different that night. The reason they were there was they all knew what was coming and they had come in to administer the coup.

You don't have to take my word for it, because I have a statement here from a man by the name of Charlie McIlveen. Most of the hon. members probably don't know who Charlie McIlveen is: I must admit I didn't know who he was until just a few days ago. I was very surprised to learn he is one of the members of this Legislature. In fact, I am told he is the Conservative member for Oshawa.

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member for High Park is not here often enough to get acquainted. He is just here for the question period.

Mr. Shulman: Well, he is not here. I am sorry he is not here and I am sorry most of

you don't know who he is. Perhaps, as the years roll by and his face becomes more familiar, we will learn who he is.

Let me read this statement from Charlie McIlveen, who is apparently the member for Oshawa. I quote from Charlie McIlveen.

Mr. Breithaupt: As reported.

Mr. Foulds: Dr. Charles.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, no; by Dr. Charlie McIlveen!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Who gives the race reports.

Mr. Shulman: Not as reported. This is by Charlie McIlveen, written by Charlie McIlveen, not reported as having been said by Charlie McIlveen. Charlie McIlveen said—I thank the member for Kitchener:

> When he opened his speech I thought something was up, because all members of the Justice policy field were in attendance. There were the hon. George Kerr, the Provincial Secretary for Justice; the hon. Dalton Bales, the Attorney General; the hon. John Yaremko, the Solicitor General; the hon. Syl Apps, Minister of Correctional Services. This alone is unusual.

Mr. Foulds: With friends like that in the rump you don't need enemies.

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

> This alone is unusual. But with 10 other cabinet ministers also in attendance, it indicated they thought Morty had an unusual speech prepared.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He always does.

Mr. Shulman: Well, thank you, Charlie McIlveen. He has finally made something that can be reported in Hansard.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Charlie who?

Mr. Shulman: The Provincial Secretary for Justice asked what his name is. Charlie McIlveen, he is one of his party's backbenchers.

Mr. Foulds: His black backbenchers.

Mr. Shulman: He will be very black after today. One of the minister's black backbenchers, yes. He is the member for Oshawa. He sits over there somewhere, I think.

Mr. Foulds: In the rump.

Mr. Shulman: In the rump.

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member for High Park never knows. He is not in here often enough.

Mr. MacDonald: The Provincial Secretary for Justice doesn't even know him. He is checking on the name.

Mr. Shulman: The Provincial Secretary for Justice is searching to see if there really is a Charlie McIlveen. I assure the minister that there is a Charlie McIlveen.

Mr. Foulds: He is larger than life. They call him doctor. It is not a matter of policy, though.

An hon. member: You can just see the close links between the cabinet and the backbenchers.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Oh, McIlveen!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: I tell you the minister isn't really informing those fellows about what is going on in the backbenches.

Mr. Shulman: I think perhaps I should inform the Provincial Secretary for Justice of some of the other backbenchers who apparently belong to the party. I know the rump is a long way over here, but there are a few of them over here who are worthy of note.

Mr. Foulds: Take a few minutes and introduce them to the Provincial Secretary for Justice. That is the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Maeck) sitting at the end of the front row. The member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Wardle) is in the back row.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): The member for Port Arthur will get his chance to speak later.

Mr. Shulman: I confess I don't put great store in what Charlie McIlveen might say, but I think it's worthy of note that if it was even obvious to the Conservative backbenchers that the cabinet knew what was coming, it probably was true. In addition to this, of course, all we have to do is read the statement of the Attorney General in which he admitted—

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member's own leader says he is unpredictable.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, I would never deny that; never deny that. That's why the member comes to hear my speeches. If they were predictable he wouldn't be here.

Mr. Foulds: Part of his charm.

Mr. Shulman: The hon.—I'm sorry, I missed that?

Mr. Maeck: I said the reason we're here is because the member would call for a quorum if we were not.

Mr. Shulman: I promise tonight I won't call for a quorum and the member can leave safely. I give him my word.

Mr. Foulds: However, I will!

Mr. Cassidy: The hon. member should talk about the depressing predictability of the people on that side.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I can recall the Attorney General mentioning in his little statement that a couple of detectives had come to see him two weeks before, carrying a statement from this private detective who'd given me the information; denying that he had given it to me and denying that the Attorney General was at the party. That was interesting.

But even more interesting, something I discovered just last Sunday, something that I didn't know at all was that three weeks before I gave the speech, one Tom Haslett from the Toronto Star, who's sitting in the press gallery right now, had been to the Attorney General and said: "Mr. Bales, is it true you were at this party?" And the Attorney General denied it. He denied it because he wasn't there. But do you remember the tremendous surprise, the shock on his face when he jumped to his feet when I suggested he was at this party—shocking! How could anyone suggest he was at that party. What party? Where? What's the address? Where's it near?

Well, one thing I must give credit to the Attorney General—he is a magnificent actor. A lousy Attorney General, but a magnificent actor!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member is not so bad himself.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): A Marlon Brando!

Mr. Roy: Is the member suggesting that the Attorney General shouldn't talk in this House?

Mr. Shulman: I think perhaps he should have behaved as a gentleman would. When he knew this was coming—and he knew—he should have sent a note across the House saying, "I was not there."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: However, perhaps the hon. member for Ottawa Centre is right. Perhaps it is too much to expect a member of the cabinet to act as a gentleman. And if so, I apologize; I take back the remarks. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre certainly should know.

An hon. member: The minister should do his research properly!

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Gee whiz!

Mr. MacDonald: They are getting excited again in the front.

An hon. member: Better get the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) in here.

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Speaker, fortunately or unfortunately, as the case may be—depending on who is involved—there's going to be a royal commission. And perhaps, just perhaps, we'll get some of the people who are involved in this delightful little affair on the stand. Maybe we'll be lucky enough even to get the Attorney General on the stand. And maybe we'll—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: And the member.

Mr. Shulman: And me; and I would love to go on the stand before or after that gentleman.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Under oath?

Mr. Shulman: Under oath—both of us.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Under oath, subject to cross-examination?

Mr. Shulman: Both of us! And I would like to have the Provincial Secretary for Justice doing the cross-examination; but perhaps that would be too easy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member would like to have everybody there and run the show.

Mr. Roy: Who is the government going to get for counsel?

Mr. Shulman: They'd like to have Charlie Dubin; but he's not available any more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is basically all I really wanted to say about organized crime with one other exception. I'm sorry the Minister for Labour (Mr. Guindon) appears to have left the House.

Mr. Roy: He'll be back at 10:30.

Mr. Shulman: Back at 10:30? Okay.

There is one other matter which is disturbing to me. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, I gave a lengthy speech in this House about one crooked union. And let me say again, because I know very well some union leaders are worried that this royal commission will turn into a witch hunt, I don't believe it will.

I think everyone is well aware across the province that most unions, like most corporations, are honest. There are crooked corporations, there are crooked contractors and there are crooked unions.

Now one of them is the boilermakers; and I gave a lengthy speech here last year about how the money had been stolen from their treasury over a period of years.

I asked the Minister of Labour to take some action. And subsequent to the speech he invited me to his office where I gave the speech again to him and his deputy. And I'm sorry to say nothing has been done and the situation has gone from bad to worse. And now the international union has stepped in and put this local under temporary trusteeship. The problem is that the international is just as crooked as the local in this particular union. Surely it is time that the Ministry of Labour stepped in with this particular union, had auditors go in and see what's been happening to the money—because it's been disappearing continuously—and order a new election supervised by the Ministry of Labour; because that's the only way we are going to have an honest election in that union.

As far as the construction unions go, I think that is now well under control. The terms of reference will allow the royal commission to look into that. I don't wish to say anything further on that subject.

Mr. Speaker, that pretty well completes my remarks. I said I would be as brief as I could tonight; I have been. I thank you for your indulgence. I have tried to be as non-provocative as the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell). I hope I haven't said anything to irritate the real St. George—pardon me the ex-St. George, I thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): In the fall session of 1971, I placed on the order paper a resolution which stated the following:

That in the opinion of this House, it would be of value to have statements by the ministry to the Legislature reviewing problems encountered by the government since the last sitting of the House and the executive action the government has taken or is considering to meet those problems; that a precedent be established for the delivery of such statements on the sitting day following the delivery of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session, under the order of business statements by the ministry; and further, that such statements not exceed two hours in total.

Mr. Speaker, this was done to accomplish certain things. Not the least was the first real opportunity for the executive to relate to this House the reasoning for certain highlights of policy decisions undertaken by the government between the last day of the previous legislative sitting of the old session and the beginning of the new session. This would be a period of approximately two hours of time and could be undertaken on the day following the reading of the Throne Speech which, I would suggest, is not too busy a day in the business of this House. I would suggest it would be a series of 30-minute statements by the provincial secretaries; it would provide a good measure of knowledge to the members on recent events and actions—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That's not fair! The member wants them to work.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: —which could be reflected in the speeches made in the Throne Speech debate. Such an undertaking would be a measure of accountability to the people and might even be considered by some as being similar to a reading of minutes of deliberations conducted while this House was in recess. One can reflect on a basic need for such a measure when we consider there were so many days when this House was in recess since the previous session of this Parliament.

There is also another reason to have this reporting as part of the sitting on the second day. It would not only make a full business period but in practice would really make a day for a question period and introduction of items for creation of our order paper, to provide for measures to be placed for deliberation by the House. This proposal would add to our deliberations in a meaningful way.

Now that I have devoted some time to what I consider a very necessary democratic measure needed here, may I take a few minutes of the House's time to suggest a

possible improvement of Canadian affairs in another place. While in Europe this past fall, one of the features I found to be of particular interest to me was the opportunity afforded within the government structure of West Germany for different levels to have direct input into the senior governmental process.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to that of our members that recently Senator Croll in the Senate of Canada suggested some possible changes to the makeup of the Senate. It is quite possible that such reform of the Senate should reflect the need for direct provincial input into certain deliberations. This could be done by representation directly from this Legislature and the other provincial Houses of Canada.

For instance, only members who have served at least five years in this House might be eligible for selection in order to have a good base of experience here as background. Three such members could be the representation quota—two from the government party of the day and one from the opposition. The term in office would be for the lifetime of this House between elections. Nominations could be made by each party from among its membership and elections conducted by secret ballot among the members of this House.

Selection could be considered not demanding full-time attendance in the Senate, but presence there for selected debates and deliberations on such items that have a basic need for provincial reflections into national considerations, such as urban affairs, energy policy, transportation policy, health and welfare, culture and arts, and recreation and sports.

Today we see a proliferation of federal-provincial conferences, with both the provincial executive and civil service people involved with their federal counterparts. Seldom, if ever, is there any direct reflection by other members of this House until a government measure reflecting conclusions reaches this place.

Present reflection in the Senate does not necessarily reflect the current political reflections of any one province or its Legislature. While it is true senators are representative of each province—and I believe we have 24 from the Province of Ontario—one can only speculate on the long-term association and contact with provincial or local government reflections as each serves his or her term of years. It may well be a valid opinion that such contact or up-to-date knowledge becomes less delineated with the time of service.

Mr. Speaker, what I have described as a possibility should be seriously considered by this House and even by the Senate of Canada. The need for such a forum for provincial affairs to be reflected at our federal level is such that when full thought is brought to bear upon it, the conclusion could easily be such as to have only a small relationship to the minimum suggested possibility that I have proposed here today.

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure as a member of this House, and also due to the support of this House for the Canadian area conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association which was held in August in Winnipeg, for me to have attended my first session of that body. It was the great regret of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) and the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers), as well as myself, that the Speaker of this House and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon) were unable to take part with us in this democratic process.

I commend to every one of you, as members of the Canadian Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the verbatim reports that each have received. I hope that each member will read these reports and, at some time in the spring session, join together under your guidance, Mr. Speaker, in applying for the 15th meeting, of which Ontario is to be the host. This year our sister province, Quebec, will host the meeting and I know, sir, that you hope for a strong delegation from Ontario to attend that session.

Mr. Speaker, over this past 15 months, due to the exposure to representations, interviews and general study with my colleagues on a select committee on economic and cultural nationalism, may I reflect that certain great events of change have taken place within the world. Also, there will be great cause for this House to take into consideration certain things in the days ahead, most extensively and in depth, especially all the items mentioned in the Throne Speech. We realize that in the approximately 60 bills mentioned by the Premier (Mr. Davis) as a possible workload, we will have before us measures with far-reaching effects on employment, industry and cultural matters to our people.

I hope to see measures that will strengthen our competitive export ability, and our economic strength improved as a result. In this connection I would like to mention several

guidelines of approach which I believe have some measure of worth for us to think about as we discuss and deliberate.

We all wish that there were more and more Canadian investments, but we would look very suspiciously at any political proposal that would bring about a net reduction in total investment from all sources. This would then suggest policies of encouragement for Canadians to invest more in Canada, and only as these sources increase to replace foreign investment resources in our development.

Trade is our lifeline and its steady expansion the best possible means toward preservation of both our political independence and our national standard of living. This suggested policy is aimed at developing new products, more research, selling efforts around the world, and encouragement to our Canadian entrepreneurs.

We must recognize that the greatest threat to our future as a strong and independent nation is any possible growth of internal dissension within Canada. What do I mean by internal dissension? It should be and would be any tendency of the provinces to compete against each other in a variety of ways: for each to favour its own products at the expense of the other nine, and even to penalize them in government tenders and in other ways.

This problem exists in Canada and must have a solution, as it is draining resources from other most necessary needs, such as our regional disparities and lack of capital for development.

We must expand our toleration of differences in language, religion and social customs, and accept our country's racial and cultural diversity as a national strength rather than a weakness. This will mean making every attempt to persuade those who would direct our capital and human resources in ways that would expand conflict, to direct it into other needs. Such other priorities must be stated and considered in evaluation of our country's objectives as a people.

We need confidence that the increasing population of the labour force and of education institutions, and the material resources of this land can ensure that we have the strength to preserve our political sovereignty and independence beyond any doubt.

We start from our present base of being the envy of almost all the nations of the world. Ours is a country which has attracted young men and women from many lands. Ours is a country which visitors from many nations are enthusiastic about. Contemplate our spaciousness, our scenic splendours, our national and human resources, our productive endeavour and our standard of living. Ours is a country which cares for its young and its old perhaps better than any other on earth, and where the opportunities for those in between to make a good life are without equal.

To know Canada today is to know that forces of creativity are ready to be unleashed, in industry, business and the arts, provided only that we do not allow individual and corporate initiative to be stifled. Few countries have less justification for any pessimism, and more reasons for hope and faith in their future.

I hope I have in some small way reminded the House that we dare not be complacent or naive, and I share with the members a faith in Canada's goals. Perhaps I could tell them that on any list of goals for Canadians I would place: To attain the highest level of prosperity consistent with Canada's political preservation as an independent country; to foster economic growth and within this goal a series of financial objectives such as promotion of exports, management of resources, improved transportation, tourism advancement, and communications and technologies generally.

Much of this is in the Throne Speech. Much of it is going to be before us in the coming months.

What is the ordinary citizen of this country to believe about the current public debate on food prices? The fact that he should realize he is obtaining a fair bargain in value? Or the other point being made, that no one level of producer or middleman is receiving unjustified prices for the goods, services and costs involved? Or the further point that the debate so far is distracting attention from the basic forces at work creating rising prices?

I would like to suggest to the House some of these basic forces at work across the world and here at home. Bad weather at home and abroad, and, we are told, stupid agricultural policies in some foreign countries have put high demand on North American supplies as well as surpluses. Farm products exports have become important instruments of our foreign policy. Our crop-producing land has been under strains of increased land taxation and urban growth that brings about losses of tillable acres, that had been in production, through subdivision for homes, airports, highways and so on. Remaining lands are placed

under forced growth due to fertilization methods that have caused havoc to production. Higher incomes are resulting in demands for convenience foods; for example, packaged dinners, partially prepared products that create more cost, not for food but for the preparation service.

Then we have the other costing feature; that of agriculture moving over the last 40 years to become the most productive, most capital-intensive, most highly mechanized and all-round industrial of all the modern industries.

We can in no way think of cattle raising, wheat growing, vegetable production as having common interests at all times. It is an industry involving a high degree of research and scientific knowledge. And today we are given the warning that the consumer would in the end have to pay for our overall thrust of cleaning up the land, air and water. Now even food products are finding that cost is being collected.

We even know we have more increases built in by our environmental laws and regulations and their application. The revolutionary increase in productivity of farm people here in Canada, while it could be said to have come about through a high level of skill, talent and energy, has kept our consumers really well off. We have had great benefits due to agriculture changing over the last 40 years from our most traditional sector to our most progressive sector.

The change has allowed about a 10 per cent reduction of the percentage of incomes spent on food over the last 40 years.

I observed, in western Europe, averages of income spent for food in some countries ranging about 15 per cent higher. We are eating better here in Canada, for less of our incomes, than much of the world. A good part of the answer is ably demonstrated in the first part of the Speech from the Throne, in which reference is made to the record achieved by Ontario and its people, with the real booster being the present government's expansionary policy. More people working means more people paying the cost, and a lowering of the taxes applied to goods and services.

Rural Ontario is known for its independence and self-reliance. But over the last 40 years we have been more and more in partnership with urban people and government. Our export of people, with their talents and intelligence, to urban Ontario has eroded rural political strength.

We are reminded of this in the mention of electoral revision to be undertaken, as suggested in the Throne Speech. We remind our urban people and governments, because of the changes I have mentioned, that partnerships only work when all parties share. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make some suggestions about price and wage controls. Few people in business today, I suppose, and few in this House, would remember the wage and price controls in the wartime period.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Far too many of them would remember it.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Well, I doubt many of the NDP would, because I don't think they were ever in much on management.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Put that in your pipe and smoke it!

Mr. Foulds: Whatever it was.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I would like to suggest to the members of this House that certain things should be remembered in connection with price and wage controls.

The purpose would be to stop the current inflation and to stabilize both wages and prices for the duration of the present problem, I would think, and not as a permanent measure.

Mr. Foulds: How about interest rates?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Wage and price controls were put into effect during the Second World War. The formula is unpopular, and it has often been argued that the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. The fact remains that some kind of restraint must be applied by the government, because voluntary measures in the public interest have not been undertaken by the labour unions or by management in the major industries.

Mr. Foulds: Or by bankers!

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Wage increases are by no means abolished under the control system; nor are prices necessarily held at a specific level without any change whatsoever. Government agencies are usually granted certain discretionary powers over both wages and prices.

The problem that confronts the nation today is as serious as any we've faced in recent history. The national economy, for instance, has reached an unprecedented size; and the relationship of business to the welfare of the community has grown more com-

plex. Most of our economists, in government, business and universities, continue to view direct controls over prices and wages as the tools of last resort.

Perhaps the reason for treating direct controls as tools of last resort arises because we have a greater understanding of how our economy functions in response to indirect controls such as monetary and fiscal policies.

There does seem considerable agreement in existence that such indirect control, properly used, can provide the basis for orderly, economic growth in a non-inflationary way. Direct controls are used over situations involving very rapid inflation when, for whatever reason, indirect controls were not totally effective.

History tells us that wage and price controls have not been successfully administered and neither labour, business or industry has ever been satisfied with the device. The economic situation throughout Canada is growing more and more critical; and unpalatable as wage and price controls may be, some people favour them as a means of halting inflation.

The real culprit in the whole situation, of course, is the wage-price spiral. Rising wage costs force higher prices. Inflation has threatened the stability of the dollar and strikes have been avoided or settled only after substantial concessions have been made to union labour. If there is no restraint imposed by the government on either wages or prices, nobody can predict with certainty what the outcome will be of labour-management negotiations in this year.

All of this merely emphasizes how important it is for the other remedies to be given serious consideration. Substantial cuts in government spending would automatically lessen the demand for certain types of products and materials.

Mr. Foulds: How about some cuts in prices? They are artificially high now.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Interest rates would tend to stay low. The nation's economy might then experience a gradual period of readjustment without the necessity of wage and price controls. One of the unfortunate aspects of wage and price laws is the fact that they are not equitably enforced.

Theoretically the government agencies involved are disinterested and neutral but actually political pressure is exerted from labour unions and industries. Their views are not readily turned down by a politically-minded administration. If, in addition to wage and price controls, there were some way to put into effect self-control in the political operation of government so that all interests would be dealt with impartially, maybe some restraints in wage and price laws could really be effective in curbing inflation and stabilizing the economy.

Mr. Foulds: How about unearned income and coupon clippers?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in the Throne Speech we had reflections on what this government was going to bring forth in some way to further the promotion of tourism. Two or three years ago in this House we had a resolution that I introduced which brought forth from the government $1 million for loans to tourism. I must tell you that it was referred to by the minister as seed money.

Members know that when seed lies in the ground too long it sometimes gets a bit sour, and the seed money for tourism is not adequate today. It wasn't adequate then. I must say to members that we have tourist lodges throughout Ontario which are in need of updating; accommodation improvements are needed generally in the whole industry.

I also would suggest that tourism does need a shot in the arm by this province in many other ways. One of them is improved transportation to the north from this city. I know the member for Downsview will agree with me that we do need a better system of routes in and out of the city.

Mr. Singer: Right!

Mr. Foulds: Right up to Fort Francis, Kenora, Atikokan and Geraldton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member sounds like a CNR station caller of years ago when they used to use a fog horn.

Mr. Foulds: That is my colleague from Thunder Bay, he's a former CPR conductor.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Right. We do need better routes in to and out of here. I suggest again to this House my concern in regard to the development of North Pickering and the international airport.

If this government doesn't build a better service route in that general area and get on with the job immediately I'm not going to suggest to members the chaos that is going to result. Those roads are overloaded today. Weekend travel comes to a complete halt for miles in that section. Here again, we're

going to talk about putting additional transportation of trucks, workers, everything into that a community.

I say to the government let's get on with the job; let's build the Scarborough expressway. Let's get the situation so that people can flow into and out of this city to other parts of this province. After all, whether or not this government realizes it, the rest of the province has to come here to deal; has to come here for investment; and does have to come here to this city to the seat of government.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That's where the member is wrong.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Spadina here we come.

Mr. Singer: Well said.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I suggest that if we don't get on with these transportation routes by the time we get rapid transit, we won't need rapid transit because there won't be anybody here. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Look who is the Speaker!

Mr. Speaker: Let it restrain you.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the real McCoy would be in the Speaker's chair tonight, but—

Mr. Speaker: You're standing up.

Mr. Sargent: —through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I want to thank him for my long period of uninterrupted attendance this year and congratulate him on his occasional tolerance.

There are many commendable things I could say about the Speaker. I have known him for many years, including when he was the mayor of the fair town of Preston, and during his service there and on the mayors and reeves committee. I know of the great job that he and his gracious wife do with the pages. I have had a lot of talks with the pages and they love Mr. and Mrs. Reuter very much for the interest that they have taken. Also, there is the warm friendship we've had with the Speaker outside the House.

Having said this, I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker himself is a bit hard of hearing, as it were. I think of a story about the—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Only when the member is speaking.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, well—I think of the story about the couple who had 11 children and the man explained that his wife was hard of hearing. Every night when they went to bed the husband would ask: "Do you want to go to sleep or what?" "What," his wife answered. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you yourself came in, sir.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The member is getting bad.

Mr. Sargent: I had better start getting serious, having said these nice things about you—

Mr. Shulman: They will seize Hansard tomorrow, wait and see!

Mr. Sargent: I do think that I can say to you, on behalf of some of my fellow collegians, as the member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil) calls them, my fellow colleagues, there are many things that you need to pull your socks up about, with regard to things that affect our lives here. We are expensive people. Our time is valuable but you don't think we are.

I think each member of this Legislature should have a speaker's box on his desk. It's a unit I can provide for you for $10 each, but I think you should pay for it because anyone will sell it to you. In fact, you might consider putting in closed-circuit television in keeping pace with the modern technology. I think it's one thing you can look at very closely, because it is not too expensive.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Why doesn't the member donate it?

Mr. Shulman: We could all stay at home and listen to it.

Mr. Sargent: Yes. This is more intelligent than what the member for High Park said tonight, though. It wasn't his best night.

Mr. Shulman: Thanks.

Mr. Sargent: I think we could have a car pool here for members. Today, I saw a very touching thing. I was walking up here and I saw the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) arrive in his limousine. He was sitting there and he waited for the driver to come round and open the door for him. He stepped out

and the driver handed him his briefcase. The minister thanked him and walked away. I thought, that's performance! That's just beautiful. It's great to see all this—

Mr. Shulman: The member was impressed.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Did he tell him, "Now remember, your name is Yaremko. You are the Solicitor General"?

Mr. Sargent: But I think it's loading it on a bit too much when all industry provides courtesy cars, that the brass over there—the upper crust I call them—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The lower crust, I call them.

Mr. Sargent: Well, those fellows over there are the upper crust. I guess one would call them that—the upper crust is usually just a bunch of crumbs held together by dough.

An hon. member: Right on, right on!

Mr. Sargent: That's the case, I'll tell you. I think what you might do, Mr. Speaker, is send the House leader (Mr. Winkler) away on a course on how to run the House—he could use that.

An hon. member: A housekeeping course!

Mr. Sargent: His skates are pretty dull sometimes.

I go to Mexico the odd time and I watch the bullfights down there; and I sometimes find myself hoping that the bull is going to win. Well, we have the Sergeant-at-Arms sitting down there with a sword—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He came back in for the hon. member's speech.

Mr. Sargent: But I don't think that's fair play. We should post another weapon here that we could use to defend ourselves. I've seen him play golf, and I don't know whether we could match the major or not, but I think we should be given a weapon to fight back with.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: And we would have a sauna bath here. I see some of my friends come in here in the mornings, and I think they would agree with me that it's needed.

An hon. member: Couples night, every Friday!

Mr. Sargent: And I think what the Speaker might do is take off that crazy hat he wears. It's a bit much.

An hon. member: Right. I agree with that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the time has come to "unquo" the status.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): What was that?

Mr. Sargent: Nice to have the minister back.

An hon. member: " 'Unquo' the status." I like that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Davis) showed up in Malton one day, outbound on a trouble-shooting mission: The pilot said to him, "Where to, sir?" The Premier replied, "Anywhere in Ontario. We are in trouble all over."

Hon. Mr. Snow: The member told us that one last year.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: No. That's a new one.

Mr. Sargent: No, I don't think I did.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It still applies.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): And they were in trouble all over then.

Hon. Mr. Snow: In fact I heard him say that on Saturday.

Mr. Sargent: Is that right? Well, we have the news that the government is going to bring down a budget. Anything can happen. We are going to increase the taxes, the Premier is telling the people. He's getting them all prepared for the fact that we are going to have to have more money to run this show.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): No, no one wants to increase taxes!

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am against that.

Mr. Sargent: Well, for goodness sake, Mr. Speaker, a news story has come out that the Quebec budget has no increase in taxes for the fourth straight time. They are running an operation down there that's a business operation.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It sure is an operation!

Mr. Sargent: It sure isn't the giveaway programme that is going on here. Many of us here have been watching this now for about 10 years, this period of unprecedented waste, this irresponsible plundering of the treasury. At this rate, the government will have hardly any money available to finance any new projects. The Premier says we now have a fiscal squeeze—a fiscal nightmare, he calls it—wherein this year we face a deficit of almost $1 billion on top of a $6.1 billion debenture debt, I believe. And he calls for a strong fiscal discipline! Well he might!

Two western provinces, Alberta and British Columbia, are debt-free, yet we, the most dynamic province in the whole of Confederation, are paying up to $1.5 million per day in debt charges. Per day! And not principal, debt charges! On top of this we have a $6.1 billion debenture debt.

Now gentlemen, no other administration in the free world—of the 50 states to the south of us; of the nine other provinces—has such a precarious financial mess.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Oh, that's silly.

An hon. member: That's true though!

Mr. Good: That's what we are trying to tell the government; it's true.

Mr. Singer: Where is it worse?

Mr. Sargent: Where is it worse?

An hon. member: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Sargent: And what is the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development doing to help it?

An hon. member: He's been down cutting sugar cane.

Mr. Shulman: He doesn't fly any more, he is doing that to help.

Mr. Good: He's been grounded at least.

Mr. Sargent: Have you read this beautiful document here; this Auditor's statement for 1971-72? Someone should take this and make a best-seller or a television serial show out of it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Give it to the member for High Park.

Mr. Sargent: It's fantastic.

Hon. Mr. Snow: He'll sell them in the hall.

Mr. Reid: It'd be nice if the cabinet ministers would read it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Here on page 31 the Premier of this province increased the amount of money to be spent in his office by $684,000. In one year he spends $1.2 million. I know he's got a lot of important things to do; he's got a lot of admirable qualities about him, a lot of things going for him. I understand that his "Who's Who" is about seven inches long.

An hon. member: His what?

Mr. Sargent: Can you imagine—

Mr. Reid: Never heard a comment.

An hon. member: How about going over that one more time?

Mr. Sargent: The member missed that one entirely.

An hon. member: Everybody's afraid they'll laugh at him.

Mr. Sargent: Can you imagine what kind of gall a man has to have; what kind of importance he must put upon himself, to spend over $4,000 per day himself. He spent more money in his office than all of the other Premiers in Canada put together. In fact he spends more than the Prime Minister of Canada.

An hon. member: Oh come now!

Mr. Sargent: All right! Check it out and see.

Interjections by hon. members:

Mr. Singer: The members opposite can't tell us because they don't know.

Mr. Sargent: The gall of this man to take taxpayers' money and increase his budget by $680,000 in one year in order to say: "I am the greatest." And he even has his patronage man there; his patronage man working out of that office. And the taxpayers of Ontario pay for that—for the Conservative Party.

Hon. Mr. Snow: When did we have them?

Mr. Sargent: We will have it sometime; not too long from now.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Promises, promises, promises.

Mr. Sargent: There is a word for the Minister of Government Services; I don't know, but, my mother always used to tell me

that if you can't say something good about someone, not to say anything.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): If you can't lick them, join them!

Mr. Sargent: So I have to be silent right now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: On page 42 of this beautiful document—

Mr. Maeck: Is that in the blue book or the pink one?

Mr. Sargent: The blue one. It is the government's downfall.

This will all be coming up on the accounts. It's a shocking revelation that we have to—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I think the member has lost his place.

Mr. Sargent: It shows the need for a gigantic efficiency survey. One time a fellow went into the Province of Manitoba and I think his fee was about $150,000—and the first year he saved them $5 million when he set up this survey. But I say that will never happen here because there are all these committees on government productivity to streamline and jazz up the place. It gives the government a chance to spend more money on its friends on these commissions.

But I want to ask the government who is responsible for the mess in Treasury? There are 130 pages of misappropriation of funds costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development should stay and face this; it won't hurt him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: It was costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Pat and Mike were coming across the ocean in a boat. Pat says, "Look at all that water," and Mike says "That's only the top of it."

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Let's not have any ethnic jokes.

Mr. Sargent: We have the tip of the iceberg, and what an iceberg this is. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there should be a royal commission called by the people power of this province to hunt out the evidence of malfeasance in this whole corrupt mess. In the area of business. We know what would happen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: There would be mass firings and there would be people cashiered for theft.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: No, not cashiered.

Mr. Sargent: I say the word cashiered fits very well there because a lot of people have got their hands in the till.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the House wants to hear the sad message in this thing, because all the opposition, my leader and all our people and the NDP will be tearing the government apart, tearing the hell out of it, in the accounts committee on this stuff. It sure as hell is time that the people had something to say.

We saw the Premier in the House the other day showing his amazing knowledge of mathematics in trying to unscramble the mess of Canada Square and his friend, Mr. Gerhard Willie Moog, who is now between Haiti and Miami in his yacht—his "yachet"! I tried to call him this morning on the overseas telephone but he was not answering his ship-to-shore phone. I wanted to ask him if it was true that he helped build the Premier's cottage or did he do some repairs on it? I wanted to ask him if he got any money from the Tory party.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Or gave any?

Mr. Sargent: If he gave any money to the Tory party; I am sorry.

Mr. Shulman: Did he repair the Premier's cottage?

Mr. Drea: Did anyone suggest that he repaired the Premier's cottage?

Mr. Sargent: I don't know. I would like to find that out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I'd like to know his profit potential on the $180 million his company stands to gain in the next 30 years. I would like to ask him his money sources, in fact. Did he need any money for this deal; because of the sweetheart deal he has with the Tories here now? What a beautiful way to do business.

It was amazing to see how the Premier squirmed when he was asked by my leader

point blank, "Did Mr. Moog contribute to the Tory election pot—yes or no?" The Premier squirmed and took the fifth amendment. He said, "On the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me, I refuse to answer that question." He said, "I will not discuss it."

Mr. Foulds: The hon. member's paraphrasing, of course.

Mr. Sargent: Of course, I'll put this in quotes.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): The member has taken it out of context.

Mr. Sargent: What is the member talking about—out of context? The mess the government has got this province in—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: How dare the member say that? This is a stinking mess the government has in financing here. Every day we turn to the papers government people are in trouble with corruption. What does the government expect us to believe? Do its members think we sit and laugh about this all the time?

Mr. Speaker, I say again that if we were operating under US law the Premier of this province would be impeached for consorting in things like Fidinam. There is no doubt about it. The governor of Illinois is in jail for 10 years; Senator Brewster went to jail this week for two years for bribery, nothing as bad as the Fidinam deal.

There are rumoured sources of funds for the Swiss Granada deal on the Hydro contracts; I don't know whether or not that's laundered money. It's pretty close to a deal like Fidinam—it was Swiss money. The money that is skimmed off in Vegas goes to New York and goes to Switzerland and comes back to Toronto. It's clean then; it's laundered.

There was a story in the paper—I couldn't get the source—a few months ago that it went through a lawyer on St. Clair Ave. W. He was the man who was the starting point. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, organized crime cannot exist without government co-operation. Well, it seems it is getting plenty of that.

Some time ago it was announced that a joint force of police of Toronto, intelligence of the OPP and RCMP had a report on the Mafia holdings in Toronto—an ongoing report on Mafia holdings here. A few days ago I phoned Mr. Bird, the deputy commissioner of the OPP, and I asked him if there was such a report; and if so could he make it available to me. He said he would call me back. He called me back this afternoon and he said there was no such report. He said he knew of no Mafia anyplace in Ontario and he made a joke about it.

I called him back this evening and I said to the deputy commissioner that it was hard to believe that he, the No. 2 man in law enforcement in the Province of Ontario, would make such a statement to me. I noted what he said and I will repeat it. I read him this statement by Mr. Nadon, who is the deputy commissioner for Canada of the RCMP, and who said:

> Information on about 1,000 major figures in organized crime in Canada was centralized in Ottawa at the central bureau of the Criminal Intelligence Service of Canada, the co-operative intelligence service of about 60 Canadian police departments that have criminal intelligence units operated by the RCMP.

He said in an interview that "although files were maintained on 1,000 figures, there might be about 10,000 involved in organized crime across the country." He estimated that about 25 per cent of the major figures were operating in Quebec. He said that about 25 to 30 per cent of these major criminals were based in Ontario, mostly in the Toronto region.

It makes one wonder, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a police force we have. No wonder these peddlers of the laundered money can operate with such impunity. I think it is time to realize that, if we are going to vote money to the OPP for intelligence and they don't have any intelligence in their division, that is in liaison with the RCMP findings, then there is something sadly wrong in the OPP.

In regard to the Fidinam case, it keeps cropping up more every day. It is still foremost in the minds of the people, and we will continue to press for a full judicial hearing.

An interesting situation develops with Mr. A. G. MacDonald, the Workmen's Compensation Board's executive manager. This man has a $30,000-a-year salary. He is the man who engineered the Fidinam programme, the man they dealt with through the WCB. He has a $75,000 yacht, he has two lovely homes, he winters in Switzerland, yet he is the man who, on a $30,000 salary, engineered the Fidinam deal.

Mr. Shulman: Is the member implying that he was paid off?

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Mr. Shulman: Is the member suggesting that he was paid off?

Mr. Sargent: What does the member think? I can believe anything about this gang over here.

Bill Callaghan, now Deputy Attorney General, was formerly with the law firm that handled some of the deals between Fidinam and the WCB.

We have an ongoing development here. We have this new Fidinam setup being built in Toronto's highest rent area. It's impractical for Workmen's Compensation Board administration. There's no parking for hundreds of injured workmen who must report to the offices each year.

As for this deal that went through with Workmen's Compensation Board, part of the deal was that Fidinam would be able to buy its present building for $3.5 million. The building cost $5.5 million to build in 1954. The market price of that building is $10 million. They had the deal to buy it for $3.5 million and would have owned it today if a disgruntled employee of Fidinam hadn't delivered to the Globe and Mail this Telex upsetting the whole deal.

The facts are that the government got caught with its pants down, and this thing won't go away. We don't know where the government raised the other $4.9 million in its election pot. We think a lot of it was done the same way as this. So we'll continue to bring that before the House.

Mr. Good: We know how the government got $50,000.

Mr. Sargent: We know how it got $50,000. We know that for sure.

We are trying now to get the log-books on the aircraft. We are working through the DOT in Ottawa to see if it'll provide the log-books of the government's aircraft. We're hopeful that can maybe develop into something. But it's a shocking thing.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Will they supply the log-books for the member's aircraft?

Mr. Sargent: I can tell the minister anybody can see my log-books.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): How about an exchange? We'll make a deal with the government.

Mr. Sargent: The member is a pilot.

Mr. Singer: We'll trade the government log-books.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Where's the member's counsel?

Mr. Roy: Right here! Come on over. We'll show the minister a log-book.

Mr. Sargent: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, I think that I should've taken a shot at the Speaker and the member for Scarborough Centre.

The member for Scarborough Centre told the Speaker the other day he had a change of heart and that he was going to be a good boy from now on. The other night I heard that he phoned the Premier at 3:30 a.m.—this could happen. He said, "Mr. Premier, I'm sorry to wake you up but the chairman of one of your commissions just died and I would like very much to know if I can take his place."

The Premier thought that over for a moment. Replying very dryly, he said, "Well, I guess it's all right with me, if it's all right with the undertaker."

They say you should always leave 'em laughing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with the provisions of standing order No. 28, I deem a motion to adjourn to have been made.

The hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) may now introduce the subject-matter of his notice to me that he is dissatisfied with the answer to the question pertaining to the French-language school situation.

The hon. member for Ottawa East may now speak for a maximum of five minutes.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You will recall that last week I addressed a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) in relation to a commitment for a French-language school in Cornwall and requested that a commitment be made by the fall of 1973. The Premier (Mr. Davis) had earlier not given his commitment, saying it was premature, and the Minister of Labour had refused to give a commitment.

Since the question was asked, Mr. Speaker, Prof. Symons has been appointed to mediate this situation. We on this side of the House approve the appointment of Prof. Symons. We think he has the trust of both sides, but what a ridiculous situation the government

has placed Prof. Symons in in this Cornwall affair.

Although I address my remarks to the Minister of Labour, they should more properly be addressed to the Premier of the province and to the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells). You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the fall of 1971, in connection with the Sturgeon Falls situation, at the time of an election there was a crisis situation, so much so that the government had to stop Symons along the highway to Ottawa and tell him to settle this problem.

Well, he did. He brought in 76 recommendations; recommendations which would avoid situations like Sturgeon Falls, Cornwall, Elliot Lake and others in the future. The government has had this report for more than a year. This report has been on the minister's desk since Feb. 17, 1972.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, when this report was presented to the House, that the Minister of Education—

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): What's that got to do with the question to which the member didn't get a reply?

Mr. Roy: That's the Symons report, I say to the member for Scarborough Centre.

At the time the Minister of Education presented this report, Mr. Speaker, he said that 1972 would be a year of decision.

Some decision! We have seen nothing but inaction in this situation. And this inaction borders on irresponsibility, because they have allowed deterioration in situations like Cornwall, Elliot Lake, and God knows where else in the province.

Symons recognized this, and I'd like to quote what he said about the situation then. He said:

> By Sept. 1, the feelings on both sides of the question became so escalated that the real danger of violent confrontation existed.
>
> Indeed, a students' strike called at the school opening in September almost erupted into violence. Similar tensions were also developing in a number of Ontario communities. It is no exaggeration to say that a crisis or near-crisis existed in French-English relations in substantial areas of the province. This had, in turn, serious implications on the national scene.

Now, the government has not implemented the recommendations of Symons. And they are having to send him back to Cornwall to do something that should not exist had they implemented the recommendations to start with.

And what have they done in a peaceful community like Cornwall, where for a century both linguistic groups existed in peace and understood each other?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): They still do.

Mr. Roy: They still do?

They have tension – people calling each other bigots, separatists. The president of the school board roughed up the president of the student union in Cornwall. Does the minister call that peace?

Why did the government procrastinate on this situation? What took so long. Why do they have to play politics with national unity and French-English relations?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): That is the kettle calling the pot black!

Mr. Roy: I ask my colleagues on all sides of the House; in a community that was 53 per cent English speaking how long would they tolerate not having their own schools? And this government got $19 million from the federal government for bilingual education!

This government's inaction is clear evidence of the incompetence and irresponsibility of its leadership. Thank God that the citizens of this province are finally starting to realize this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may now take five minutes to reply if he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker: first of all I should like to tell my hon. friend from Ottawa East that it is not my intention to discuss the issues in this dispute for the simple reason that we now have a mediator, and I would presume it would be very improper on the part of a responsible local member to discuss the issues at this present time.

I should like, however, to state my amazement that since this matter concerns the French-speaking element of this province, my hon. friend from Ottawa East did not see fit to engage in the debate in the French language. And I shall turn into it right now.

Mr. Roy: I have spoken more French in this House than the minister!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: M. le Président, je m'étonne que mon bon ami et collègue d'Ottawa Est ait raté une occasion rarissime

d'utiliser le français dans un débat qui touche d'abord et surtout les francophones de l'Ontario.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Il a fait allusion tantôt à la commission Symons et à certaines recommandations, mais il a oublié de signaler cependant que l'une de ces recommandations a déjà été mise en vigueur, soit la nomination d'un sous-ministre-adjoint en la personne de M. Carrière.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Seulement une!

Mr. Roy: La seule. C'est la seule qui été faite.

Mr. Cassidy: C'est la seule chose qui a été faite.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Et puisque mes bons amis de l'opposition ne veulent pas reconnaître, même que dans ses défauts, dans sa faiblesse, la loi 141, le Bill 141, a donné quelque chose à l'Ontario, que l'Ontario n'avait jamais eu auparavant, et je veux dire les écoles secondaires françaises dans la province d'Ontario.

An hon. member: Sounds terrific!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Bien sûr, M. le président, je suis le premier à reconnaître que la loi n'était peut-être pas parfaite, mais il faut dire qu'elle a été le résultat du comité Bériault qui a traversé la province plusieurs fois afin de rencontrer les groupes francophones de cette province et d'essayer d'obtenir ce qu'il voulait. Comme on se souvient, à cette époque-là, les institutions privées ne pouvant plus tenir le coup, il a fallu que le gouvernement, et c'est un gouvernement conservateur encore une fois, qui a donné à cette province des écoles françaises en Ontario.

M. le Président, pour répondre à mon ami d'Ottawa Centre, je dois dire que seulement dans deux endroits dans cette province, nous avons eu des affrontements, des chocs, des heurts, comme dans le cas de Sturgeon Falls et Cornwall, mais parlons donc de Toronto, parlons donc de Windsor — parlons donc d'Ottawa; la lettre et la loi, le bill 141 a fonctionné parfaitement.

Alors mes chers amis, à Cornwall c'est un problème très complexe et, comme je l'ai dit, je n'ai pas l'intention ici d'intervenir et d'influencer en quelque sorte—

An hon. member: Maybe I should—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —le médiateur qui a été nommé par le gouvernement.

Je dois dire, M. le Président, que si mes collègues de l'opposition veulent essayer de toucher à la réputation du député de Stormont en ce qui a trait à la préservation et l'épanouissement de la langue et de la culture française en Ontario, ils perdent leur temps. Et même avant que mes collègues aient l'honneur se s'asseoir ici dans cette Législature, bien avant, j'ai eu l'avantage et le privilège de parler dans cette Chambre en français, en 1957, en 1963 à titre de député de Stormont, après avoir conquis un château fort libéral, de parler en français pour la première fois dans cette chambre, j'ai eu l'honneur en plus en 1967 d'être le parrain du bill de l'Université d'Ottawa, une université bilingue qui se trouve dans le comté d'Ottawa Est de mon ami. J'ai en plus des fils qui ont fréquenté les écoles françaises depuis toujours, j'ai même un fils qui fréquente l'école française St-Laurent, alors je peux vous dire que je suis très au courant de la situation et j'espère que la solution que le gouvernement a prise en envoyant un médiateur compétent—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): That'll hold them.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —un médiateur reconnu á travers la province—solutionnera ce problème et que notre population comme autrefois sera de plus en plus unie dans l'avenir.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Très bien! Couldn't have said it better myself.

Mr. Speaker: I now deem the motion to adjourn to have been carried. This House stands adjourned until 2 of the clock Thursday afternoon next.

The House adjourned at 10:40 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Third readings 507

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Wardle, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Shulman, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, Mr. Sargent 507

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Sargent, agreed to 535

Motion to adjourn 535

Debate re answers to oral questions, Mr. Roy, Mr. Guindon 535

Adjournment 538

No. 14



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 5, 1973

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have with us today as visitors in the east gallery students from Vincent Massey Public School of Oshawa and, in the west gallery, students from Allan A. Martin Senior Public School of Mississauga and Nelson High School of Burlington. A little later we will be joined in the east gallery by students from E. J. Sand Public School of Thornhill.

Statements by the ministry.

HERITAGE ONTARIO

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table at this time the report of the Heritage Ontario congress. This report, entitled "Heritage Ontario," represents the combined efforts of a great number of individuals both within and outside government, including the 1,500 participants in the congress workshops who were the real authors of this particular document.

I would like to pay special tribute on behalf of the province to the 26 members of the Heritage Ontario Advisory Committee, most of whom are in attendance in the House this afternoon. I am sure that the hon. members join me in thanking these individuals for their outstanding contribution to the success of Heritage Ontario. I am very pleased on behalf of all of us to welcome them to this assembly this afternoon, and to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your kindness in making the arrangements for their seating.

It is impossible, of course, to appreciate the significance of the Heritage Ontario congress without an understanding of the historical context in which it took place. Ontario is particularly proud of the leadership role which it has played in encouraging Canadians to recognize the cultural pluralism of our society. Indeed, during the Confederation of Tomorrow conference held in Toronto four years ago, Ontario made clear its aims for the future, with the statement: "Canada should be a bilingual country while maintaining its multicultural character."

We are pleased, as a result, that the federal government is now taking seriously the implications of a pluralistic approach to cultural heritage and is in the process of announcing the framework of what it calls a Canadian government policy on multiculturalism. Such a development represents significant progress from the indifference with which the federal government first greeted Ontario's efforts to move in this direction, and we in Ontario look forward to a greater complementarity of effort now that Ottawa has broadened its vision to better reflect the cultural realities of life in Canada.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Complementary what?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Complementarity.

Mr. Lewis: Complementarity?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Complementarity.

Mr. Lewis: There is nothing like complementarity in cultural diversity.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That's right. It produces unity.

Mr. Lewis: It could lead to homogeneity.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It's nice to welcome the member back to the House.

Mr. Lewis: I have been back a lot more often than the minister has been here—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Oh, I understand the member was off, going through the peninsula.

Mr. Lewis: —and I have some responsibilities, however I may discharge them.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: What does the minister ever do when he's here?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I make statements.

Mr. Lewis: Why not give us the political background to the document rather than this rubbish?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Here in Ontario, we recognized in planning the congress that Heritage Ontario could not be a conference of people who were involved in the same business, or who shared the same views on any given issue or idea. Rather, it had to be a congress in which no one group predominated in a gathering of many, in which no dogmatic focus of concern was identified beforehand, and in which no consensus of opinion was guaranteed when the three days were over.

In effect, what the Ontario government did, Mr. Speaker, was to bring together a truly representative cultural cross-section of the population for the exchange of ideas on a wide variety of issues, to create a "living environment" in which participants could mould the shape of the congress while the government kept a memory bank of the proceedings.

Mr. J. E. Foulds (Port Arthur): Kept a what?

Hon. Mr. Welch: So by almost any definition, the Heritage Ontario congress—

Mr. Foulds: Who wrote this speech? Did the minister write this?

Mr. Lewis: No, he didn't write this.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now, look, one thing the member has got to get quite clear, this congress was a lot more successful than what the member or his party attempted to do later, much more successful. So don't start talking about any partisan—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: That's true. That is a fair comment by almost any definition.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: By almost any definition.

Mr. Lewis: Such a phrase!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: What does the member think I have been doing up there all these weeks?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: By almost any definition, the Heritage Ontario congress more than met the expectations of both planners and participants. While almost every section of our society found its voice, individual problems were recognized as shared and possible solutions were offered at that particular meeting. Individuals and groups transcended the uniqueness of their own perspective to come to grips with the shared nature of culture itself, and reasserted the individual's right—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Why has the Solicitor General lost his role as the spokesman for these matters?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Look, just as a matter of courtesy to those who worked so hard, would the member like to listen to this? They are here.

Mr. Lewis: In my opinion, it is an insult. It is libellous!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That's for them to decide, and I would consider—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would consider the member the last person who would qualify as a spokesman for them.

Mr. Lewis: That's fine. I don't pretend it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member must have done something more in the peninsula than just try to get a seat down there. What was he doing down there?

Mr. Lewis: I tried to rehabilitate the minister's political reputation and I failed.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Great, great. We don't need any help down there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This exchange is entirely out of order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Right, right. Should I start from the beginning again, Mr. Speaker? Individuals and groups transcended the uniqueness of their own perspective to come to grips with the shared nature of culture itself and reasserted the individual's right to define his own experience in ways which are most meaningful to him.

Many developments following last June's congress, Mr. Speaker, have illustrated just how timely the discussions and the exchanges actually were. In reading the report, one cannot help but be impressed by the number of observations and comments which, since their writing, have subsequently been reflected in policy developments. Nor can we deny the breadth of the present focus on cultural pluralism in our province.

Steps have been taken by the Ministries of Education and Labour to implement the recommendations of an interministerial committee concerning prejudice and bias in Ontario textbooks. Amendments have been made to the Schools Administration Act to provide for Indian representation on school boards that administer institutions with a sizable percentage of Indian students. Amendments to the Human Rights Code substantially expanded the definition of discrimination related to housing and for the first time established grounds by which discrimination related to membership within self-governing professions is prohibited.

The government, as you will also recall, Mr. Speaker, has announced the establishment of an Ontario Welcome House to be administered through the Ministry of Community and Social Services, where a broad range of agencies and services designed to meet the needs of newcomers will be physically located under one roof. A bill to create a languages of instruction commission for Ontario's education system will be put forward as a follow-up to the recommendations of the Commission on French-language Secondary Education. Increased assistance to the native peoples of the province has been pledged in recognition of the right of the Indian in this province, no less than that of any other resident, to develop culturally to his fullest potential.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That's why the government gave the Indians five million bucks in five years.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Despite the needs which still remain, we in this province have achieved considerable progress in building into our programmes a sensitivity to the cultural pluralism of our people. We are anxious that this sensitivity and responsiveness become an ongoing element in the process of social and cultural development in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in tabling the final report of the Heritage Ontario Congress this afternoon, I hope that many people will gain from the recorded proceedings of this event a better understanding of what cultural identity is all about. I hope that others will find in this bilingual report on multiculturalism a visible example of the philosophy stated by the former Premier of this province, Hon. Mr. Robarts, in February, 1969, when he said:

> I would like to make it clear that, while the government of Ontario has accepted bilingualism, we have not accepted biculturalism. It is a fact of life that Canada is a multicultural mosaic, and this is nowhere more apparent than in our Province of Ontario. Of this we are very proud, and we think that the multicultural aspects of our country are really a part of the true Canadian nationality.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as part of the tabling of this report may I inform the members of the intention of the government to establish an Ontario advisory council on multiculturalism. During the discussions at Heritage Ontario—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): All Tory jobs.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —it became obvious that all of us were interested in reaffirming the ongoing nature of a multicultural focus, the necessity of seeing the Heritage Ontario congress as only part of a broader thrust within this province and this nation toward a greater responsiveness to various cultural needs and aspirations. Repeatedly, it was pointed out that cultural development should not be institutionalized or packaged but meaningfully encouraged and enhanced. It was also made clear, as you will read in the report, that there was a need for a continuity of focus in discussing cultural pluralism, so that the public could identify a medium through which their own views on this subject could be made known to their government.

It is hoped that the new Ontario advisory council on multiculturalism will assist us in achieving these particular goals. Made up as it will be of approximately 30 members who will serve on a rotating basis, the advisory council will be asked to advise the government through the cabinet committee on social development concerning policies and programmes with direct implications for Ontario's cultural communities. The council will report annually to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development outlining its activities and views.

The first chairman of this council will be named very shortly. It is our intention to work very closely with the chairman in setting up the membership and the administrative details of the council for its first year of operation. We will be looking to the council to play a very major role in carrying on the contributions which the original Heritage Ontario congress provided. I am confident that the hon. members will share with me a sense of optimism at the positive thrust which lies behind the announcement this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

TOBACCO INSURANCE

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I will be guided by your advice. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence) a few days ago asked me a question concerning flue-cured tobacco insurance. The answer may take the form of a statement—it won't be long.

Mr. Singer: Give it as a statement!

Mr. Speaker: I would say to the hon. minister that if the answer is more than two or three minutes, it might well be given as a ministerial statement.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thank you, sir. Since this is a bit of a departure from the normal way we have been handling crop insurance, we propose to administer the tobacco plan somewhat differently than the other plans that are available at present.

We will not be using commission agents, as such, to sell the contracts. With the co-operation of the Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers Marketing Board, we have established an average farm yield, insurance coverage, premium rate and coverage per acre for each farm with tobacco acreage allotments.

Since we also have a list of all growers, we will forward from the Toronto office an application form to each grower with the above information contained in it.

We will then ask all interested growers to return the application to our office together with the premium deposit of $100. As soon as acreage allotments are finalized, they will be invoiced for the difference. This procedure allows us to substantially reduce the cost of administration, which according to the new federal-provincial crop insurance agreement will be paid entirely by the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked me for a list of those who would be the contact men working with the Crop Insurance Commission but located in the areas of tobacco growers. I will do that now. They are:

E. A. Adams Insurance, 207 Main St., Delhi (Norfolk); Robert J. Byers, RR 3, Allenford (Bruce); Frank Cowan, Box 279, Burford (Brant); Walt Cronk, Brock St., Vittoria (Norfolk); Herbert Frey, 515 Talbot St., Aylmer (Elgin); Bev Gray, RR 1, Port Hope (Durham); Malcolm Gray Insurance, 97 Frank St., Strathroy (Middlesex); John Hofstetter, RR 1, Plattsville (Oxford); Jack Hughes, Box 21, Simcoe (Norfolk); Gordon Lowes, RR 3, Chatham (Kent); Morley Nelson, RR 2, Baltimore (Northumberland); Rosenfeld Insurance, RR 3, Wheatley (Essex); and Don Way, RR 3, Tillsonburg (Oxford).

Mr. Speaker, I will give this list to the Hansard stenographer so that it will be available for spelling. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Singer: Not quite. Just the hon. member for Downsview, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Not quite yet!

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Not yet, he means. He tried hard enough.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Margaret, watch it!

SCHOOL BUDGETS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier (Mr. Davis), who I was going to ask whether we should get ready for a shooting war with the Province of Alberta as hinted by the hon. member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough), I guess my first question will go to the Minister of Education.

Could the Minister of Education tell us whether or not he has come to any conclusion which will be of assistance to the Metropolitan Toronto School Board as a result of his recent meetings with trustees of the Metropolitan Toronto School Board?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, up until noon when I was in my office for five minutes, I hadn't received the kind of information I asked them for at our meeting on Tuesday afternoon, so I really have no hard data in order that I would know in specific terms what they are even asking for. When that is presented, we can then survey it.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, could the minister explain to us why, when he had his meeting with the trustees of the Metropolitan Toronto School Board, he invited to be present all of the Tory members from Metropolitan Toronto but no Liberal members and no NDP members?

Mr. Cassidy: Shame.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Speaker, none of them asked—

An hon. member: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Wells: None of the other members asked—

Mr. Cassidy: Just the trained puppets!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): A nice little cabal!

Mr. Lewis: Is that so? Does he think that? That's not very nice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, in view of the minister's recent complaints about the snow job that he thought was being put over on him by the North York trustees, why did the minister not avail himself of the opportunity to be present at any one of the 15 meetings? Or have any of his departmental officials been present at any one of the 15 meetings to which they were invited and which they said they wouldn't attend?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, those meetings were what we could call small "p" political meetings.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Wells: It would not have been appropriate for members of the Ministry of Education civil service staff to attend those meetings.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The meeting the minister held was a large "p" political.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The people for whom it would be appropriate to attend would be the local members, some of whom, I gather, were not invited to those meetings—that is our members—and some of them who did attend were given no opportunity to speak. I still say that those meetings were fairly one-sided operations to present one side of the story. If the member would like us to hire a hall and present our side that's fine. I think we have a very good side to present.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of final supplementary, does the minister need any greater hall than this legislative assembly to present his side of the story if he has one?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that is a very good point, Mr. Speaker. I would say to the hon. member—this is the question I've been asking for the last couple of weeks and I'm sure he saw it on television—in Metropolitan Toronto nothing is being cut back; next year they are being allowed to spend $5 million more. They say they need to spend $29 million more and yet total enrolment next year in Metropolitan Toronto will see 5,500 fewer pupils. Now tell me why they need to spend $29 million more?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The answer, in fact, was not an answer to the last supplementary regarding the size of the hall required. It was more of a statement. If the leader of the New Democratic Party has a substantial supplementary question of urgent public interest I will permit one more supplementary.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Something substantial?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He always has substantial questions.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Not only substantial but relevant.

Mr. Lewis: I refuse to be intimidated, sir. I will await my turn.

REMOVAL OF BOOKS FROM CIRCULATION

Mr. Singer: I have a question which I think belongs to the Solicitor General; if he feels it doesn't, perhaps one of his fellow members of the Justice galaxy could step in.

Could the Solicitor General advise us whether or not the various steps set out in section 160 of the Criminal Code have been followed subsequent to the seizure by the Metropolitan Toronto Police of the books written by Xaviera—whatever her name is—

An hon. member: Hollander.

Mr. Singer: Hollander.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Looking at her name every night.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Excellent reading. One falls asleep after a few pages.

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is not of sufficient urgency or public importance to justify supplementaries. The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, surely it is of urgency when it has been suggested in this House that something has been done by our

police which is contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code? Surely it is of urgency that we ask the senior law officer—

Mr. Speaker: Surely it is of urgency that the members obey the Chair in connection with the oral questions! Does the member for Downsview have another question?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a considerable series of questions.

Mr. Lewis: Okay!

POWERS OF SECURITY GUARDS TO ISSUE PARKING TICKETS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the Solicitor General advise us whether or not he approves of the procedure whereby security guards can issue parking tickets which they obtain from the Metropolitan Toronto police, apparently making it appear that they are regular police officers?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Do they have to be police officers to issue parking tickets?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I shall not answer the question directly, except to say—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): What else is new?

An hon. member: A typical political answer.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —this, that in recent days I have taken the matter under review and have gone over the history of the development of this. I'm aware that there are not only cons but some pros with respect to the matter.

The situation as it exists at present is that a committee has been set up from within and without the ministry office to review all of the pertinent facts so that a contemporary decision may be made.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary: Could the minister explain to us how it was possible to circumvent a previous direction that issued from the office either of the Attorney General or the Solicitor General, if it then existed, which forbade the giving of powers similar to police officers' powers to anyone other than police officers?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's profession will enable him to understand that there are different—

Mr. MacDonald: That's taking a lot for granted.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —viewpoints on the legal specific technical interpretations of the legislation which is applicable.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Too many lawyers!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a final supplementary: Is the minister not aware that I was not talking about legislation; I was talking about a specific directive issued out of one of the Justice departments?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The directive was based on an interpretation of the legislation. This is where the crux of the matter comes.

As I've said to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, the matter is under review. There is a problem to which a solution has to be found and we are looking for, not an answer to the hon. member's question, but an answer to the problem.

McWILLIAMS INSURANCE REPORT

Mr. Singer: I have one more question, of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Could the minister tell us why, when he tabled the McWilliams Report, he only tabled small extracts from it; and whether or not he is aware that substantial criticism has arisen since the tabling of that report because the full report was not made available to the members of the Legislature and to the public; and will he now table the full report?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that I tabled the recommendations only—numbering some 75 or 76 recommendations. I have not tabled the report itself; I am still currently studying it. I am not going to make any statement as to whether I will be filing it later on or not.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, does the minister not agree that the recommendations lose some of their effectiveness if the Legislature and the public are not going to be able to read the reasons whereby the conclusions were finally arrived at? Does he not think it would only be fair to the commissioners, and the public, if the whole report was made available and not just pre-digested portions?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, that's the determination I'm now trying to reconcile in my own mind.

Mr. MacDonald: What is in the report anyway?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

TORONTO DOWNTOWN HOUSING

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, to the provincial Treasurer in the absence of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman): Is the provincial Treasurer able to tell the House what precise agreements and what expenditures of money related to those agreements have been entered into by the Province of Ontario with respect to the housing development at Sherbourne and Dundas Sts. in downtown Toronto?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): No, sir, I'm not able to; but I would like to provide certain information which is in the form of a statement given by the Minister of Revenue last night on this subject—if that's the wish of the House.

An hon. member: Read it!

Mr. Speaker: If this is a ministerial statement it should not be given at this time.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, it's obviously not my statement; but it does contain important information on this rather urgent question. I will give it only if there are no objections.

Mr. Speaker: If the answer can be given in two or three minutes I would permit extracts from the statement.

Hon. Mr. White: Dealing with this rather important matter the Minister of Revenue last night made the following statement:

> A great deal of public attention has been focused on the Sherbourne-Dundas area where site clearance work began on Monday in preparation for the construction of a 360-unit rental development.
>
> In response to an appeal from persons interested in preserving the character of the neighbourhood and following a meeting with Mayor David Crombie, we urged the developer to suspend demolition of existing housing and meet with us to consider an alternative for a proposed development of 360 units in a 29-storey apartment building.
>
> I would emphasize at this point that while the development was proposed to OHC, final provincial approvement for the project has not yet been given. We have no contract with the developer and have no control over his actions. At this time all we can do is use whatever persuasion we're able to exert.
>
> I examined the correspondence related to this development and, to my astonishment have learned that OHC did not actively seek out this location, nor pursue its redevelopment.
>
> Indeed, I found to my great surprise that the original project, which was to contain two 24-storey towers, was vigorously pressed upon OHC by the ward aldermen, John Sewell and Karl Jaffary.
>
> In a letter which he wrote to OHC's managing director on April 1, 1971, Ald. Sewell stated that he and Ald. Jaffary had a meeting with residents of the area at which it was conclusively agreed: "That all, or a large number of the units will be made available on a subsidized rent basis. The meeting requested me to write you to inquire if your corporation would be willing to either fund construction of the project, or part of it, or rent some, or all of the units from the developer."
>
> Replying to the alderman's letter, the managing director of OHC informed Mr. Sewell that OHC's immediate goal was to increase the supply of three, four and five-bedroom units, but expressed interest in the Sherbourne-Dundas proposal in terms of long-range planning.
>
> At its meeting on April 5, 1971, Toronto's committee on buildings and development dealt with a rezoning application on behalf of New Style Construction Ltd. to permit the two-tower development. Preliminary steps towards rezoning were taken by the committee which informed OHC that it "would look with favour on the Ontario Housing Corp., having some form of participation in this project."
>
> On July 2, 1971, Ald. Karl Jaffary wrote to OHC and noted that city council on June 29 was called upon to approve the Sherbourne and Dundas development. In his letter Mr. Jaffary said: "It was apparent to me that many members of council would have been very happy to approve the development if Ontario Housing Corp. was going to take a major part in it. The development is now planned to consist of two towers, and it was the hope of many of us that Ontario Housing Corp. might well acquire one of those towers."
>
> It is quite apparent there was considerable support from the ward aldermen and

Toronto city council for the participation of OHC in this proposed two-tower development. OHC became involved the following year when, in response to a Metro-wide OHC—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has taken more than three minutes now, which I would deem to be sufficient for an answer to a question. However, in view of the importance, if the hon. members unanimously agree to extend it for another minute or two we will make an exception in this case.

Mr. Lewis: I don't want it taken off the question period time, Mr. Speaker. If that is what you insist on, forget it.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. minister has exceeded what would normally be a response to a question.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question then.

Hon. Mr. White: They didn't like the answer, eh?

Mr. MacDonald: No. Supplementary question.

Mr. Deans: Very interesting!

Hon. Mr. White: Interested, but not much.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a supplementary question of the provincial Treasurer as a spokesman for the government in the absence of the minister responsible for housing.

In view of the changed circumstances in the last two years since those letters were written by the ward aldermen, and in view of the happy coincidence between their desire for a renovation rather than a tearing down and building of highrise and the need on the part of OHC for multi-bedroom facilities, why doesn't the government change its position and see that OHC goes in and comes up with multi-bedroom facilities?

Hon. Mr. White: Perhaps this new question will enable me to read the second half of this statement which deals with those issues.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If the hon. minister gives the second half of the statement in his response to the supplementary question, I will permit it.

Mr. MacDonald: I want to see whether it deals with my question.

Mr. Deans: This is a game.

Hon. Mr. White: OHC became involved the following year when, in response to a Metro-wide OHC proposal call in March, 1972, the firm of Irber, Sable and Damis submitted a proposal for a 24-storey building which would contain 302 units on 1½ acres of land, approximately half the site referred to earlier by the aldermen.

Metro's housing advisory committee approved the project in April and OHC's board of directors approved the proposal on July 18, 1972, subject to a rezoning of the site. On June 1, 1972, Ald. Sewell wrote to OHC again and asked whether OHC was thinking of leasing or buying any of the units in either of the two proposed towers? The alderman at that time gave no indication that he opposed clearance of the existing housing at the site or the erection of the highrise buildings.

Mr. Speaker: I think the answer is now exceeding a proper answer to the supplementary question.

Mr. Sargent: He is wandering.

Mr. MacDonald: He hasn't answered my supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. White: The answer is later down here.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow one more supplementary, in view of the urgency of the matter.

Mr. Dukszta: Will the government support this project financially if the city expropriates this site according to the new lines that were done in the Sherbourne feasibility study by Diamond and Myers?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I am informed—

Mr. Speaker: I think the answer need only be yes or no.

Hon. Mr. White: I can't answer that question. I haven't got the pertinent information available.

Mr. Cassidy: That is the crux of it—no commitment over there.

INTEGRATED COMMUNITY HOUSING PROJECT

Mr. Lewis: A new question: Does the Treasurer know why his colleague, the Min-

ister of Revenue, has been refusing to move in the provision of—

Hon. Mr. White: That is absurd. Listen to the rest of the statement.

Mr. Lewis: —integrated housing in this area for two years now? Can he explain why this has all been caused by the Minister of Revenue?

Hon. Mr. White: The Minister of Revenue is, I think, meeting right now with Mayor Crombie.

Mr. Lewis: It's about time—after they start wrecking the buildings.

Hon. Mr. White: I got this information secondhand, but that is my understanding. I'm further given to understand there will be a further statement tonight. I think it's really most unfortunate—

Mr. Lewis: Well, maybe he should make it in the House.

Hon. Mr. White: —that the House won't listen to the next two pages of this statement, since the matter is obviously urgent.

Mr. MacDonald: The government is going to save the buildings after they are torn down.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE APPLICATION

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. Has he administered the appropriately stiff rebuke to his board of review, in light of the divisional court's comments on the case involving a 65-year-old widow's application for public assistance, and the clear indication that the board of review failed to take the question of need into account? Has he been in touch with the board since the court's ruling?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this case. I'll be pleased to look into it.

GENERAL WELFARE RATES

Mr. Lewis: Well all right, I will send the minister the clipping. I would have thought it had been brought to this attention.

May I ask him, by way of another question, is it his intention now to raise the levels of assistance for general welfare recipients above $115 a month, given the instance of it being raised, in British Columbia yesterday, to $140 a month for an individual?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I'll be making a statement in the House early next week with reference to various matters that have been brought to my attention. One concerns the increase in old age pensions as it affects those who are in homes for the aged; and also the question of additional assistance to those who are on general welfare. I will be making this statement early next week.

Mr. Lewis: So by way of supplementary, the minister is saying that he will in fact announce the increases next week? Am I to understand that?

I am not asking the minister for the sums.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What I said, Mr. Speaker, is that I will be making a statement next week as to the various adjustments we are making.

Mr. Lewis: Okay; the minister can call it an "adjustment", because he is embarrassed to call it an increase.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Yes, 10 bucks a month; $10 a month.

COMPENSATION TO CRIME VICTIMS

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Attorney General: Has the province yet signed an agreement with the federal government to obtain a share of the costs of compensation of victims of crime and of legal aid?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: That is done, is it?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Yes, in both cases, Mr. Speaker.

CONFERENCES FOR WOMEN

Mr. Lewis: A question, last question Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: In these gratuitous, condescending conferences for women which are being held around the province, particularly the provincial conference for women, why was it necessary to have among the ministry's experts someone from Morrison-Lamothe Bakery and what could she contribute about consumer's rights, or consumer responsibility?

Why was it necessary to bring in the chairman of the American Farm Bureau? Is there no one in Canada of comparable status who might have views in this area?

Why was it necessary to have Fred Davis appear through the courtesy of the Imperial Tobacco Products Ltd.

And what in God's name can the minister tell us, by way of summary, is the Minister without Portfolio (Mrs. Birch) going to talk about under the title, "The Future Is Not What It Used to Be"?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Perhaps the by-elections!

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, as far as the conferences are concerned, they are under the chairmanship of the women, and they design and develop their programme as they see fit for presentation to women's groups throughout the Province of Ontario.

As far as the invitation to Mr. Davis is concerned, it was extended, I believe, a year or so ago. I will look into the background of it, but we pretty well leave the programme up to the board or the executive of that particular organization, to design and develop the programmes they think best serve the women of this province.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): In the view of the Treasurer!

Mr. Deans: Those best suited to promote the Conservative cause.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West. All right, the hon. minister.

POLICE SEIZURE OF COMPANY'S BOOKS

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) asked a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism:

> Is the minister aware of why the police recently seized the records and books of Disney Display with which, according to the public accounts, his ministry had over 90 per cent of the display business last year?

May I first of all say, Mr. Speaker, that our ministry did approximately $270,000 worth of business with Disney Display in the years 1971-1972, which accounted for 17.6 per cent of the display business by my ministry. Secondly, sir, as far as the seizure of the books is concerned, I believe it was on the instructions and at the request of the National Revenue Department of the federal government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

TEACHER NEGOTIATION LEGISLATION

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

Will the minister be introducing, before Easter, legislation governing teacher and board negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course the exact time of introduction of legislation is something that has to be decided by the government and myself, but I think the Speech from the Throne indicated this legislation would be coming. I can't tell the member whether it will be before the Easter holiday. We have had the mid-winter break; I can't tell you whether or not it will be before the Easter holiday.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the legislation be based on the Reville recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, that is like asking what the legislation which we haven't introduced is going to say. Of course, the hon. member will be able to draw his conclusions when he sees the legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

POSITION OF MINING RECORDER

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Has his ministry this week undertaken measures to remove one Mr. Roger Denommee, the mining recorder, who revealed to the Northern Miner the report which would have called for the abolition of the mine recorder's post? Has the ministry removed him from job?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the hon. member that I am very much aware of the situation to which he refers. I can tell him that I wasn't very pleased with the mining recorder's actions, but to my knowledge no disciplinary action has been taken.

Mr. Martel: Is it not a fact that he was to be brought to Toronto this week some time for some confrontation with the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I think this is correct, Mr. Speaker. When something like this happens, I think it is only right that we examine all aspects of it and I do believe he is coming to Toronto to meet a committee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the same minister; it is not anything one can put on the order paper—the minister might say yes or no to it. In view of the fact that I personally witnessed—

An hon. member: What is the question?

Mr. Sargent: Is that member the parliamentary assistant there?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I personally witnessed the minister loading on to his aircraft at the Island Airport great supplies of medicinal material in the form of booze for a trip. We are still trying to get—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member ask the question?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I am leading up to it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Will he ask the question?

Mr. Sargent: Will the minister advise whether we have to go to the extent of a court order to get the logbooks of the Davis air force and the personnel using it? That's all we want to know. The Provincial Auditor's report, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The question has been asked. Perhaps the minister would care to answer.

Mr. Sargent: It is a two-part question.

Mr. Speaker: It had better be!

Mr. Sargent: Why is the minister afraid to let us see the logbooks? Tell us that!

Mr. Speaker: That's an improper question.

Mr. Sargent: It's a pretty good one. Let the minister answer the first one, then.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the member for Grey-Bruce that I don't know the air force to which he refers. We have a very good air service within my ministry of which we are all proud; I am sure all the members here are equally proud as I am of the tremendous work they do.

In regard to the log books, this question has been brought to my attention on many occasions in this Legislature and I have given the answer. As I said to the leader of the New Democratic Party just the other day, there would be a policy statement made.

Mr. Sargent: Is the minister going to make a policy statement on that? When?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In due course, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In due course.

Mr. Sargent: How long is that?

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park is next.

REPORT ON SILVER SHIELD MINES

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Who in his ministry gave instructions that the OSC report on Silver Shield was not to be completed? Is he yet in a position to answer the question which was given to him last year asking whether any members of the Ministry of Natural Resources had been trading in the stock of that particular company?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I am not aware of any order being given to anyone to preclude the finishing of the report dealing with Silver Shield. I am advised by the chairman that the report will be completed very shortly. As the member knows there are certain charges pending against certain individuals connected with that company and the report, for obvious reasons, will not be made available to the public until the charges are disposed of.

I wish to make no comment at this particular time with reference to the suggestion that certain people in the Ministry of Natural Resources were involved with the purchase of shares or suggested purchase of shares in Silver Shield Mines. I understand that this is touched upon within the report and certain steps might be initiated as a result.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Inasmuch as the minister or the

OSC chairman had that report—the results of that investigation—long before the charges were laid, why has the minister taken no action within that ministry?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should get a new informant, because the report was not in the possession of the chairman of the Securities Commission. He advised me about two weeks ago that is was not even completed. It is almost complete, but it is not completed as of yet.

Mr. Shulman: A final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the interviews were completed over a year ago, how can the minister explain that it took a year to put the result of those interviews into a report?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I am advised that the interviews were not all completed over a year ago, Mr. Speaker, and that in fact some were completed just a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

OHIP PREMIUMS

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. Was it his government's intention to grant to the Ontario Health Insurance Commission the power to forgive $50 million of premiums by the wording of the Act establishing the commission, which states: "The commission is empowered to do all things necessary to arrange for the organization of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan"?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think the simplest way to respond would be to draw the hon. member's attention to the written statement on that very subject read in this House by the Treasurer a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. provincial Treasurer.

Does the Treasurer have the intestinal fortitude to admit that the government proposal for regional government in the Hamilton-Wentworth area has resulted in an irreconcilable situation, and will he propose to his government that that area be included in the areas in which regional government will not be proceeded with this year?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, I have the guts—and no, I won't give any such assurance.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: Would the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs indicate whether the statement attributed to him the other day, that his government was going to slow down on regional government, was an indication of government policy or was it simply an offhand remark taken out of context?

Hon. Mr. White: I think the report was accurate, Mr. Speaker. I don't think I used the works "slow down." What I did say was that the proposal of the ministry for regional government east of Metro, and the several proposals for regional government west of Metro, now attend to the most critical urbanized area of this province.

I myself anticipate no slowdown as such in the reform of local government. At the same time, I am quick to say that I don't think the model established in the Metro area is the appropriate model for all parts of this province. I am hoping that the counties and regions and other municipalities in the outlying parts of the province, including my own part of southwestern Ontario, will themselves find a way to modernize local government without having Queen's Park impose a regional plan on them.

Mr. Haggerty: Getting pretty close to home, eh?

Mr. Sargent: They've got to check their policy now!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: And I have reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that this will indeed take place. I had the privilege of speaking as the keynote speaker to the semi-annual conference of the Association of Counties and Regions of Ontario on Tuesday night in the King Edward Hotel, at which time I learned from the warden of Lambton county that conversations had started with Sarnia. I learned from the warden of Essex county that meetings have started with Windsor. And I learned from the clerk of Westminster township that a meeting is planned between Middlesex and London. So we see now—for

the first time, I suggest—an effort being made at that local level to reform local government in the way that hasn't been apparent in the past.

This, as a matter of fact, was our plea to the local level of government five or 10 years ago, but when the response wasn't forthcoming we assumed the responsibility, and now we have attended to all the critical spots.

Mr. Haggerty: Blackmail.

Hon. Mr. White: And we have reason to think that the municipalities, the counties and so on, will be able to deal with internal alterations, amalgamations, boundary changes and so on to meet the needs of the future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill should have the first supplementary.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary question: Would—

Mr. Deans: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Deans: It was my question; he asked the first supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth is quite correct: he asked the original question; and the hon. member for York-Forest Hill had a supplementary. I will permit the hon. member for Wentworth to have a supplementary.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't normally do that, but I am always afraid of getting cut off at two supplementaries. I want to ask the minister whether—

Mr. Speaker: I think I indicated to the hon. member the other day that I would consider the importance of the question—

Mr. Deans: That's what I was worried about.

Mr. Speaker: —and then decide how many supplementaries to allow.

Mr. Deans: That's exactly what worries me.

Mr. Foulds: The member will have to ask better questions.

Mr. Deans: May I, by way of supplementary question, ask the minister whether he is aware that a polarization has taken place which would make the implementation of either of the two proposals almost unacceptable? Will he begin the process again in a considerably shortened way, to try to come up with something which might in fact be acceptable to both parties?

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary.

An hon. member: Wait a minute, wait a minute.

Mr. Speaker: Surely to goodness the response from the minister can be given and then the rest of the hon. members who've tried to get up can ask their questions before the hon. member for Grey-Bruce shoots up.

Mr. Sargent: All right, all right. Don't get your blood up.

Mr. Speaker: I'm not, you are!

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I'm not aware that the polarization has taken place; no, I must say I'm not. I'm not aware of that. I don't think there's been any polarization, notwithstanding the efforts of the MPP for Wentworth—

Mr. Deans: That's a lie.

Hon. Mr. White: —who is reported in the Record as saying, "MPP backs Beverly," and who is trying at every chance he gets to exacerbate the existing difficulties.

Mr. Deans: That's not true.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Just politics.

Hon. Mr. White: If additional proof is needed I'll be glad to read into the record—

Mr. Deans: Read it!

Mr. Cassidy: The situation was created by the government, which gave an untenable choice.

Hon. Mr. White: This is from the Kitchener-Waterloo Record of March 20:

> The fight against union with Waterloo region by northern residents of Beverly township will be carried on to the floor of the provincial Legislature next week by NDP House leader Ian Deans, MPP for Wentworth.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: Well, well!

Mr. Deans: When did you hear it?

Mr. Cassidy: Shame.

Hon. Mr. White: Quoting further:

> In a telephone interview, Mr. Deans said he will ask John White, Minister of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, why the 900 residents of a 30-square-mile section of the township are not being told what will happen to their demands.

Etc., etc., etc.

Hon. Mr. Welch: All things to all men.

Mr. Deans: Well, by way of supplementary—

Hon. Mr. White: Notwithstanding the troublemakers, like my hon. friend, who are attempting to exacerbate the concern which is evident—

Mr. Cassidy: Shame.

Mr. Singer: The troublemaking exacerbater who wants to discuss something in the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. White: —I have high hopes that a consensus will be formed. I would like to say that these hopes are not ill-founded. I had breakfast this morning with the reeve of West Flamborough and an associate of his on council. I have meetings tomorrow morning and a luncheon meeting with the mayor of Hamilton and, I think, 18 councillors. I hope that we can come together to a consensus, notwithstanding the destructive influence of the hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Go and get 'em.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question.

An hon. member: Let him have it, Ian.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. member for Wentworth has had one question and a supplementary. I will accept one more supplementary—the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Deans: Well, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Deans: On a point of privilege, sir. Is it not the privilege of the members of this House to bring to the attention of the ministry, petitions which have been raised by citizens of this province in favour of, or opposed to anything being done by this government?

An hon. member: That was no point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, isn't it a breach of faith and trust to say on March 20—

Mr. Stokes: Does the minister have a point of privilege?

Hon. Mr. White: —that the hon. member will take the side of one particular group, when the pledge has been given to the hundreds of thousands of people concerned, that their views will be received until March 31?

Mr. Sargent: Is that a question?

An hon. member: What game is the minister playing?

Mr. Deans: The minister is completely misrepresenting the facts in both circumstances.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Deans: If he had done his job properly he would have—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Deans: He has destroyed the credibility of the government in the area.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Wentworth, of course, did not have a valid point of order.

Mr. Deans: A point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: As far as being a point of privilege is concerned, there is no such parliamentary privilege.

Mr. Lewis: Well, you know, it's not a breach of trust, it's a fit of pique, for heaven's sake. Why should we accept the regional government plans this government sets down?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense.

Mr. Deans: Ninety per cent of the people of the area are opposed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: All of his Hamilton members deserted the minister on this issue.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The Treasurer is carrying a large piece of lumber on his left shoulder.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon member for Sault Ste. Marie. We have had sufficient supplementaries.

MAPLE MOUNTAIN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. First of all, is the minister aware of the article that appeared in the March edition of Exchange, the monthly news bulletin of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, refering to Maple Mountain development? And can he tell us, if he is aware of it, how accurate the contents are?

Mr. Singer: That is certainly more urgent than the police breaking the Criminal Code.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the article in Exchange. It was brought to my attention. I must say that the comments that were made in the article, Mr. Speaker, are not those in keeping with the quality of this government. We have assigned the responsibility for two consultant reports to figure out whether there is a practical project, a feasible project, and whether it is economically sound. When this government has come to the decision as to whether it is, sir, there will be an announcement to this House as to what direction we shall take in special attractions in this problem.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

ESPANOLA WATER CONDITION

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of the Environment: What action has the minister's department taken in response to the letter from Espanola stating their alarm regarding the contamination of surface waters in the area, which they describe as black, inky and full of solids?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member can tell me the date of that letter. I don't recall anything recently from Espanola.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to provide the minister with a copy of a letter addressed to him on March 27 of this year; a week ago.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that that letter obviously went to somebody to investigate it; and if it hasn't got to me yet—

Mr. Good: It was addressed to the minister. Doesn't he read his mail? He doesn't have anything else to do.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the hon. member doesn't have anything else to do.

Mr. Sargent: Isn't he getting paid for it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

WAGE RATES ON ROAD PROJECT

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister explain why, under the Ministry of Transportation and Communications contract No. 72-119—that's the construction at Plains Rd. in the Hamilton-Aldershot area—why the contractor, Steed and Evans, is being allowed to pay some carpenters employed on carpentry on the bridge structures less than the fair wage schedule rate; particularly as this contractor bid, and was awarded the contract under the fair wage agreement?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is referring to a jurisdictional dispute between the carpenters' union and the labourers' union. Or is it another contract?

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to any jurisdictional dispute. I am asking why all carpenters employed on carpentry on that site, from whatever source, are not being paid the rate specified under the fair wage schedule.

And furthermore, would the minister then investigate all rates paid to persons in the various job classifications on that site to determine that they are all being paid the correct wage under the fair wage schedule?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will acquire the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

FAMILY COURT PROCEDURES

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. Could this minister tell me whether his ministry is still following the policy of forcing women into the family court when the women have already made their direction that all payments by their husbands shall go either to the provincial or municipal social service? It's the welfare department, I'm sorry; it's still the same. Is this still going on? And are these women forced to swear hearsay information or face the threat of being cut off welfare?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for her question; it's a very important question; a question being brought to our attention many times. But I would say that this matter is under the Attorney General.

I believe it is the Law Reform Commission which has made a study and we are looking forward to its report. It is a very complex question. It has legal implications as well as social ones. But I would say that if there are any cases that the member is aware of, if she knows of any mothers who are presently suffering any hardships, if she would bring them to my attention we would be pleased to look into them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I think the minister is well aware of at least three cases brought to his attention by transcript. Could I know, then, whether his opinion is that this procedure is necessitated by the legislation, and whose legislation it is?

An hon. member: Don't get upset.

Mr. Singer: I would say that is the Treasurer's.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister care to answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will be pleased, Mr. Speaker, to reply specifically to the hon. member in the near future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Natural Resources has the reply to a question previously asked.

ALLEGED USE OF STRIKEBREAKERS

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor West asked a question in regard to the production of the Ontario Provincial Parks folders.

I am informed that an order for the reprinting of this folder was placed with the printing services branch of the Ministry of Government Services in accordance with accepted government policy and procedures. The job was put out for tender by that ministry and subsequently the order was placed with C. F. Houghton, a Toronto printer, the lowest tenderer who guaranteed delivery within the limited time specified by my ministry. C. F. Houghton Ltd. subcontracted the folder work to the Brooker Trade Bindery.

I am further informed that the printing services branch of Government Services does not, in the normal course of business, specify how subcontracts may be awarded. Indeed, such action appears impractical in view of the vast number of printing orders placed by the branch and where there is a need for subcontracting.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: On that then, the minister is saying that he did not have the authority to write in his letter of May 12 to the International Union of Bookbinders—that therefore subcontracting to this firm that is on strike could not be prevented?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the letter to which the hon. member refers was a letter written by me to the union. I would point out to him that that particular order to which he referred at that time was placed by the Niagara Parks Commission which comes under my ministry. I did have the authority to send that letter to them. I assured him at that time that I would send the letter and I did.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has now expired.

I should like to inform the House at this time that the meeting of the procedural affairs committee called for 9:30 tomorrow morning will now be held this evening at 6 o'clock and is not expected to take more than 10 minutes.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Stewart presented the annual report of the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario for the period of April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972; the annual report of the Crop Insurance Commission of Ontario for April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972; and the

annual report of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food for the period April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972.

Mr. Taylor from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr1, An Act respecting Aradco Management Ltd. and Oak Stamping Ltd.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the East York Foundation.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Simcoe and Erie General Insurance Co.

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Reliable Life Insurance Co.

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting Constitution Insurance Co. of Canada.

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Village of Glencoe.

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the Town of Espanola.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the Tillson Spur Line Railway Co.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Town of Orangeville.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting Bridge St. United Church Foundation.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the County of Bruce.

Your committee would recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing and penalties, if any, be remitted on Bill Pr15, An Act respecting Bridge St. United Church Foundation.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal the Northern Development Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, under the Northern Development Act, loans of up to $500 were made to settlers in northern Ontario between the years 1917 and 1930. These loans were secured by liens registered against the property of the borrowers. The only loans outstanding at the present time are those which appear to be uncollectable. The purpose of this bill is to repeal the Act and to provide that any outstanding liens will be discharged.

Mr. MacDonald: Earthshaking, earthshaking.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal the Agricultural Development Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, under the Agricultural Development Act, loans were made to farmers, which loans were secured by mortgages on the land. At the present time there are very few mortgages outstanding, all of which will mature during the 1974 calendar year. The purpose of this bill is to vest the assets formerly vested in the Commissioner of Agricultural Loans in the Treasurer of Ontario and to transfer the powers and duties of the commissioner to the Treasurer, effective July 1 of this year.

TREASURY, ECONOMICS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in this bill are of a housekeeping nature. A correction is made of the cross references to the Audit Act, and in addition provision is made in the statute for an official seal of the Treasurer.

DEVOLUTION OF ESTATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Devolution of Estates Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the bill basically accomplishes two things: First, it increases the preferential share of a spouse on an intestacy from $20,000 to $50,000 and prevents escheat to the Crown of part of the property of the deceased where the spouse is the only lawful heir.

Under the present provisions of the Devolution of Estates Act, where a person dies without having made a will the spouse of that person is entitled to the first $20,000 of the deceased's intestate estate, after payment of debts and expenses. That amount is commonly referred to as the spouse's preferential share. The spouse is also entitled to a further portion of the residue of the estate, if any.

Under the present law, as well, where a person dies without making a will and leaves a spouse only, with no other heirs, the government of Ontario is entitled to a portion of the person's estate by escheat.

Over the years there have been very few instances in which the Crown has become entitled to claim a portion of the estate in these circumstances. In those very few circumstances, the surviving spouse has applied to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for a waiver of escheat and a waiver has invariably been granted. As a matter of principle, we feel that the Crown should not in any case became entitled to a portion of the estate at the expense of the surviving spouse only because there were no other beneficiaries.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, provision is made in this bill that the Crown will obtain no part of the estate where there is a surviving spouse and there are no other heirs.

SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, under the present law, where a person dies without making a will, in order that that person's estate be administered letters of administration must be obtained. Under the provisions of the Surrogate Courts Act, the person applying for letters of administration must obtain a bond to ensure that the estate will be properly administered. The purpose of the bond is to protect the beneficiaries of the estate and the creditors.

Under the bill which I have just introduced to amend the Devolution of Estates Act, the spouse of a deceased person who has not made a will will be entitled to the first $50,000 of an estate. Where the value of an estate, after creditors have been paid, is less than $50,000, the only person who would benefit from the protection of the administration bond is the spouse. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that a bond is not required where the net value of the estate is less than $50,000 and an application for administration is made by a spouse of the deceased person who dies without leaving a will.

CITY OF HAMILTON ACT

Mr. Reilly, in the absence of Mr. J. R. Smith, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LAND TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Land Titles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, as a result of amendments made to the Land Titles Act during the last session, subdivision plans in the future are to be registered under the land titles system where it is available. Practical experience in attempting to bring about this change indicates that the date suggested of April 1, 1973, was premature and would result in increased land prices to purchasers at a time when price and availability of serviced lots are of concern to everyone. Accordingly this amendment will extend the date to Jan. 1, 1974, and provide more flexibility in the application of the legislation.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, His Honour awaits us—

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. David was on her feet.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the orders of the day, may I ask for the concurrence of the House to revert to ministerial statements in order to hear the balance of the statement from the provincial Treasurer since it concerns a matter of urgent public business?

Mr. Sargent: That was a well set up deal.

Mr. Speaker: I suppose if we have the unanimous consent of the House we could revert. Do we have that?

Mr. Lewis: No, you don't have unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker. The minister knows how the rules are observed here. He could have made it during ministerial statements.

Mr. Speaker: If we do not have unanimous consent there is no manner in which we can entertain it.

Mr. Lewis: It's ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order.

Mr. Haggerty: There is no point of order.

Hon. Mr. White: There is nothing argumentative in this statement. It has an urgency that very few matters have.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. I'm sorry.

Mr. Singer: That is not a point of order in the rules of order. The rules are there.

Hon. Mr. White: I can't imagine how it would hurt the cause of the leader of the NDP to have this information in the records.

Mr. Singer: The Treasurer thinks he can say anything he wants at any time. He is not going to.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Speaking to the point of order—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: What is he talking about then?

Mr. Speaker: I attempted to have him sit down as soon as possible. There is no point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: If it is urgent, let him bring it in as a ministerial statement. There are 22 members in the cabinet.

Mr. Speaker: The minister is out of order. I have called for order several times.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Why wouldn't the members hear the statement?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: On to more pleasant things, Mr. Speaker; His Honour awaits in his chamber to give assent to certain bills.

Mr. Lewis: We are not allowed to ask questions on the Treasurer's so-called facts whether he introduces them during question period or while waiting for His Honour.

Mr. Singer: The member said the other day the Treasurer is as arrogant as the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) but not as able.

Mr. Lewis: No, that's wrong! He's more able than that member and more arrogant!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before you call the orders of the day, I would inform the House that the Lieutenant Governor is waiting to give royal assent to certain bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon. W. Ross MacDonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 3, The Ministry of Government Services Act, 1973.

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill 5, An Act to amend the Crown Witnesses Act.

Bill 6, An Act to amend the Administration of Justice Act.

Bill 7, An Act to amend the Limited Partnership Act.

Bill 8, An Act to amend the Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill 9, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Bureau Act.

Bill 10, An Act to amend the Collection Agencies Act.

Bill 14, An Act to amend the Proceedings Against the Crown Act.

Bill 15, An Act to amend the Securities Act.

Bill 16, An Act to amend the Certification of Titles Act.

Bill 17, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act.

Bill 66, An Act to amend the Forest Fires Prevention Act.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, it's noteworthy that there are four members on the government side of the House and about 10 on the rump side.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): What's that about the government rump?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: This is a real compliment to me; I appreciate the large turnout.

I would like to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, in continuing my remarks, that we are very proud to have the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) on our front bench. Her record of service to the people of Toronto, I think, will be a leading factor in our taking over the government two years hence. And in Huron we had a very fantastic victory, because if there ever was a safe seat in the Province of Ontario it had to be the stronghold of Mr. MacNaughton. I think his great victory there speaks very highly of our member.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Thank you.

Mr. Sargent: You're very welcome.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have been trying to get the logbooks of the Davis air force for some time and we are going to go as far as a court order, if necessary, to get them.

Now I have an aircraft of sorts and I've been seeing this operation for years at the Island Airport, as I have mentioned before, where the big black limousines drive up there in the late afternoon on Friday—

An hon. member: After closing hours.

Mr. Sargent: —and they load cases of booze and all the other refreshments into the aircraft. They may be taking medicine to the Indians, but I don't believe that. We want to find out exactly what these junkets are for, where they are going and who they are carrying—all the honky-tonk people they are mixed up with now. We'd like to see just what goes on in these pleasure flights.

But in this regard I heard a pilot's story about the Davis air force that the hon members might be interested in. It closely parallels the position of the government, I believe, Mr. Speaker. On a flight to Cuba the pilot's voice came over the intercom. He said, "Ladies and gentlemen, I have two pieces of information for you. One of them is good and one of them is not so good; so I'll tell you the bad news first. The bad news is that we are lost; we don't know where we are. As I told you, there is good news too. The good news is that we have a 200-mph tailwind." This points out that the government doesn't know where it's going, and it's going there pretty fast.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I'm glad he directed our attention to the moral of the story.

Mr. Sargent: A headline in the Kitchener paper says, "Davis Pleads for Defeat of Unruly Eddie Sargent." You'll pardon me for bringing this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because I have nothing against the Premier (Mr. Davis) whatsoever, but he says that he wants to win Grey-Bruce the next time around. "I want to win it very much," the Premier says. The story goes on:

> The Liberal's action in the past has needled Mr. Davis as well as other Conservatives and it resulted in Mr. Sargent being ejected from the provincial House on several occasions.
>
> Thursday night 252 party faithfuls paid $25 a serving to dine with their leader in the first fund-raising effort for the next provincial vote.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Downtowner Inn?

Mr. Sargent: No, this is in the Legion. They didn't give any business there, eh?

The gathering heard their leader say that the provincial party will again support the federal Tories when another election comes. "Ontario didn't do so badly for the federal party in the last election," he said, "and I hope the election is not far off."

Again, coming back to the Grey-Bruce riding, Mr. Davis told his listeners there has been a tendency to do little until the election is called. He said, "I want to win this riding very much."

He said that again. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, in reply, is that I wouldn't say such a thing against him. Rather, I would say that I hope that he stays right on where he is until the next election, because he is the best thing that ever happend to the Liberal Party for the past 30 years. It is the best thing that ever happened, as long as he keeps doing just what he is doing right now.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Right.

Mr. Sargent: And we will laugh all the way to the government seats.

An hon. member: I'm sorry.

An hon. member: There are only two doctors over there now.

Mr. Sargent: Carrying on about this man—only two?—I'm glad to have the member for Oshawa here.

An hon. member: There are six of them in the House.

Mr. Sargent: Six of them in the House?

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): Thinking of the member for Grey-Bruce's health.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Thinking of the government's health too now.

Mr. MacDonald: Mental or physical?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the House for a remark I made the other night. I said about the amount of money that the Premier spends on his vote — $1,200,000 to run his office—that he increased it in one year by $680,000, and I said that it's more than all the other provincial premiers in Canada put together spent to run their offices. In fact, I said it was more than the Prime Minister of Canada spent running his office. There was great opposition to that remark from the government benches.

I checked with Ottawa and I find I'm wrong by $100,000. I find that the Prime Minister of Canada spends $1.4 million—we checked it out. The Premier spends about $1.25 million here. Included in the $1.4 million in the Ottawa deal is $33,000 for Mr. Diefenbaker. So, I was right on target when I said that this man has the audacity to ask us to give him about $4,000 per day for his ego.

Historians some day—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Diefenbaker?

Mr. Sargent: — I believe, will record—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Diefenbaker? I think the member is wrong there, isn't he?

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I don't think the $33,000 is for Diefenbaker.

Mr. Sargent: No, they have it in the vote for Mr. Diefenbaker. That's what it is in the vote for. I don't know what else.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Yes, $33,000 for Mr. Diefenbaker.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It is not for Mr. Diefenbaker.

An hon. member: He is a privy councillor.

Mr. Sargent: What I am trying to get across is that if the people of Ontario could see this exact scene right here today—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): They are beginning to see it.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): "The blue machine."

Mr. Sargent: "The big blue machine" is hiding its head.

Mr. B. Newman: They saw it on March 15.

Mr. Sargent: I don't know. Historians some day will be able to guess, but we will never know for sure, what the Premier has cost the Province of Ontario, what this man has cost the people of Ontario.

Mr. Bullbrook: In the field of education alone.

Mr. Sargent: That's right. Everything he has touched he has snafued.

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Tell us what he snafued.

Mr. Sargent: He has cost us untold millions of dollars in the field of education. He has cost us untold millions of dollars in regional government.

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Sargent: He played politics with issues like Spadina and Pickering. He spent $14 million of Toronto people's money to get three or four seats. He spends, as I mentioned, $1.2 million on his own office. I think I can sum it up in about four words, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He's got to go.

Mr. Sargent: Read the auditor's report. There are 130 pages of corruption, inefficiency and misappropriation.

An hon. member: Mismanagement of things.

Mr. Sargent: We are having our research people check the millions of dollars that this report shows it is costing the people of Ontario. This alone proves, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is a bust.

An hon. member: Good for you.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Wrong again.

Mr. Sargent: The art of persuasion can be stated in five words. Unfortunately, I'll need more than five words. I hope when I have finished that at least Hansard and the people of Ontario will be somewhat persuaded to share my view on this subject, but, Mr. Speaker, nobody is listening.

An hon. member: They agree with the member; they are now.

Mr. Sargent: Politics has been designed as a process of taking money from the rich to buy votes from the poor on the pretext of protecting each from the other. There are those who say—I will tell the member for Victoria-Haliburton—that with a big enough kitty, like he had the last time, properly spent, he could persuade the inmates of death row to vote for the reinstatement of the death penalty, if you have enough money.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Now something similar happened in Ontario last election, I have many friends in the government and in the opposition. I am not labelling the members opposite as perpetrators of this growing corruption, this cancerous, ongoing affair here. In fact, a lot of them are like the man who was riding a tiger; he couldn't steer it and he couldn't get off. They think that they are dribbling the ball but actually they are just watching it bounce.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Did the member write that?

Mr. Sargent: I try to write my own stuff; I don't have any tax like the members opposite have. But I must congratulate the member for Victoria-Haliburton; he made a very fine speech the other day and I congratulate him.

An hon. member: You're going to get him coming over here.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): The only way they'll shut him up is to put him in the cabinet.

An hon. member: He should be a parliamentary assistant. They passed him over for lesser talents.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, my point is that nobody is listening; we can't let the people of Ontario know what is going on.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): We're listening.

Mr. Sargent: I think many of the members opposite are ashamed of what their party is doing. Many of them who come in here have been in county council and city council, and ethics meant something. I am not naive enough to believe that those members buy this corruption that is going on in their party.

I ran a city for 12 years and I never took a raw nickel in my life; I took a bottle of whisky once, but I suggested to the fellow that he sit down at the mayor's desk and drink it with me. That's as far as I got on the take. I think those fellows opposite are the same type of guys, if they weren't mixed up with this corrupt crowd, because the establishment has taken over, as I will prove later on.

The other day I was in Chicago. I picked up the Chicago Tribune and found the following on its masthead. It says:

> The newspaper is an institution developed by modern civilization to present the news of the day, to foster commerce and industry, to inform and lead public opinion, and to furnish that check upon government

which no constitution has ever been able to provide.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, this check is needed more than ever in Ontario today. I would wish the press were here to hear what I have to say. The newspapers in Toronto are not doing their job.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I thought they did very well.

Mr. Sargent: The out-of-town press has courageous reporters and the newspapers carry their stories. I know what I am talking about in this field. The Vancouver Sun makes government its daily target. In the USA in every market we have crusading investigative reporting; governors and senators go to jail every month because of newspaper crusading.

Here in Toronto what happens? By accident the Globe and Mail gets a report from an employee that Fidinam was involved in hanky-panky with the government and it breaks a story. But there is no investigative reporting. The press in Toronto closes its eyes.

I would suggest to the House that we lack the gutsy journalism that will go after crooks in government as it does in England and in the States. Here we are what is now the largest city in Canada—bigger than Montreal—and we know there is organized crime, and we know the government is using laundered money, and the Star and the Globe and Mail are more concerned with making money.

Look at the Toronto Star today. It is running a ratio of advertising to news running about 75 to 25, or 80 to 20 per cent on some days—80 per cent advertising content, 20 per cent news. It's a shocking thing that we cannot press this crusading on behalf of the people of Ontario. This Toronto Star is the most lucrative money machine in America, and Beland Honderich is interested, it seems, in only two things: black ink on the financial statement at the end of the year—and one thing I will give him credit for—fighting for our national ownership of our country.

But what a tragedy for the people of Ontario the Telegram folded. Even though it was a Tory paper, at least we had another voice. I say thank God that the Sun is coming up—and I hope they will make more money.

But what about the reporters in the House? Their main job—most of them—is to try to hunt for a job as a parliamentary assistant to a minister; and so they don't want to antagonize any minister too much.

I think it is time they got up off their butts and did some investigative reporting—and take this book, this bible, showing millions of dollars of corruption and misappropriation, and do something about it.

Then what happens? We have 117 members in this House who are success stories in their own right; each one of them is a success story. What happens when the House folds? The press gallery runs down the hall as if they were chasing the ice cream machine man, and they find the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman). And that is all they do for news. There are 117 of us here who have opinions. What do they do up there? I think it is time we had a new look at the communications with the people of Ontario—and especially at the Toronto Star and the Globe and Mail in Toronto.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Star and the Globe and Mail are nothing but patsies for the Premier; nothing else but patsies.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: That is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Sargent: All right. I will say a lot of things that some members don't agree with; but I have the guts to say them and I think I am right.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): They say an empty wagon makes a lot of noise.

Mr. Sargent: Well, time will tell.

But remember this—whether you like the Republic of China or not—there is a Chinese proverb which says: A thief is a thief whether he steals a diamond or a cucumber. And to sell government contracts or raise money by them, by our law is a crime; and yet nothing happens.

If the House is interested, here is what McLuhan has to say about the whole subject:

> The Mafia is no more extra legal, or extra constitutional, than political parties and their machines. The hidden rim spin of information speeded up bypasses written legislation and restores the oral tradition in all transactions. [He quotes Shakespeare where he says:]
>
> "Caesar never did wrong without just cause." So the oral tradition easily penetrates the innumerable loopholes inherent in any written code. However, the gap between the old legislation and the new fixers creates a world of ever more rapid

> change, the natural results of pushing this process first, the reign of organized crime; and then comes the retrieval of the ancient cliche of common or oral law. [He finalizes by saying:] Where there is no remedy, there is no crime.

And that is the Premier's situation today: "Where there is no remedy, there is no crime."

Now taking this Provincial Auditor's report, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it is an indictment of dereliction of duty, management, corruption, misappropriation of funds.

If the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) is responsible for this mess, why should he not make a full-scale report to the people of Ontario as to why he should not resign his seat? He was in charge of this department; he was the public Treasurer—and we have this fantastic loss of money to our people. How could one man have the audacity to sit in this House a few weeks after he resigned because of a conflict of interest.

Now we have the situation, Mr. Speaker, where Mr. Spence all of a sudden becomes a virgin. He discloses 130 pages of shocking news to the people of Ontario, but, in all charity, I don't think he wrote the report. I give the credit to Mr. Groom, the new auditor. I commend him for this fine effort. If this is a yardstick of what is going to happen in this audit department in the future I'm very happy about it.

But I will say this, it's a shocking thing that for the past 30 years this kind of being charitable—what can I call it?—when we have millions and millions of dollars being lost, mishandled, misappropriated by the government. What has happened in the past 30 years if there's $50 million lost here?

Mr. Deacon: On just one item.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, it's $50 million on one item. But if there's $100 million, or whatever it is, you multiply it by 30 years. What has happened to the people's money for the past 30 years?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Tell us who got the $50 million.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon me?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Tell us who got the $50 million.

Mr. Sargent: Well, if the member will look around he'll see one area where there's $15 million from the federal government which should have been used and wasn't. But that doesn't matter. The point I'm trying to make is, we're supposed to have faith in this front bench here, as the people who can run our affairs properly, but we realize this, that in politics the whole game is who will have control of the contracts to give to their friends. That's what the members opposite insist on having to protect the establishment.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Is this the member's speech toward a bid for the leadership?

Mr. Bullbrook: It's just what the people of Ontario are asking about, that's what the speech is about.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): If they want to hear a leadership speech I'll chat.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, we know what it costs for a member of the opposition to be elected. We have to mortgage our homes, borrow money from the bank—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): What about the Downtowner?

Mr. Sargent: Even the NDP fellows don't have any. Each one of the Tories, when he runs, gets a cheque for $25,000 and he can salt $15,000—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Listen, don't kid me! I've been talking to members who are better friends than the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman), who've told me this.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: All right, the Conservatives spent $50,000 in St. George. Is that right, or is that wrong?

Mr. J. M. Jessiman (Fort William): My cheque must have been lost in the mail.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I want to tell you what it costs to be a member of the opposition. The people who serve here are the NDP. We are true democrats.

Mr. Good: That's right.

Mr. Sargent: We believe in democratizing our society; that we don't have to be beholden to the establishment like those fellows over there.

Mr. W. Hodgson: That's a good word.

Mr. Good: Want to take over the mortgage on my house?

Mr. Sargent: So they must give us marks for that—that we put our money where our mouth is.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): In that case the member has a lot of money!

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I guess he's right there. I asked for that one.

I would like to ask the Premier, what kind of a deal was made with the brewers—the liquor corporations—when he allowed them to increase their prices—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Ask the minister. He's here.

Mr. Sargent: —just after the election? No, he wasn't the minister then. How much money did they put into the Tory pot before the election? Did the minister know, were the liquor companies in trouble? Were the beer companies in trouble financially? I didn't know that. But see, Bell said they were in trouble financially so we had a rate increase inquiry. Did we have an inquiry to see if we could raise the liquor prices? Does the minister know that?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): I don't know.

Mr. Sargent: No, I don't think so. I think we had an under-the-table deal that we would say—just after the election—we'll increase the rates. Now, how much money the Tories got I don't know, but it would be interesting to find out.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I know the breweries and distilleries got about $19 million.

Mr. Jessiman: That was the equalization payment for the north to the south.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member for Thunder Bay uses the same mathematics as the member for Owen Sound.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it was pretty healthy. I think of all that harping over there. If they'd like to hear what I think of their harping they can listen to a Russian fable for a minute. It's interesting to see the parallel between those fellows gloating and harping all the time. I think I can best make my point by telling this old Russian fable.

A small bird lay freezing to death on a country road in Russia. A peasant came along and saw the dying bird, and thought to himself, "If only I had something, anything, just to wrap this bird in, I might save its life, for surely it's going to freeze to death." But unfortunately he had nothing to wrap the bird in.

He caught sight of some cow droppings nearby and he thought in desperation, "Perhaps if I wrap the bird in that it'll warm it enough to save its life." He picked up the bird and wrapped it in the cow dung and laid it gently on the ground and went on his way.

After a while, the dung began to work and the bird started to come to life. The bird felt so overjoyed at feeling warmth again it attempted to sing but all it could emit in its weakened condition was some low pitiful tones.

Just then another peasant came along and he heard the bird's attempt at song and he thought, "Well, poor bird, it's strangling in that cow dung." He picked it up and he moved the dung and laid the bird back on the ground and went on his way. Shorty after, the bird died of the cold.

Now there are three morals to this fable. The first one is it isn't necessarily one's enemies who put one in it. The second one is it isn't necessarily one's friends who get one out of it. And the third moral is when one is in it up to here, for God's sake don't sing!

Mr. Dymond: We use that stuff to make the grass grow.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the headline of the story in the Toronto Star, if I can find it here, is "The Horrors of Housing in Toronto"—no, "Horror Stories about Housing Needs in Toronto," April 5.

We've been watching the minister trying to cope with this very complex department over the years; I've been the critic many times. I'm amazed at the fact that the government still keeps him on the job. He's always quoting statistics. "Statistics," said Mark Twain, "are like ladies of the night—once you get them down, you can do anything with them." This minister, even when he gets them down, still can't do anything with them. I'm talking about the figures here.

We have a case here; in an issue of the Globe and Mail, Friday, March 23, is a story about a chap here in Toronto.

Mr. Jessiman: Doesn't the member ever read the Star?

Mr. Sargent: He bought a home on a 30-year, $30,000 mortgage at 10 per cent interest. His total payment, covering the whole thing, is $354 per month, and over the 30

years he will have paid $131,000 for a $30,000 mortgage. The point I'm trying to make is this: That if the man had the $30,000 to start with he would have saved $100,000. This is what is wrong with this government. It has no concern for people.

Mr. Bullbrook: Just for the banks, the insurance companies and the trust companies. It's got lots of concern for them.

Mr. Sargent: So true.

Mr. Stokes: It's consistent, too!

Mr. Sargent: There's a lot in what the member for Thunder Bay says, but we're going to change that.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): The member for Grey-Bruce should keep on dreaming.

Mr. Sargent: I am involved in some land I have; I own it personally. I am talking about doing a project for low-cost housing and this project is called Quadrex.

We have a 500-home development in Hull with which I tried to get the minister's attention. I presented it to the new Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), but he has done nothing about it.

In effect, we have houses down there selling for $11,000. These are three-bedroom homes selling for $11,000 and $13,000. I'm sorry. The $11,000 home is a two-bedroom one and the $13,000 is a three-bedroom home. The technique they use is steel and concrete for building a Quadrex housing unit. I've been down to see them and they're simply a lovely development.

I'm going to put a development of about 70 of those in Owen Sound because I see the need to give people housing which they can afford.

Mr. Rhodes: Is that a philanthropic move on the part of the member or is he going to make money?

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Mr. Rhodes: Is that philanthropy or is the member going to make money?

Mr. Sargent: I believe in the free enterprise system as the member for Sault Ste. Marie does. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot about the Niagara Escarpment.

Mr. Stokes: He believes in ripoffs, but just little ones.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): In partnership with Shouldice.

Mr. Sargent: The Ontario government, according to the Speech from the Throne, is not telling us very much about this development. The Speech from the Throne announced that legislation concerning land use and control will be introduced and did so in the usual grandiose terms. "The preservation of our physical resources is one of the most urgent requirements facing all governments today," it goes on to say.

We have watched this development up our way, in the Bruce county area, and we have been told they are going to acquire 93,000 acres in my riding. A couple of years ago a local citizen bought a tract of land and he sold it to an American for $35,000. A few months later this department bought the land from the American for $350,000.

We have a situation there, Mr. Speaker, wherein the warden of the county has been barred from meetings with the officials. At another meeting, two reeves and one deputy reeve, members of the press and members of the public were excluded by this force from the government; and when they tried to bar me and the press, I said to try to stop us! So we barged in and we had this meeting.

But it is a long, sad story. I can go on two or three pages and tell members of the complete lack of continuity and follow-through, but I will finalize the last page. It says:

> On April 6, 1972, McKeough confidently boasted that he foresaw no difficulties with members of the board in terms of land acquisition, that all was going according to schedule.

We can't get any planning items approved. The whole peninsula is in limbo. No one can undertake any development of the land because the government plans to acquire 90,000 acres. I say it is one hell of a mess. The Bruce Peninsula is in limbo because no one there knows what is going one.

Repeatedly I have asked—

Mr. Leluk: They need a new member.

Mr. Sargent: Well the member should try that some time. I would like to run against him some time!

This member—I get them all mixed up, Bert Lawrence is his name—I asked him repeated times. And he said: "I don't know, you will have to ask Leo." And Leo can't give answers, because Bert has got to ask somebody else. So it's a big shambles of responsibility; and it is hard to believe it can happen in 1972.

Mr. Laughren: We would like to ask Bill, but he speaks only to God.

Mr. Sargent: That's right. When you meet him in the hall in the morning and you say "Good morning," he says "Thank you."

Today the Treasurer (Mr. White) was saying in the House that the member for York-Forest Hill approached him on his approach to regional government. I just thought; he's appointed another series of committees, a couple more; municipal liaison committee—we are the most 'committeeing" country in the whole world. We must have hundreds, or 200 or 300 committees around here costing us maybe $50 million a year. No one seems to know; we have committees coming out your ears.

I think of the time the grand old man of General Motors, Charles Kettering, was working in his lab one day in 1927 and someone rushed in and said: "Charlie Lindbergh has just flown the Atlantic alone." And Kettering said: "Hell that's nothing, let him fly it with a committee!"

I think that's about what happens in this place.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's have a look at the ethics of this blooded group we have here.

Let's start with the member for Chatham-Kent. He was caught in a land deal, so he resigned because of alleged conflict of interest. I don't know how you can measure, but it goes back further than that. I'll complement that by saying that he resigned to keep the lid on. How do the members like that one? Yes, there is a lot more to it than ever came to the surface and that would be coming to the surface if anyone wanted to press it.

And what happened in the London subdivision mess down there? When it takes anyone in this province a good eight months, a year or two years to get a subdivision plan approved from the raw plan to the final, what happened in London? The president of the Conservative association boasts to his friends, "I can do it for you in 30 days." How do the members like that one?

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): The member should hire him.

Mr. Sargent: We can't because we haven't got his connections with the government. He owns the government.

Mr. Laughren: It is like getting a liquor licence.

Mr. Good: In his hip pocket.

Mr. Sargent: And now we have this minister, who resigned in very much disfavour, back in his seat and second in command, I understand, I don't know. But what a charade; what a mess.

During his term of office he was the golden boy. He cost us hundreds of millions of dollars in regional government. And look at the mess in this book as provincial Treasurer. I can tell the House he was party to loading booze on the aircraft down at the island airport—numerous time I saw this—and yet they refused, they arrogantly said to me, "You cannot see our logbooks." What kind of a group is this that allows this to happen? It is amazing how they can.

We have the Attorney General (Mr. Bales). He was caught in a land deal. He offered to give the money back to charity.

Mrs. Campbell: What charity?

Mr. Sargent: What would have happened if he hadn't been caught? Wouldn't he be in an awful spot—he couldn't give it to charity. Wouldn't that be terrible? But luckily he was caught and he can give it to charity.

Mrs. Campbell: What charity?

Mr. Sargent: I don't know. He'd have to keep the money; that would be awful. He was at a meeting the other night and someone asked him—this is how much this man consumed—what he thought of the Indianapolis 500. He said, "I think they're all guilty."

Mr. Rhodes: That is 1949 vintage.

Mr. Leluk: That is an old joke.

Mr. Sargent: He's an old guy.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) thought, "I might as well get on the merry-go-round too." He said, "I'll pave my barnyard." He gets $3,000 to pave his barnyard. He might as well.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: How many thousand?

Mr. Sargent: Three thousand. Does the member want more than that?

An hon. member: What's important? Does the member mean if it was only $1,000 he would be less guilty? Is that it?

An hon. member: He made the rules.

Mr. Villeneuve: That is all he was entitled to.

Mr. Stokes: And it was meted out on the basis of need.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Grey-Bruce has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: We'll get to you too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stokes: Kind of hurts, eh? How much did you get?

Mr. Sargent: Now you take the Cuban ambassador, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence). He thought it would be nice to take a trip in a plane. He didn't like the treatment he got in the House. You guys weren't very nice to him.

Mr. Good: You are lucky you have your own plane, John.

Mr. Sargent: Now to Charles MacNaughton. He's out of here now. He didn't get caught. He retired a wealthy man. I can tell the House there will no tag days for Charlie MacNaughton. We'll leave that one there.

Next, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman). We are getting down the line here. He was removed from his cabinet post on the liquor board because of conflict of interest. The members opposite didn't know that. They've jockeyed him around, but he is still in operation.

Mr. Keith Brown was going to be a cabinet minister. He has a sweet land deal in Peterborough. He didn't get caught, though. It elected one of the NDP members one time.

Then we had the $1 million furniture and desk deal last year, that "no tender" deal. That was all right; there was nothing wrong with that. There's also the Melchers case that the member for York South keeps bringing up, about a bagman charging $10,000 to get on the shelves. We've had the Bramalea scandals. And we've had the Talisman case, where they sold a liquor licence to Labatt's —and they're still doing it, I understand—or still trying to.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Still selling it?

Mr. Sargent: Well, check the ongoing licence application of Holiday Inn for a hotel in my town. Who owns the land but the vice-president of Labbatt's.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The company owns it!

Mr. Sargent: We had hundreds of billions of dollars in contracts set up by Eddie Goodman, a director and legal counsel of Cadillac Development. We had the British Mortgage caper, where Leslie Frost and his friends in Victoria and Grey made several millions of dollars that I know about, because the Province of Ontario loaned him $3 million in credit to buy out British Mortgage. That was completely illegal—completely illegal.

We had millions of dollars in Ontario Development Corp. loans for friends of the government. We have Mr. Caswell, the Tory president in North Bay, who gets good big loans from the Ontario Development Corp. We had a law partner of John Robarts who received $155,000 for his work in the Atlantic case. These things are just accidents; they could happen to anybody!

We all know about the Fidinam case, and the $50,000 payoff there; and the Canada Square deal, whereby a good friend of the Premier received a 30-year deal with a potential profit of $6 million a year for putting up a building on Hydro land for $1 a year on a "no tender" deal.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: My hon. friend is really embarrassing his own members.

Mr. Bullbrook: What?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: He is embarrassing his own members.

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. member can't be serious. My colleague is telling the truth. Embarrassing us? The member has got to be kidding. Everything my colleague is talking about is absolutely true—$183 million in potential revenue on the Hydro deal; Gerry Moog is a friend of the Premier's. ETV and OISE—the same fellow. The Premier was the Miinster of Education when he made that deal.

Mr. Leluk: Who's making the speech?

Mr. Sargent: He's doing pretty well. Leave him alone. He's doing all right.

Mr. Bullbrook: Embarrass us! That'll be the day.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): They can't be embarrassed.

Mr. Sargent: Every time the members opposite get embarrassed, that's what they always say. The hon. member for Victoria-Hamilton is in a rut; he should change his tune.

Every Tory in the House is on a committee of some kind. They're getting free rides some place. It's the old "John Root"

style—everybody's milking the government in some way. And it kind of irks us; year after year the NDP and the Liberals sit here and the House is just loaded with Tories. We get pretty sick of their arrogance. Believe me, it's pretty tough to put up with all this arrogance. Pardon me for my arrogance, but I'd rather be this way than knuckle to them.

Mr. Laughren: The strengths are resolved.

Mr. Rhodes: If only the Liberals could strengthen their benches.

Mr. R. Gilbertson (Algoma): They did.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a great concern for the need to consider the small businessman in this province.

Mrs. Campbell: You'd better have; he's almost gone—along with the small farmer.

Mr. Sargent: When one considers all the areas where government is involved, these words of John Kenneth Galbraith come to mind:

> In North American society the big business bureaucracy and the public bureaucracy work in close alliance, and the goals of this alliance are essentially in conflict with the interests of most individual members of North American society.
>
> There is a system of several thousand giant corporations which dominates the economic life of the continent, and the bureaucracy of this corporate world in alliance with the public bureaucracy is increasing the focus of public power and is responsible for the inequities and irrationalities which are deeply inherent in the structure of the system in all developed countries.

Or to quote another Canadian, Eric Kierans: "Corporate managers and civil servants keep the same company." I repeat that, Mr. Speaker—underline this: the corporate managers and the civil servants keep the same company, think the same way and deal with other people's money.

Mrs. Campbell: And the assessors.

Mr. Sargent: That's right. They also have the same kind of utter confidence in themselves that they know what is good for the people.

We don't know here—but the civil servants know what is good for the people. However, they do not represent the vast majority of the people who make this economy go.

There is no distinction between the civil servant and the high level bureaucrat of the large corporation. Neither of them is making these decisions for our benefit; and neither of them is handling his own money.

The small businessman has enough problems with the labour market, rising costs, the squeeze on profit margins and the fierce competition. Surely governments need not make it worse.

I always pay tribute to the member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), for every year he gets up and makes a speech for the small entrepreneur; and no one else on that side of the House goes to bat for the small businessman.

Mr. B. Newman: They don't listen to him.

Mr. Sargent: No, they don't even listen to the member for Eglinton; and he's an average small businessman. What is wrong with the government? Don't they realize that, I guess, 65 per cent of our revenue comes from small businessmen?

Mr. Gilbertson: I'm for them.

Mr. Sargent: I know the member for Algoma. I'll buy those two gallons of syrup right after work.

An hon. member: Let's face it. He's trying to be big overnight.

Mr. B. Newman: Make sure it's not 52 per cent water, now.

An hon. member: Is the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations checking on that?

An hon. member: Has he got a vendor's licence?

Mr. Haggerty: I think he and the member for High Park have got a vendor's licence.

Mr. Good: At the member's prices this year, he wants to get big overnight though.

Mr. B. Newman: Get a quart of that.

Mr. Rhodes: The member for Grey-Bruce should have numbered the pages first.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I've got the wheels down now. I'll be coming in soon here.

We've been watching the final stages of the US takeover here. And we have been loaning them the money to do it; making large loans to US corporations who are in the excess profit brackets.

Time doesn't permit me, Mr. Speaker, to develop these areas of major concern; but this is by far the most important issue in Canada today, especially in Ontario.

I say to the hon. gentlemen that free enterprise left alone without government regulation can destroy itself. It can dominate the rest of the wheel of life—and that's what's happening in our surrender of control of our economic life.

This is why our free enterprise system needs tough government guidelines from the top, which we are not getting from Ottawa or Queen's Park. This latest legislation is not effective; it's closing the barn door too late. It's toothless. We have no real meaning in this legislation.

A couple of weeks ago there was a lead story in the Financial Post about a small firm in Cayuga, down west here a bit. The firm is in the metal casting operations and its accounts receivable were not building up; there was not sufficient working capital to keep going. The owners went around town and had the doctors and lawyers, merchants and friends sign his notes at the bank. He had 35 or 40 employees.

Finally the bank closed in on him and wouldn't honour his cheques. So the man had this alternative: to go out of business, or to sell to a firm in Buffalo. The firm in Buffalo could go to Queen's Park, borrow the money on a forgivable loan, buy the man out and own the operation.

This is what I'm trying to say. We have been in bed with the big corporations for so long that we have lost sight of the fact that people count.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that all of us here who love our way of life read the new book called "The Fall and Rise of Jimmy Hoffa." This will shock members into action. Who really controls Canada?

I was talking to an architect a while ago and he said that in the next 10 years our population here will increase to three million people. He said, "Do you know that in the life of a 40-year mortgage, we've got to build another Canada?" I said, "What's wrong with the one we've got?" He said, "Nothing, but in 40 years we're not going to have 25 million people in Canada—we're going to have 50 million! We will have to have twice as much of everything that we have now, twice as many new homes and twice as many new cars." But we have to protect our economy, our way of life.

In the past week or so I was travelling to North Carolina. I had a drink with a top US executive. He was a vice-president of marketing for the American Tobacco Co. After talking about the book—he was also reading the book about Hoffa—he said he knew Hoffa personally. He said he heard Hoffa say, "With a flick of the switch I can turn America off. I can paralyse America." He said he could do the same thing in Canada. This man who tells the President what to do is the real thing we have to worry about here in the years to come.

Gentlemen, I really believe that we have a great future here. I'm sorry the things I have said have not been in agreement with the other side but we're all working for the same things. We have our own acres of diamonds and everyone in this room is a builder or he wouldn't be here. I hope that we will become active participants in the public drama of our country, in view of the fact that we do care about ethics, about corruption in government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, This is the second occasion I've had to engage in the debate from the Throne. I know a little more now than I did the last time, a year ago, and I know a little more about the role of the Speaker.

At that time I just assumed that Mr. Speaker ruled with a great sense of judgment and fairness and, really, my attitude hasn't changed much in that sense. I do detect though, Mr. Speaker, that a little bit of influence is being exerted on you; I suspect it's in a subliminal fashion, from your right whenever the supplementaries get a little hot. There seems to be a fairly high correlation between the number of supplementary questions asked of the ministers of the government.

Also, I hope that you are able to receive medical attention for your left ear in the next year. Either that or we should install a sound meter that records the levels of sound in the chamber when the "ayes" and the "nays" are called out. There have been several occasions when I was sure there was a congenital defect somewhere, Mr. Speaker.

I realize it is a very difficult problem. You have certain encumbrances about your neck from certain members of the Legislature, both on your left and on your right. I know that makes your problem very difficult.

I would like to welcome to the Legislature the new members who were elected in the last month or so. I've been disappointed al-

ready. I don't mean to be uncharitable at this time, and maybe I'll change my mind as the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) starts to feel more at home in the Legislature. I hope that I have an ally in the member for St. George on one of the topics I'm going to talk about this afternoon. I can always hope.

In the past year the vaunted strength of the Conservative government really hasn't been very awe-inspiring to the opposition. Those of us who were elected in 1971 in particular find it remarkably easy to detect flaws in the administration of the province.

Now there are admittedly a few of the ministers who make our job easy. In other words, there are ministers who really don't need to be criticized by the opposition because the criticism would come anyway from the media, would come from perhaps the Auditor and from the public at large.

I'm thinking, for example, that the situation in the Ministry of Health has been so bad that, whether there was an opposition or not, there would have been widespread opposition or criticism of that ministry in the past couple of years.

The rise and fall of that particular minister, the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter), has been really remarkable to see. It's been remarkable to see him go from his rather quixotic stance or activity of tilting at the windmills or at the status quo, to prostrating himself at the feet of the medical and dental professions.

That's been a rather tragic fall, I feel.

We could really dismiss that whole situation in the Ministry of Health as being a nightmare, except that there is too much at stake there. There's too much at stake in terms of the cost to the province, and in terms of delivery of health care to the province. I think that it means that since we cannot dismiss the nightmare that the minister must be dismissed from that ministry.

The Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. McNie) is another minister who is going to make criticism easy from this side of the House. I say going to, Mr. Speaker, because so far his pronouncements have been devoid of any kind of substance that would allow the opposition to sink its teeth into.

He's referred to by the Ontario Federation of Students, as you may know Mr. Speaker, as the "benevolent marshmallow"; and I'll leave it up to you to determine whether that's an apt description of the minister or not.

He's clearly, I believe, in the hands of his ministry and management board; and perhaps even the Deputy Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): There are a lot of malignant marshmallows over there too!

Mr. Laughren: Yes, there certainly are.

But the new Minister of Colleges and Universities, I think, has set a new level of dialogue at the post secondary level. You probably remember, Mr. Speaker, the fellow who is the present Treasurer (Mr. White) and his slogan of "more scholars per dollar." Well there is something about that ministry that lends itself, I guess, to these outbursts of great prose, because the new minister is putting it together a little differently.

This is how he says it when he's talking to the Sarnia Construction Association's 6th Annual Apprenticeship Graduates Dinner on March 9 in Sarnia. He's summing up his remarks for the evening when he says this, and sort of telling people what it is like to be a Minister of Colleges and Universities. He says:

> That's the way it goes in this ministry. Steamfitters and plumbers tonight, opera and ballet tomorrow; with library conferences and student sit-ins the day after.

That the Minister of Colleges and Universities—but I don't want to dwell on him very long, because I have a large assortment of speeches from the minister, I'm sorting them out and will deal with them in more detail during the estimates of that particular ministry.

Mr. Lawlor: Most of the speeches are like soap operas, aren't they?

Mr. Stokes: That was speech No. 18B that he was quoting from there.

Mr. Lawlor: That was the macaroni-and-cheese speech!

Mr. Laughren: The members have prompted me to read them another of his quotes. This, once again, is to the same group, the Construction Association's Apprenticeship Graduates Dinner, and he says:

> You know, even in North America we may have become overly attached to our institutions. We point with pride to a multi-million dollar complex for education or commerce. Cities vie with each other

for the honour of having the tallest building and these structures house companies and agencies and government ministries, each with their own little or large areas of responsibility.

So far it's not bad, Mr. Speaker. It's a real in-depth analysis.

We go to school. We go to the office. We go to the factory. All are institutions.

The only thing that is missing from the story so far is Dick and Jane.

There are some who advocate an end to institutions. Well I don't. Among other things I wouldn't want to be blamed for putting the construction industry out of business.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that ever fatuous!

Mr. Laughren: That's just a sample, Mr. Speaker. We really must deal with the Minister of Colleges and Universities in much much more detail during the estimates.

Mr. Stokes: Does the member mean he is going to build more institutions?

Mr. Laughren: Completely fatuous.

Mr. McIlveen: I think the member for Nickel Belt should get an Oscar for this performance.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, thank you. That's the parliamentary assistant to the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) speaking, in the front row of the Tories.

Another new minister, Mr. Speaker, who, I think, so far has had unusually good reviews from the critics, is the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Clement). It's good to see him here; it's good to see him here.

An hon. member: Relations; Commercial Relations.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He's the only minister who is here.

Mr. Stokes: No more affairs over there; they are all relations.

Mr. Laughren: I detect a Potter-like stance in the new minister—Potter-like, the way the Minister of Health was a few years ago. But I would caution the minister—

Mr. Lawlor: Aw, the member wouldn't wheel him Potter-like.

Mr. Laughren: I'd caution the minister lest he end up with the same fate as the Minister of Health.

I must say that I cannot be as generous as other critics in my assessment of the minister, particularly because of a situation which is occurring in the Sudbury basin for the last couple of years. In that particular situation, the minister is very much aware that a subdivision development there has caused a great deal of heartache for a lot of people.

In that subdivision in Chelmsford, people made downpayments and subsequent monthly payments to the mortgage holder, only to find that the downpayment was not being applied to the mortgage. Indeed, the transfer of land had not even been made from the mortgage holder to the would-be purchaser, although the mortgage holder had agreed that this would be done, and the real estate salesmen had promised it would be done and that the purchaser would not have to hire a lawyer of his own.

Then the next thing that the would-be purchaser knows is that he receives a notice from the bank that his rent will now be paid to the bank. Well, it's an incredible situation to have made a downpayment, and to have made subsequently what you thought were monthly mortgage payments, only to find out that you were paying rent all the time and that your downpayment was down the pipe.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Who engineered that?

Mr. Laughren: Well I'll come to that.

The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations at that time—I must say, not the present minister—and the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) were both made aware of the situation. The amount of time that elapsed between the time they were warned and the time that any action at all was taken is just deplorable. It allowed the developer—in this case Ross Shouldice—to wheel and deal, certainly not to the benefit of the homeowners, and one would only have to assume that it was to his benefit that he was allowed to wheel and deal as long as he was.

The legal entanglements in that situation became absolutely ludicrous in the month of March this year when individual homeowners were served with a summons naming them in a $272,800 suit.

Mr. Foulds: Shame!

Mr. Laughren: To make it even more ridiculous, co-defendants with those homeowners were Ross Shouldice and some of his

cronies. It is an absolutely ridiculous situation.

The whole story of that Shouldice subdivision in Chelmsford is one of land speculation, misrepresentation, fraud, usurious interest rates, substandard construction, contempt for the law and for people, and a fund-raising land speculator for the Conservative Party by the name of Ross A. Shouldice.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Outstanding Tory, eh?

Mr. Laughren: The Shouldice project itself has raised yet again the question of the integrity of the government and some of the people who are supporting its policies. It is just too much to ask us to believe that the political affiliations of Ross Shouldice had absolutely nothing to do with the time that elapsed between the time the government was made aware of the problems in that subdivision and the time that it took any action at all. To this date, Mr. Speaker, there has been no public inquiry announced into the affairs of that subdivision and no charges have been laid.

Mr. Stokes: Why?

Mr. Laughren: The real losers in this whole situation, Mr. Speaker, are not necessarily those people who put down the downpayment only to find that it didn't apply to the mortgage or they didn't have title to the land, although they are losers, too, of course. The real losers are the people in that subdivision who bought their homes there several years ago. They now have a substantial equity in that subdivision; they have made repairs on their homes and they have a stake in that subdivision.

Now how in the name of heaven do you expect those people to be able to sell their houses for any cause whatsoever, if they get transferred or if they want a larger home, or if they just want to move? Who is going to buy a home in that subdivision with the publicity that has surrounded it? And the publicity is the fault of the government, not the local members in the Sudbury district, because the only way we could get any action at all in that subdivision was by creating some sort of embarrassment for the ministers of the government.

There are at this time 50 empty houses in that subdivision, and it is inevitable that that subdivision will deteriorate unless something happens. The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) continues to ignore the situation entirely. He should have set a precedent by putting that entire subdivision under trusteeship and proceeded to rent or sell the homes in that whole subdivision once they became empty. He has refused to involve himself whatsoever.

He would have set a precedent, true, but what is wrong with that? The whole problem of the subdivision, Mr. Speaker, is one that the government really must realize requires a public inquiry; and quickly, too, not to allow it to drag out, because as time goes on the legal entanglements get worse.

If that subdivision was put under trusteeship so that people in the subdivision could come to the trustee, in this case Ontario Housing, with their legal problems, with problems they might encounter if they had to sell, Ontario Housing Corp. could attempt to rent the homes or to sell them if there were buyers for them.

So I think that the three ministers, at least in this situation—the previous and the present ministers because there has been sufficient time to lay charges—the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the Attorney General and the Minister of Revenue have really abdicated their responsibilities to the people in that subdivision. When you think of why they are abdicating their responsibility; when you think of the person on the other side—I am thinking now of the person who developed the subdivision and who pulled all the deals in there; and I search for words to describe that man. The words that best express it, without using language that would offend the members of the Legislature, is that—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Call him a parasite.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): There is no language to offend the members.

Mr. Laughren: Well, I'll go a little further than that. When you consider the number of people who have been hurt and the inaction of the government, and all for a two-bit, devious, scheming land speculator by the name of Shouldice, I can draw no other conclusion, Mr. Speaker, than that he has been protected and has been allowed time. I hope that it comes to an end very, very shortly.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I see the land holdings and the land speculation and deals that are carried on by the members of this government, as released to the press, I despair that we are ever going to clip the

wings of the land speculators in this province. I fear they are one of a kind.

Among some of the other deficiencies of the Throne Speech read by the Hon. Lieutenant Governor was the absence of any kind of commitment at all to improve the role of women in the Province of Ontario, in this the country's most industrialized province.

It is not because the government has not been made aware of the need for the reform of our laws. The Ontario Law Reform Commission in 1969 made some very specific recommendations, and they have all been completely ignored. Those recommendations dealt with family law. They would have improved, somewhat at least, our rather antiquated system of justice as it applies to women in marriage.

The Ontario Committee on the Status of Women submitted to the government in March of 1972 a brief of considerable substance, and urged that two very specific recommendations be implemented without delay. These were the two: One, the establishment of an implementation committee to deal with the relevant recommendations, some 60 in total, of the federal Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada.

The committee was to consist of civil servants, representatives of women's groups, trade unions, professional associations, and members of the general public. I would suggest that there be a strong contingent of elementary school teachers and guidance counsellors on such a committee as well. Of course, at least half of the members of that committee should be women.

The second recommendation of the Ontario committee was that a member of cabinet be assigned to co-ordinate the implementation of the report of the royal commission. I was most disappointed to note that the Speech from the Throne made no mention whatsoever of such a committee. One would have hoped that with two women members in the government—one of them in the cabinet by the way—such a committee would have been recommended or would have been implemented and the opposition would not have to be prodding the government into taking this first step toward justice for women in this province.

If the member who represents the riding of Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) is anything other than a token appointment to that cabinet, let her come forward and be counted by insisting that at least the recommendation of that committee be implemented.

This government creates select committees willy-nilly on such pressing sociological and ideological conflicts and problems as snowmobiles and land drainage, and ignores the injustices of our society toward half the population. It is inconceivable to me how the two women members of this government can continue to sit in this chamber while the government refuses to accept the fact that there is a problem or that there are injustices.

Mr. Deans: They are so embarrassed they are not here.

Mr. Laughren: The blame for the status quo, of course, lies not just with the government and not just with men in our society but with society at large in the way in which women have been delegated to inferior roles — not just now but for centuries. Surely if this government does not implement reforms the blame for the continuation of sex discrimination in the province will lie increasingly with it.

There is nothing to be gained by stalling. There is recognition that the present injustices are universal, and there is absolutely no justification for this government prolonging its present state of inertia. There is no question that women are playing an increasingly active and responsible role in society.

Mr. Lawlor: Look at the member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) over there. He is a male chauvinist.

Mr. Laughren: I hope the member for Lakeshore will let me know if he can find one who isn't.

There is no excuse for women, as members of the work force, not being entitled to, and receiving—I emphasize the words "and receiving", Mr. Speaker—the same rights as other working people. Yet such is not the case. Despite there being a women's bureau within the Ontario Ministry of Labour, discrimination continues and no charges are laid.

I emphasize the fact that they should receive the benefits because it is one thing to put in legislation that there shall not be discrimination but it is another thing to ensure that women in our society actually are not discriminated against. It is one thing to say, for example, that we must have equal wages for equal work but it is not happening because the government doesn't care.

The fundamental premises of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women are sound. They are not radical, not even for that group of—what is the right word?

Mr. Foulds: Inert male chauvinists.

Mr. Laughren: No, I was thinking of something much more reactionary than that.

Mr. Lawlor: Is there anything more reactionary?

Mr. Laughren: Yes there is; it is from the ice age though.

Mr. Foulds: Deep frozen male chauvinists?

Mr. Laughren: There were four basic premises of that royal commission:

1. Women should be free to make the choice as to whether or not to work in or outside their homes.

2. The mother and father in society are responsible for the care of children.

3. Problems related to pregnancy and childbirth place a special onus on society to assume more responsibility for dealing with these problems.

4. Society must be prepared to afford special consideration to women because of the need to catch up and erase the discriminatory practices and conditions of the past.

Those are the four premises of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women. One could categorize the problems of sex discrimination endlessly. There are probably three aspects of discrimination against women which are most obvious and those are the ones I will deal with—education; the place of work; and the care of children.

Education has, of course, played a major role in the stereotyping of women and their roles. That stereotype has been reinforced by the realities of post-secondary education and subsequent employment opportunities—or lack of them—when they graduate. It's understandable, of course, that with the traditional concept of women as domestic chattels they would consider themselves as either incapable or unworthy of higher education. As a result, their involvement in social or economic functions was a token one, and the cycle was complete—truly a self-fulfilling prophecy.

It's absolutely essential that in order to overcome the centuries of conditioning that our educational system be jolted out of its present lethargy. This is a difficult task. That bureaucratic bastion of empire builders is more dedicated to retaining the status quo than to the concept of equality in democracy. But jolted it must be.

Mr. Foulds: Right on!

Mr. Laughren: It is becoming clearer all the time that that jolt must come from outside the ministry itself, and outside the government. We can only hope that societal indignation will manifest itself in ever-more uncompromising demands by parents, by students and by teachers that sex discrimination be removed from our schools. This government, through the Ministry of Education, should adopt books, and only books that portray women in diversified roles in society.

Guidance counselling must assume a major responsibility for encouraging girls to continue their education in virtually any field, according to their interests and abilities. Career counselling must also provide girls with a greatly broadened horizon of job opportunities.

The physical education programmes in our elementary, and particularly our secondary schools, have been guilty of discrimination. Enormous sums of money are allocated to the boys' athletic programmes, such as football and other team sports, while the girls tumble on mats in the gymnasium. Does anyone believe for a minute that the large, expensive facilities such as football fields, swimming pools and gymnasiums would have been built for girls' programmes?

The girls are encouraged to develop one set of skills and the boys another. Naturally, the boys' sports lead to the reinforcement of stereotype sex roles again—hard-nosed, muscular and swift.

Surely the budgets of the girls versus the boys phys-ed programmes should be examined. The present programmes are not, in the long run, in the best interests of boys either, since football, for example, is hardly a life-long leisure activity that most men pursue.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Tell them what Norman Mailer said about men who play football.

Mr. Laughren: Yes; I don't think they're ready for it.

Mr. Lewis: No, I don't think they're ready for it either.

Mr. Laughren: Better to train both sexes in sports such as tennis, badminton and so forth—activities they may very well engage in throughout their adult years.

The provincial colleges of education and the teachers' colleges also have a responsibility to offer courses that examine sex stereotyping and provide suggestions on eliminat-

ing sex discrimination from the schools. Of course, the boards of education must cease their discriminatory policies as well, of promoting men to positions of responsibility, both in the schools and at the board level. Surely seeing virtually all the administrative positions filled by men has an adverse effect on the deliberations of a girl choosing a career.

Even the salaries of women and men elementary and secondary school teachers vary significantly. In Canada—I must exclude Ontario and Quebec here because the statistics were not available to Statistics Canada.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder why.

Mr. Laughren: I wonder why too.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder why Ontario's afraid to reveal those figures.

Mr. Laughren: The salaries of men elementary school teachers were 25.2 per cent higher than those of women. At the secondary level, men's salaries were 17.7 per cent higher. These are very significant figures since they are from a sector of our society that pays equally for equal qualifications.

This is very important, because of course it shows rather starkly, I think, that establishing equal pay legislation, which we have in this province, does not solve the problem entirely. Of course it helps, but it doesn't solve it.

Although Ontario has the highest participation rate in Canada for women in the work force, they are there as an inferior sector. This is at least partly caused by the smaller proportion of women who graduate from our post-secondary institutions.

According to Statistics Canada, 35 per cent of full-time enrolment in Canadian universities in 1970 was comprised of women. Their projection for 1980 to 1981 inidcated only a slight improvement, to 39 per cent. The picture at the graduate school level is even worse, with only 21 per cent of enrolment being female in 1968.

Even more dismaying is the fact that in 1928, 28 per cent of university graduate enrolment was female. In 40 years, this is a decline of seven per cent in graduate enrolment, despite the fact that girls generally perform at a higher academic level in our secondary schools.

At the doctoral level in Ontario only nine per cent of doctoral degrees awarded in 1970 were to women. Of 16 selected years between 1931 and 1970 inclusive, only 230 doctoral degrees were awarded to women out of a total of over 3,500 awarded. It should be clear that the problems at the post-secondary level are a result of earlier conditioning in the school system as well as at home and in society at large.

For this reason, it may very well be necessary to offer special assistance to women in the form of scholarships, grants or bursaries in order to encourage them to continue their education. In particular, once again as a temporary measure, there should be special incentives for women to enter a more diversified range of professions, such as law, medicine and engineering. Until the faculties of our colleges and universities are more fairly staffed by women, it will be difficult for female students to envisage post-secondary teaching as a career. This could be somewhat alleviated by special incentives for women to continue into graduate programmes.

While the problems of sex discrimination in our educational system are serious, they are even more shameful in the whole field of employment. Despite ever-increasing participation in the labour force, women continue to be discriminated against in almost every conceivable fashion and occupation.

I really must express my amazement, Mr. Speaker, at how docile women's organizations have been. There are those in our society who regard the leading spokesmen of the women's organizations as radical. But when one examines the facts, even superficially as I have done, the reaction is one—must be one—of disbelief. Perhaps docile is not a good word to use.

Mr. Lawlor: The government's not only anti-human, it's even anti-feminine.

Mr. Laughen: That's right!

But the word docile implies apathy perhaps, and I don't think that should apply to the women's organizations.

In the light of the seriousness of the discrimination in the area of employment, I must say that the acceptance of the status quo could only be the result of very effective conditioning on the part of our entire society of both men and women. This government can, of course, shrug its collective shoulders, point to its women's bureau in the Ministry of Labour and claim it's aware of the problem.

If the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) is looking to the women's bureau to rectify the problem, he'd better look again and he'd better look elsewhere. The bureau will not

solve the problem. I suppose they'll bring into line a few of the sweat shops of the province and eliminate some flagrant abuses—all without prosecutions. I really wonder if they think that prosecutions are unladylike.

The enormity of the problem is such that no one ministry can solve it. A co-ordinated, concerted drive must be launched to change the attitudes as well as the hiring and promotional practices of employers. But first to be changed must be the attitudes of hiring and promotional practices of the government itself.

In the cabinet of this government sits the Minister of Labour, the same minister who points with pride to the women's bureau. The Minister of Labour is pointing to a token gesture only and his deeds match not his words. The minister's labour-management arbitration commission list, at the latest figure I was able to get, has 41 approved potential board chairmen, and not one woman. He claims he cannot find one. The Ontario Labour Relations Board has 14 members, and not one woman.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Labour has plenty of company in his discriminatory ways. On 54 selected boards, commissions, committees, councils and so forth appointed by the government, there are 917 members, of which 46 are women. Only two of those are chair-persons.

It is inconceivable to me that in this day, with the winds of change whistling past their ears, the various ministers would not be more sensitive to the injustices they perpetuate.

Mr. Foulds: The ministers are completely insensitive about all things.

Mr. Laughren: Let me give you a few examples of sex discrimination in the appointment of boards and commissions to show you just how ludicrous the situation is. Perhaps the makeup of some of these boards or commissions has changed in the last couple of months, but when I obtained these figures they were up to date.

The minister's advisory committee on rehabilitation, 11 members, no women; the minister's advisory committee on geriatrics, nine members, no women; Teachers' Superannuation Commission, 10 members, two women; the minister's advisory committee on child welfare, 13 members, four women; the St. Clair Parkway Commission, 10 members, no women; the Ontario Labour Relations Board, 14 men, no women; the committee on university affairs, 13 members, three women; the Ontario Research Foundation, 25 members, no women; Ontario Housing and Ontario Student Housing, 19 members, one woman—I wonder if she feels like a token; Ontario Economic Council, 19 members, two women; the Niagara Parks Commission, 10 members, no women; the Ontario Council of Regents, 15 members, one woman; the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, 13 members, one woman, the board of governors of OISE, 34 members, three women; the Ontario Provincial Library Council, 22 members, four women; the board of governors of Ryerson, 11 members, one woman; the Assessment Review Board, 403 members, eight women; the committee on assessment and taxation of special purpose properties, 19 members, no women; the Ontario Municipal Board, 16 members, no women; the advisory committee on Algonquin Park, 16 members, no women; the Quetico Park advisory committee, 12 members, no women; the pesticide advisory committee, 12 members and no women at all.

Mr. Foulds: What about the ONR?

An hon. member: No women.

Mr. Stokes: Would the minister like a woman on the board?

Mr. Laughren: These are selected organizations. Mr. Speaker, but of course the total of 46 out of 917 indicates the kind of discrimination that's going on. In some cases it is really astounding.

Let me select a few of those, Mr. Speaker. Look at the advisory committee on child welfare; four out of 12 members are women. The Ontario Labour Relations Board, although 38 per cent of the work force in this province is female, there are no women out of 14 members. The Ontario housing committee has but one woman out of 19, even though I am sure that a substantial, if not the majority of the tenants of Ontario Housing are women; one member out of 15. The Ontario Council of Regents has one woman out of 15, and it is a good indication of just how weighted the colleges of applied arts and technology are in their discriminatory practices against women.

Mr. Stokes: Right on!

Mr. Lewis: Did the member mention the arbitration panel?

Mr. Laughren: Yes. But I suspect that the colleges of applied arts and technology are even worse. If we were ever to include the boards of governors of every college of applied arts and technology in this province it would just tend to substantiate what I am

saying; it would probably weight it even more and be evident of being even worse than these figures show.

Mr. Foulds: Absolutely!

Mr. Laughren: The OECA, the Educational Communications Authority; one woman out of 13 is just incredible, considering the nature of ETV and the fact that when ETV is beamed into the homes I expect the majority of viewers will be women.

Actually, the organizations concerned with education reveal a great deal about why reform is difficult and excruciatingly slow. If the boards of governors of all our educational institutions were taken into consideration, I think it would just further document what I am trying to say.

Also, the absence of women on parks and environmental committees is most regrettable. Those same men who presided over the deterioration of our environment are now being given the job of protecting that same environment.

I don't think I need to go on any more. The most revealing statistic, I think, is 46 women out of the 917 government appointments on boards and committees. It is really shocking. There is no way that the government can justify that.

Mr. Foulds: Absolutely unforgivable!

Mr. Laughren: I would really hope that the member for Scarborough East would come forward on this matter. I mentioned earlier in my remarks that I was disappointed that the member for St. George did not talk about this in her remarks in the Throne debate. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, we need help if we are going to rectify the situation. The government is obviously not going to do it.

The civil service itself it a beautiful example of discrimination. There are approximately 23,000 out of 63,000 civil servants who are female. It is hard to nail down exactly what is management in the civil service, but the best estimate I could come up with in talking to a number of people is that out of those 23,000 less than 50 have achieved any top managerial positions. It may be considerably less than that.

Of course, the Ontario government doesn't stand condemned alone. Society at large does. But it is up to the Ontario government to rectify that.

Mr. Foulds: They should show some leadership.

Mr. Laughren: The participation rate of women in Ontario has risen steadily to the present level of over 38 per cent. But, by and large, women perform the menial jobs, the low paying jobs, the temporary jobs. They are the first to be fired and the last to be hired. Even when women do the same jobs as men they are paid considerably less, despite legislation to the contrary.

There are two very serious problems to which this government must address itself. First, it must at least attempt to solve the problem of job classification, because job classification now allows employers to classify jobs differently and pay accordingly. The criterion should not be job classification but the actual worth of the labour being performed.

Secondly, there are the promotional practices through which employers promote men first and faster. With 35 per cent of the work force in Canada as a whole, and 38 per cent in Ontario, why is the percentage of women in managerial positions less than 4 per cent? If work of equal value is being performed by women, then rates of pay for women should be raised to the level of men doing perhaps different work, but work of equal value. Employers must be prevented from using different job descriptions to ease out of their responsibility as outlined in the Ontario Equal Employment Opportunities Act.

According to Sylvia Gelber, director of the women's bureau in the federal Department of Labour, between 1961 and 1971 the percentage of women in the labour force rose from 27.6 per cent to 33.3 per cent in Canada, but during this time the percentage of all women in managerial position rose by only 0.2 per cent from 3.7 to 3.9 per cent. This indicates that while women are joining the labour force in substantial numbers they are just not being promoted.

It is possible in industry after industry, and in occupation after occupation, to document the differences in wages between women and men who do the same jobs. To list just a few examples—and these examples were provided by the Canada Department of Labour. These average wage rates per hour: In the tobacco industry, cigarette-making machine operator, average wage for women $4.02, for men $4.24; finisher in leather tannery business, $2.44 for women, $2.70 for men; synthetic textiles, spinner, $2.22 for women, $3.22 for men; a thrower, $2.11 for women, $2.91 for men; in the men's clothing business, a tailor, $2 for women,

$2.84 for men; a bundler in the paper box and bag industry, $1.99 for women, $2.60 for men; in wire and wire products, an assembler, $2.06 for women, $2.71 for men; motor vehicle parts and accessories, an assembler, $2.45 for women, $3.82 for men; an inspector $2.72 for women and $3.84 for men.

I could go on and on, but I think that suffices.

In managerial occupations the percentage differences in men's over women's earnings for the latest year for which statistics were available is 135.4 per cent greater for men. More specifically, in professional and technical occupations the salaries for men were 87.1 per cent greater; in clerical occupations, 53.1 per cent greater for men; in sales occupations, 166 per cent greater for men; and in services and recreational occupations, 120.8 per cent greater.

And these figures, I remind you, are the differences in average earnings in those occupations.

In our schools all across this country, an area that should be the least susceptible to sex discrimination, the average salary differences reveal who gets promoted. Except for Ontario and Quebec, men earn 17.7 per cent more. And I say except for Ontario and Quebec only because those figures once again were not available; only for those two provinces were figures not available. But that doesn't mean that we have any reason to believe that the figures were any different for this province.

And it doesn't matter how much education women have either. For those with no education whatsoever, men earn 84.5 per cent more than women who also have no education. For those with a university degree, men earn 84.4 per cent more.

So while education increases a woman's income, naturally, it does not lower the difference between the two. With no education at all men earn 84.5 per cent more and with university degrees 84.4 per cent more. So education is not the answer as long as this discrimination is practised.

And regionally, discrimination plays no favourites either; and I'll document a few figures derived from survey returns in Toronto. This was in 1971—this is even with the job classifications.

Junior accounting clerk, women $94 a week, men $111 a week; senior accounting clerk, women $117 a week, men $151 a week; senior bookkeeper, women $124 a week, men $162; junior clerk, $85 for women, $94 for men; intermediate clerk, $105 a week for women, $118 for men; senior clerk, $122 a week for women, $153 for men; cost accounting clerk, $104 a week for women, $137 a week for men; material record clerk, $94 a week for women, $133 for men; order clerk, $107 a week for women, $135 a week for men; and tabulating machine operator, $108 for women, $132 for men.

Go get them women's bureau. They are all there to be had. Let's have at least one prosecution this year. Let's set the new benchmark.

The most surprising difference in salaries between men and women occur among the faculties of our colleges and universities. In 1970-1971 men with a doctorate degree earned 13.5 per cent more than women with a doctorate, while men with lesser degrees consistently earned more than women with similar degrees.

It is clear that regardless of the industry, the occupation, the job description or the location in this country, women are discriminated against in the work force.

And the professions are no better. According to Statistics Canada for the latest year available, the breakdown was as follows and Statistics Canada had the figures for 1961, but the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education has updated those figures and projected them as follows for 1971.

Physicians and surgeons, 11 per cent of physicians and surgeons are women, 89 per cent are men; lawyers and notaries, four per cent are women, 96 per cent are men; judges and magistrates, five per cent women, 95 per cent men; dentists, seven per cent women versus 93 per cent men. And engineers, three per cent women —

Mr. H. C. Parrott (Oxford): Does the hon. member want to know why some of these figures are true?

Mr. Laughren: Yes, I sure do want to know why some of those figures are true and if the hon. member could tell me I would be absolutely delighted.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Nickel Belt will sit down, if the member for Oxford wants to tell him.

Mr. Laughren: If he'll stand up and the Speaker will let me have the floor again, I'd be glad to let the member stand up and tell me why there is this discrimination in the

Province of Ontario. Stand up on a point of order or a point of privilege and I'd be –

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt has the floor, go ahead.

Mr. Laughren: I'm willing to relinquish it temporarily, if the member is willing.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Oxford will be very pleased to explain the male discrimination in his profession and all related professions–and he knows that is true.

Mr. Parrott: Of course. There are valid reasons.

Mr. Lewis: Well then will he just tell us why? What are the valid reasons?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Nickel Belt has the floor.

Mr. Laughren: One of the saddest commentaries in this whole area is that the attitudes of the professions and their governing bodies make it even more discriminatory than the professions themselves.

Mr. Foulds: Hear, hear. Absolutely!

Mr. Laughren: The third serious problem faced by women in the province is the problem of child care. Probably no government action could benefit so many women so quickly as would an aggressive child-care programme for the province.

At the present time there are thousands of mothers–almost half of whom are the only parent running the household–to whom daycare centres offer the opportunity to become a free agent in the work force. A child-care centre should serve not only the poor and the wealthy, but any women who decide their potential as individuals can best be realized outside the home.

Mr. Foulds: Right on!

Mr. Laughren: It is just not possible to assume that child care is the responsibility of the family alone. Society has a collective responsibility to its children and to the mothers who bear them.

Mr. Foulds: That's hitting it.

Mr. Laughren: Because traditionally the mother was trapped in the home is no reason she should remain there in a somewhat sophisticated and highly industrialized society such as we have in Ontario.

Mr. Foulds: That's good stuff; sock it to them.

An hon. member: This is a terrific speech.

An hon. member: It really is. I am enjoying this one.

Mr. Laughren: Put simply, Mr. Speaker, working mothers should have child-care centres available to them. For parents with low incomes or single parent families, child care is probably the only alternative to poverty in the home, with all its subsequent social costs. That's something this government doesn't seem to realize.

Mr. Foulds: Certainly this government doesn't.

Mr. Laughren: Child-care centres offer such families opportunities to break the cycle of poverty, which would pay immeasurable benefits to society in the long run. Child-care centres also offer an exciting opportunity to provide decent delivery of health and social services to children and to mothers at a critical time in the development of the child.

Preventive health care for the children and counselling for the parents are just two benefits that would in themselves justify a substantial allocation of public funds for the development of a variety of child-care centres in the province.

One should not overlook, when one is talking about sex discrimination, the importance in our economic system of the presence of a inexpensive labour pool. And of all the conditioning that has taken place, this probably has the most important ramifications. I understand why it is necessary to have women as a cheap reserve labour pool, but I sure find it repugnant.

Mr. Foulds: We can't accept that, Mr. Speaker; but the Tories can.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I shall leave that for now.

As a socialist I just couldn't make a speech in the debate on the Throne Speech without talking about the lack of a resources policy for this province. As a socialist from northern Ontario, I cannot rise in this Legislature and criticize the policies of this government without expressing my contempt for the ministry that presides over the depletion of the natural wealth of the province.

And of course, as a socialist from the Sudbury basin I cannot criticize the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) without at least talking about or mentioning the International Nickel Co.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): He is stealing the speeches of the member for Sudbury East, stealing his material.

Mr. Laughren: It is not because either I or my colleague for Sudbury or Sudbury East are paranoid about the International Nickel Co.—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Just paranoid!

Mr. Laughren: On the contrary, we often talk about that constituent—and it is a constituent of ours. But the reason we talk about it so much—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: He's cutting in on the territory of the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Just listen and learn.

An hon. member: He's just adding variety and spice.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, it is because the Sudbury basin is completely dominated by that company. It dominates and controls the environment in the Sudbury basin. It dominates the entire economic health of the Sudbury basin. And more important it will dominate and control the future of the Sudbury basin.

Mr. Martel: And the Ontario government.

Mr. Laughren: It has controlled the Ontario government for years.

Mr. Foulds: Certainly the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Mr. Laughren: I really doubt that most people of Ontario realize just how big the International Nickel Co. is.

An hon. member: Pretty big!

Mr. Laughren: Just in land alone it owns 210,000 acres in the Sudbury basin.

An hon. member: It's a shame.

Mr. Laughren: And it has proven ore reserves in this country of 387 million tons.

I might add that those ore reserves are not being depleted. If you look at the ore reserves of the International Nickel Co. for the last 20 years you'll find they are always about the same. As a matter of fact they are higher this year than they were last year.

An hon. member: They buy them.

Mr. Laughren: The reserves are not being depleted. Of course, the depletion allowance they get is because we're supposed to believe they're being depleted, but we know better than that.

An hon. member: It's just a put on.

Mr. Laughren: In fact, let me tell members how big they've been in the past, translated into profits. Since 1894, which was the beginning of the International Nickel Co., although it wasn't called that then, total dividends distributed to shareholders to the end of 1971 were $1,962,952,000; almost $2 billion! The company distributed another $75 million this year.

Mr. Bullbrook: Has the member any idea of how much of that goes out of the country?

Mr. Germa: It is inflationary.

Mr. Bullbrook: What percentage of that would go to the United States?

Mr. Laughren: Probably in the neighbourhood of a half now, but in previous years it was more than half.

The total taxes paid by the entire mining industry from 1919 up to 1971 were $328 million. Dividends to the International Nickel Co. shareholders alone were almost $2 billion. But revenue to the province, in the form of revenue from all the mining companies in the province, was a little over $300 million. That tells us the sense of priorities of this government and the kind of perspective it has on who should pay taxes in this province.

Mr. Germa: Sell them!

Mr. Foulds: Hit the little guy.

Mr. Martel: I don't know why we just don't give it away.

Mr. Foulds: Hit the little guy, that's the Conservative cry.

Mr. Martel: Just give it away.

Mr. Laughren: I would like to speak for a few moments on the resource wealth of this province, since I'm convinced that the government needs some good advice.

I'm also convinced that future generations in Ontario will read, with total disbelief, how we allowed the private sector to ship out our resources for its own short-term benefits because it was more profitable for it to do that than to develop a secondary

manufacturing industry in this province. That's the only reason—and when we consider that they're all non-renewable resources, it is all the more sad.

Those ores are being sold out at bargain basement prices. With no overall industrial strategy in Ontario, it is not surprising that the province has developed in a rather lopsided way, with resource extraction in the north and a somewhat more sophisticated development in the south.

Mr. Martel: Wholly-owned by the United States, mind you!

Mr. Laughren: The population pressure in southern Ontario, which has threatened to turn the whole "Golden Horseshoe" into a megalopolis, is at least partly caused by the flow of people from the north because of the lack of job opportunities up there, particularly for the more bright, ambitious young people. The publication of the Kierans report on natural resources in Manitoba has raised in many people's minds the question of ownership of the province's resources. If, as Eric Kierans says, the issue of proprietorship of our resources has already been established—and it is public—then we must determine whether or not we are obtaining the maximum benefit from those resources for the people of our province. It should be clear that as long as our resources are left in the private sector the people of Ontario will not receive the maximum benefits from those same resources.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, the best interests of the private sector do not parallel the best interests of the public at large in this province.

Mr. Foulds: Right on!

Mr. Laughren: Eric Kierans sums it up just beautifully and I would like to read a little bit of Kierans into the record.

> To be satisfied with the new jobs created and to forgo the surpluses and profits inherent in the development of its own endowment is hardly the mark of a strong and mature government. It accepts the role of hewers of wood and drawers of water for its people when they are capable of much more. That role provides wages and salaries and little else.
>
> The profits which direct and finance the future belong to those who have been invited in and this capital formation, which amounts to 28 per cent of the value extracted, does nothing for Manitoban priorities in the fields of agriculture, health, education or whatever.
>
> A developing nation, a province or a colony, may be rich in its beginnings, but when that wealth is depleted through the poverty of its policies nothing remains of the original endowment but the instability, dissatisfaction and political unrest arising from poorly-conceived policies.

Mr. Martel: There is no policy.

Mr. Laughren: To continue:

> A new resource policy will undoubtedly bring the government of Manitoba into conflict with the federal government and the large multinational corporations, two formidable opponents. It will not, however, violate prevailing political or economic philosophies.

Then he goes on to sum it up in a very brief paragraph:

> Investment in developing natural resources does not require vast investment sums. It's highly profitable and the surpluses could be used to strengthen the economic base and social institutions within a province. Exploitation by the private sector leads to none of these results, providing only temporary employment during the lifetime of the resources. Leases granted by the provinces for nominal fees are the source of large capital gains when sold by successful prospectors to established firms and yield high rates of profit to mining firms. This capital generated from resource exploitation rarely stays in a province to strengthen its economy.

So has spoken Eric Kierans.

A most refreshing aspect of the Kierans report is its rather devastating comments on the myth that mining is a high-risk sector.

The large corporations with their sophisticated equipment in control of markets take very few risks, and the concentration of progressively larger and fewer firms dominating the industry is a trend that probably will continue. During the five-year period between 1965 and 1970 the number of metal mining corporations in Canada declined from 852 to 218 and, in 1969, 36 of those firms controlled 87 per cent of the assets, 86 per cent of the equity, 84 per cent of the sales and 86 per cent of the profits.

Mr. Martel: And that's called free enterprise!

Mr. Laughren: The day of the independent prospector is gone, as is the day when mining was a high-risk enterprise. The taxation of our resource industry has been disgraceful all across Canada, with the corporations and their shareholders keeping 85.3 per cent of profit and only 14.7 per cent going to the people.

Mr. Martel: Fourteen per cent!

Mr. Laughren: If we apply the Canadian figure to Ontario, the result is interesting. Ontario metallic mineral output is about 44 per cent of the total Canadian metallic mineral output and in 1971 totalled $1.29 billion. In that same year, the people in Ontario realized in total revenue from the mineral industry only about $25 million.

Mr. Martel: Isn't that great—$25 million.

Mr. Laughren: When all minerals are considered, the revenue to the province was $27.6 million in taxation on a total output of of $1.55 billion, for a return to the people of the province of 1.78 per cent for their natural resources.

Whenever we talk about the enormous wealth of the Province of Ontario in terms of its resources, we should divide by the figure 56, because only 1/56th goes to the people and the rest goes to the corporations.

What makes it so ludicrous is that we give depletion allowances to the corporations for taking out our own resources. That is the part I find the most incredible—giving them a depletion allowance to take out our resources. It just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Martel: We're subsidizing them.

Mr. Laughren: Eric Kierans has recommended to the government of Manitoba that a 15 per cent mining tax be levied, based on the value of annual output. If this rate had been applied in Ontario, it would have meant $228 million for the provincial treasury in 1972.

Mr. Martel: Instead of $27.6 million!

Mr. Laughren: Any government that feels the necessity to raise the tuition fees in our post-secondary institutions and to cut health costs, surely is irresponsible if it does not tax all the potential tax revenues that are available to it.

The Kierans proposal that reserves be subjected to tax is particularly appealing, because it puts the mining companies on equal footing with other landholders such as farmers. Of course, Kierans' purpose in assessing such a tax is to speed up the pace of repatriation to the Crown of these reserves. In Ontario, even if a 10-cent-per-ton tax on proven reserves was applied, it would mean $38.7 million from the International Nickel Co. alone in 1971.

Surely the provincial Treasurer must salivate at the thought of $228 million in revenue from the tax on output and another $38.7 million from a tax on proven reserves.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Laughren: If all other companies, reserves were included as well, the government would undoubtedly have a figure in excess of $300 million. This would not only provide excess revenue for the province but would effect the same thing as Kierans is saying for Manitoba, speed up the repatriation of our resources to the people of this province, because that's who they belong to and that's who will eventually get them. But it won't be this government that gives it to them.

Mr. Martel: Despite the Tories.

Mr. Stokes: It would run half of the ministries in this government.

Mrs. Campbell: It would bring up more bureaucracy.

Mr. Laughren: I would like to read to the House a couple of figures from the International Nickel Co.'s 1972 annual report, just released and hot off the press.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: This is a consolidated report, so it includes more than their operations in Ontario, and I hasten to add that. In 1972, net sales were $900,323,000; net earnings—they had expenses—were $109,000,906. Taxes were $42,298,000. But of the $42.2 million in taxes that they claim here, $29.8 million are deferred, so that they are left with a current tax of $12.4 million on $900 million in sales.

Mr. Martel: Poor Inco.

Mrs. Campbell: Wait until they get to the assessments.

Mr. Martel: They're starving.

Mr. Laughren: That is approximately 1.4 per cent of sales and 11.4 per cent of profits. If the province gets 12 per cent rebate from the federal government on its

corporation tax, that means the province gets 12 per cent of $12.4 million, which is $1.4 million. That's the corporate, the income tax return, to the province of Ontario for a company that does in total—not just in Ontario admittedly—$900 million in sales. It is less than $1.5 million.

Mr. Deans: Much of it in Ontario though!

Mr. Laughren: Much of it, or most of it in Ontario; certainly the vast majority of it in Ontario.

But let me tell you some of the things that they are allowed to write off: Depreciation and depletion, $56.2 million. Depreciation is somewhat of a legitimate expense, but of that $56.2 million, $9.4 million was depletion. Depletion is not a legitimate expense in a non-renewable resource or in any resource. Deferred income taxes were $19.3 million and writeoff of obsolete facilities, equipment and capitalized exploration, $15.5 million.

So you can increase that profit figure that I quoted to you of $109 million on net earnings. That's what the profits will come out as in the paper—they already have I suppose—$109 million.

But it's not $109 million; it's $200 million. You have to add a further $90 million to that if you are going to get an accurate figure, a true figure that really represents the surplus realized by that company in 1972.

I have one other set of figures, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stokes: Tell us how much what they are investing in foreign countries.

Mr. Laughren: I'd like to compare the taxes and the dividends of the International Nickel Co. for just two years. I won't bore you with all the last 50 or 70 years. In 1971, International Nickel Co. declared a profit of $94.2 million. They paid taxes of zero. As a matter of fact they had a tax credit in 1971, even though they earned profits of $94.2 million.

Mr. Martel: Thanks to Benson.

Mr. Laughren: When they couldn't afford to pay any taxes on that $94.2 million their dividends were $97 million, over 100 per cent of their earnings in 1971—103 per cent of earnings. They couldn't afford to pay income taxes to the people of this country, but they sure as hell could pay dividends of $97 million.

In 1972 International Nickel Co. had a profit of $109.9 million.

Mr. Martel: Poor year!

Mr. Laughren: Very bad year!

Mr. Martel: Bad year!

Mr. Laughren: Taxes, when we have taken out the fluff, were $12.5 million; dividends $75 million or 68 per cent of earnings, while profits were 11.4 per cent.

Mr. Bullbrook: Taxes!

Mr. Laughren: Pardon?

Mr. Bullbrook: The member said profits; he means taxes.

Mr. Laughren: Sorry, taxes were 11.4 per cent of profits, yes.

What kind of nonsense is that, when we are trying to improve the quality of life in the province and in the country, when we allow a corporation to pile up accumulated dividends, retain earnings, allow all sorts of writeoffs and enormous profits, and we get virtually nothing from them to improve the quality of life in this province. It's a disgrace.

Mr. Stokes: They tell me Sudbury hasn't even got a city hall, is that right?

Mr. Laughren: Sudbury does not have a city hall.

Mr. Martel: It also has a tax bill three times higher than any city its size.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: I listened to Benson when he was in Sudbury. He was going to get tough and he backed off all over the ballpark. He was so squeamish. Benson was going to take them on and he backed off.

Mr. Laughren: He sure did. That's evident in the kind of taxation he introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a moment about energy. The removal last year of the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) from the cabinet sent shockwaves throughout the province because of the fact that he carried a pretty big stick with his multi-portfolios. Now, of course, he formulates policy concerning the energy requirements of the province.

The member's assignment is in order, I suspect, because Ontario is faced with a problem in energy since it uses a lot more

energy than can be supplied from within the province. I think that in the years to come the availability of energy in the province is critical if we are going to continue to grow at our present rate.

I was delighted, I must say, to see that the member had not been deluded into thinking that we, in Canada, have an energy crisis.

Speaking in Sarnia on March 9, the member reminded his audience that the United States had an energy supply crisis, not Canada. It is just remarkable how that parliamentary assistant to the Premier can identify the colonial status of some province, but not the Province of Ontario. Remarkable insight by the member from Chatham.

Commenting on the announced intention of Alberta to increase the price of natural gas, the member expressed sympathy for Alberta's dilemma in responding to Ontario's concern over the increased price of gas. And he said:

> All the arguments basically against Alberta proceeding with higher gas prices distilled down to the country asking Alberta to gore its own ox in the interests of Canada, or other parts of Canada, and to be the first in line. Whose ox will be next on the line? Might it be Ontario and its nickel, iron, copper, uranium or even some as yet undiscovered resource? How would we react as citizens, as producers, as a government, if we were asked to forgo the price-setting mechanism of world markets in the interests of Canada?

Well Mr. Speaker, the former Treasurer still believes there is a market price determined by the laws of supply and demand in the resource industry! Of all industry, he believes it of the resource industry! I didn't realize that a former Treasurer of the province would still believe that.

If there is a price-setting mechanism out there, it sure as hell is not set by supply and demand, or in the interests of the people of the country. It is set in the interests of a few giant corporations, not the whole country.

And I also wonder where the member for Chatham-Kent has been while this province's resources were being shipped out hous bolus, at bargain basement prices. And does he know what the tax rate is on our resources?

Here's another quote—and to those people who know him better than I, does this sound like that fervent free-enterpriser from Chatham?

> What I do know is that our reserves represent the strong card in our industrial negotiations with the United States. [I could comment on that.] That gas gives all of us, as Canadians, a position of strength, whether we trade it, manage it in return for secondary manufacturing opportunities, and in turn export opportunities.

And then, commenting further on the need for a national energy policy, the member said:

> We need a superior organization that is able to impress upon all Canadians and the rest of the world that we do have a preferential future, and that we recognize that right in a manner that is both intelligent and informed, in the widest context of national needs.

Mr. Speaker, that really is too much! That is too much from the former minister who couldn't even come up with an overall provincial plan for development, too much from the minister who couldn't come up with any kind of programme for local development across the province, and too much from the Treasurer who could sit back and see the kind of revenues that we get from our resource industries ourselves.

We receive a negligible amount of revenue from our resources, and he is laying it on the Alberta government and on the federal government that we need a federal policy and that he thinks the federal government is remiss in not having done so. Then he condemns the Alberta government for giving the corporations five-sixths of the price increase while only taking one-sixth for the revenues of the province.

How much did the province of Ontario get when the International Nickel Co. raised the price of electrolytic nickel from $1.33 to $1.53 a pound Sept. 4, 1972? How arrogant can you get, to start telling another province that it is not realizing enough from its resources and it is giving too much to the corporations; and telling the federal government that we need an overall federal plan—when he couldn't do the same thing for the province of Ontario?

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the province stopped playing footsie with the private sector and brought under public ownership those key resources that are the key to the development of a fully integrated industrial base in this province. There is very little difference between giving the private sector five-sixths of any price increase and collecting less than two per cent of the value of ores extracted.

If the parliamentary assistant is going to make a positive contribution to this province he will see to it that our energy resources are brought under public ownership. This should include the Onakawana lignite deposits, and the uranium mines at Elliot Lake at present controlled by Denison.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let us return the energy crisis to its place of origin, the United States.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Was there any agreement among the three parties as to which member would speak next?

Mr. Lewis: They are both Tories, it doesn't really matter.

Mr. Speaker: I see three hon. members on their feet at the present time—four of them now.

Mr. Gilbertson: Mr. Speaker, sometimes there is a little confusion about getting them in order, so if the opposition have no objection I think we will get back on the right track after the member for Algoma-Manitoulin, if that is all right.

Mr. Martel: If they have no opposition?

Mr. Lewis: I understand the member for Algoma gets extra money each year for saying this kind of thing.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, the last word I got was that the Conservatives were withdrawing their speaker so that I would be following the NDP.

Mr. Speaker: If those are the arrangements that were made, the hon. member of the Liberal Party my speak.

Mr. Ruston: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened with some interest to the former speaker (Mr. Laughren). I can't say that I learned very much from him.

Mr. Lewis: We wouldn't expect the member to.

Mr. Ruston: I will see if I can't enlighten the chamber a little. Since they talk out of their mouths two different ways all the time it gets a little disgusting.

Mr. Ferrier: The member is a pretty good expert on that too.

Mr. Ruston: However, we won't get into that. I know my opposition, as far as I am concerned, is across on the other side. Since the last by-election we know who we are fighting—we are fighting the Conservatives, we are not fighting the NDP. That was shown in Huron where they went down from 3,400 to 1,700, and when rural people come to the conclusion that they are no longer any good then I think the handwriting is on the wall.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to say a few words at this time and I want to congratulate you on the operation of the question period in the last few days. Last week I think it got a little out of hand and I want to congratulate you now for bringing it back into line with a little more order to it.

It is a pleasure, too, to have two new members, from St. George (Mrs. Campbell) and Huron (Mr. Riddell) joining us and I do know that they are very capable members. I might say that the member for St. George happens to be my member for the few months while I am staying in Toronto, so it is a pleasure to have a lady member in the Legislature sitting on my behalf.

I would like to talk for a few minutes on agriculture. There seems to be a lot of publicity lately on meat prices in particular, and I think it's overrated to a great deal, Mr. Speaker. It seems that in the last number of years, provincial and federal governments have not really taken the leadership in any way whatsoever to try to consolidate, or try to see that we had a national food policy or a national agricultural policy, so that the farmers would know where they're going.

We've had no control of production and we've had imports. We've had to fight our prices with prices from other countries because of imports. We've had to fight high costs of operations here because of spiralling wage costs, and the costs of inputs that farms have with tractors, machinery and such things as that. I think in the last 10 years the cost of what we would call an average-size tractor of about 60 to 80 horsepower has about doubled. This certainly has to come frome someplace.

The farmers have got efficient. In fact, right now one farmer is feeding about 40 people in Canada. The world average, I will tell the members, is a great deal lower than that. So our farmers have got efficient, and probably have got too efficient because they were not getting paid for their efficiency.

With the talk of the meat boycott and so forth, I see one article here from Nov. 23, 1971, where the Ontario Federation of Agriculture was meeting in Hamilton. The headline was, "Dim Farm Future Pointed." Mr. Ernie Belzaire wrote that. I might say Mr. Belzaire was a farm reporter for the Windsor Star. He passed away only about a month ago. I think he was one of the most able farm reporters in Ontario. The farm people and the agricultural people are certainly going to miss him, because he did understand farming and the whole farming gambit.

We look at meat prices today, and we talk about sirloin steak. I suppose it runs from $1.39 to $1.69. I have figures showing that three years ago sirloin steak was $1.49 in Loblaws store on Bloor St. in Toronto. I see in today's paper that Loblaws have sirloin steaks at $1.35 a pound.

The cost of producing a pound of beef has gone up considerably, especially in the last few months. It generally takes about eight pounds of grain to put a pound of gain on beef. At the present time the general cost of producing one pound of meat is about 29 cents per pound of gain. That doesn't include the price of this critter before that; that's just the pound of gain.

So, you can see, Mr. Speaker, with that kind of cost it certainly is necessary to have a price somewhere in the range that we're paying today. We've probably been spoiled in the last number of years. I think among the general public in buying meat and so forth, with our barbecues and everything, every spring and summer everyone gets his barbecue out and I guess he figures everybody has to eat steak. But if you get a cut of meat off a good critter, I would think there's as much protein in any one cut as there is in a cut of steak. So I don't think we all have to eat steak every day of the week. Of course, there is only so much steak you can get off a critter, and so naturally if there's an awful demand for it, the price is bound to go up.

It was only two years ago that the price of pork was about 30 cents a pound. The cost of producing that meant at that time that most producers were really losing money. Now, true, it has gone up in the last few months to around 44 cents a pound, and even up to 56 cents. Now, if we consider that two years ago the federal government paid a subsidy on all pork production in Canada of $5 per head to anyone who had produced them that year, because the price was so low. The maximum anyone was allowed was up to 200 head, so you could collect $1,000 in subsidy because the price was low.

Well that's being subsidized out of taxation. Certainly we won't have to subsidize any hog growers this year, so we're saving money there. We were paying for it, but a lot of people didn't realize it.

Subsidizing farmers is not really the answer, in my opinion. You're just really fooling everybody. If you really want to buy a car, you pay the price. If you're going to buy a shirt or pair of shoes, you pay the price that that manufacturer figures he has to have in order to pay the wages and operations and get a reasonable profit.

Now, if you tell a farmer to produce a pig at $30 a hundred, and then keep the price of that meat down so that people on low incomes can buy it, that's fine. But when you've got to bring taxes in and pay a subsidy on it, otherwise he's going in the hole. So you're just fooling yourself.

What we should have is that it should be the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. That's the price it should be. If we have people in the low income bracket who cannot pay for it, cannot afford to buy the necessities of life, then it's the responsibility of we the public to have a minimum guaranteed income. If they're on social assistance we have to make that higher so that they can buy the commodities they need, and the person producing them can still make a reasonable profit.

Mr. Laughren: Who is the member to be talking about guaranteed poverty!

Mr. Ruston: Pardon?

Mr. Laughren: Why is he talking about guaranteed profits?

Mr. Ruston: Well, knowing the member's party that's an interesting point. You know, this party here, of course, gets all its financial support from the unions—

Mr. Lewis: Not all. Not all.

Mr. Ruston: —and I see that the unions had a meeting in United States last week and Emile Mazey, the secretary-treasurer of the union, came out with a resolution to have a boycott on meat April 1. If every farmer in United States and Canada says "Well, dammit, we'll have a boycott on every car that the union makes," and didn't buy a car for a year, I wonder what they'd say then.

Mr. Bullbrook: They wouldn't like it.

Mr. Ruston: I wouldn't like that either, because my family work in the automobile factory and they've got to live and we've got to live and the farmers have to live. But that's not the idea of the union heads. "To hell with them," they'd say. "We're just looking after ourselves."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: That's just the way they work. And I know all about that.

Mr. Laughren: . . . Tell us what to do in Canada.

Mr. Ruston: They are not. I have belonged to the unions. I know how some of the union heads work.

Mr. Laughren: The member really loves to work for them, doesn't he?

Mr. Ruston: Yes. I do. I get along very well with them. I don't take money from them to run my campaign though, like the NDP does.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Where did the member get his?

Mr. Ruston: Why doesn't the member look at my financial statement.

Mr. Bounsall: He doesn't get it from workers?

Mr. Ruston: Yes. I get it from a lot of workers.

Now Mr. Speaker, another thing that we talk about that caused some feed prices to go up and in turn caused meat prices to rise was a higher cost of production. Soybeans in the last few months, as most people are aware, have gone up a terrific lot. I was noticing that the soybeans got up as high as $6.40 a bushel. But the interesting thing is, a lot of that was speculation.

Look at the amount of soybeans that were sold. In September there were 70,000 bushels sold at $3.19 a bushel on the average. In October, 3,184,000 bushels sold—this is in Essex and Kent county, Ontario—at an average price of $3 a bushel. November—2,560,000 bushels at an average price of $3.32 a bushel. December—1,863,000 bushels at an average price of $3.83; January—3,365,000 bushels at an average bushel price of $4.20.

Now, the soybean farmers have gone to the federal government asking for a floor price of $3 a bushel, so at least they will be guaranteed $3 a bushel. I think the problem would have been better for all of us if that price were to stop at about $4 or $4.50; although it is good that someone did get a higher price.

If you go back to 1969 in the area where I live, they had no soybeans at all; and yet at the end of the year they had their farm taxes to pay and everything, the same as everybody else. So it will certainly take them a while to catch up from a disastrous year like that.

We have the tax rebate to farmers that has been in effect in the last two years, and I think that we had some input in that. There was a resolution on the Legislature floor and it was discussed and the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Treasurer (Mr. White) announced it that fall. Now I see by the Provincial Auditor's report that he thinks that it should be put into a special bill instead of being affected just by regulations—and it certainly should. There were a number of people who actually had money sent to them for their farm tax rebates and then mailed it back.

The Auditor's recommendation is that a special Act of the Legislature should be passed, spelling out the rules and regulations for all payments be made on the basis of an application form; and probably at the same time we should designate what a farmer is in order to clear up that bit of legislation.

Mr. Deacon: How did the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) get into that?

Mr. Ruston: It is an interesting point as to whether the Minister of Agriculture would be qualified for that. I would think it best for cabinet ministers not to accept it. It seems to me that that would be the best situation in the community. His farm might be eligible for it, but I think it would be best for him not to accept it.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to mention health care. Again, the cost of health care has spiralled a lot in the last few years, but there are one or two things that I think we have probably forgotten about why the cost of health care is up so much; for example, if we look over the past 10 years, there is the number of people who now have access to all forms of health care.

I can recall having been associated with one of the local county co-ops where an awful lot of people just didn't have it. They had what they called an insurance plan, but

it only covered them if they had a surgical operation in hospital. If they went to the doctor's office or had eye examinations or something like that, they paid for that out of their own pockets. Now this was available to everyone in the province.

I can recall one time where a person added full coverage for his four children, his wife and himself. And two days after they had the full coverage they all had their eyes examined. That cost us $90, so I suppose he hadn't had them examined for five years. So I think that what we have got here is a case of people making use of the service.

No doubt it is something that we certainly need; and maybe we should have some form of regulation to it with regard to the person receiving that service.

Maybe we should have a card, like a credit card or something, where they go into the doctor's office and a bill is made out, and they sign it—the doctor puts on it how much the service is. At least they know what the doctor is charging. Now you go in and you come back out and you don't know what it is.

When we ran it they would come in and look over their card and say: "Do you mean the doctor charges $30 for that 10 minutes consultation?" And I said: "Well, he is a specialist and that is what he is allowed to charge. It is unbelievable to them. A lot of people don't realize what this is costing us, the taxpayers—and the government. Maybe this is one thing we should have.

Another thing we might find is that individuals may go to one doctor today; and if they don't think they get the right answers, maybe four days later they will go to another doctor. He might tell them something a little different; and maybe he will send them to a specialist. We have seen it happen, where they run to more than one doctor. If we had them on the computer instead of the doctors, we might be able to find out why there are over-usages. Some of the doctors perhaps aren't aware that health insurance is being over-used by some people. I think this is something we should find out in this age of computerization and that perhaps could be looked into.

I want to mention something very briefly, Mr. Speaker, about the purchasing of Hydro rights of way. As you know, in our area we are kind of in a peninsula and we have to have a lot of Hydro lines running down to serve the city of Windsor and the industrial area there. We already have a number of rights of way through, but they are expanding on them, building duplicate lines alongside of them and so forth.

One thing really bothers me. When the Hydro negotiators go in and start talking prices they seem, when they are negotiating at first, to set a price that is not too high, naturally, because it is their first time around. The second time around they may get a little higher. Then if the owner is in a position where he could use a little extra money right then he thinks: "Well, maybe I am going to have to accept at some time anyway, I can't stop the hydro line." Rather than go to expropriation maybe he'll say: "Well, all right, it sounds pretty reasonable. I'll sign the agreement"

Then someone down the road, maybe the next farm over, someone a little more experienced in financial matters, a little more financially capable of holding out a while longer; he'll maybe say: "Well, I'm not going to accept that. That is not good enough." So the buyer will come back in another month or two and he'll say: "No, I'm not accepting that either." He'll hold out and hold out, and Hydro ends up paying some of these people 25 per cent more than in the original instance when the fellow settled just three or four months earlier.

This is certainly not fair and it is not right. It is the same land and the same value, and they certainly should all receive the same.

I think what they should do is when they make these agreements it should be the same agreement for every farm if it is the same type of soil. They shouldn't have the fellow who is willing to accept the agreement in the earlier stages losing pocket money because he is agreeable to a line going through.

I should maybe mention a thing or two on regional government and local government responsibilities. I noticed some of the areas where the province has put regional government in they are passing some of the responsibilities now carried by the province over to the regional governments; highways, for example. What they are doing, really, is they are sloughing off some of the responsibilities they have had for a number of years onto the regional government. Instead of giving the regional governments a boost they are giving them a kick.

I think of our own area where the city of Windsor annexed parts of about three of the townships adjoining it. Provincial highways—three of them—running through these townships were wholly maintained by the provin-

cial government. As soon as the city of Windsor annexed all the area they had to take over the responsibility for all these highways; all the province now pays on them is 50 per cent. This added charge of operating and maintaining these roads has been a real burden on the local taxpayer.

We had the same thing with roads that were passed on to the county from the province. It is just increasing the burden on the local taxpayer in the real estate tax.

On planning, this was mentioned the other day when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) made reference to Chatham township – I was reading some of the correspondence on that, going back as far as four or five years negotiating with the Minister of Municipal Affairs about their plan – and the fact they just hadn't got anywhere with him.

I recall in our own area, when we put in the plan in our township, the amount of correspondence back and forth with the department. It was about four years before we finally had it approved.

Certainly planning is a necessity now, but there is one thing that concerns me, and that is whether we are maybe getting a little too stringent with our planning and zoning when it comes to a farm family wanting to pass on a lot or something to the son or daughter.

I know I had some in my own area. It concerns me some when a person has 100 acres and wants to pass a lot or two along to a daughter or son, who may not actually be farming full-time now but may be in a few more years.

In fact, I could see that if farm prices were to stabilize at the prices some of them are now, a number of people who are now in cities working could very well quit and go back to the farm. In the last number of years farming has been very poor–incomes have been poor. A lot of people went to the city to obtain an added income.

Mr. Deacon: Or get some income!

Mr. Ruston: They had to have it to keep the farm going. They have been using the income from cities to keep the farm going for the last number of years.

It's getting near 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose I could end soon but I wanted to mention the flooding conditions in the area. I think we should be taking a really serious look at what we are going to do about controlling the action of the high lake levels on properties. I'm not just thinking of buildings. It's the erosion of the land. It is certainly a serious matter.

I know that the people living there are certainly aware of it but a lot of people are not. We have to have a front line somewhere to stop this erosion, and if we allow the present beaches to go, where do we go from there? We'd be losing more soil. The eroded soil going into our lake system is bad too, because of the pollution coming from the soil itself–the nitrogen and so forth which runs off into the lakes cause pollution problems and cause more growth in our lakebeds, so we certainly do need some form of erosion control on the frontage of our lakes.

I don't think we want a dike all around the whole area but I think we should be certainly experimenting with weirs or groynes out into the lake at certain angles, depending on the wave actions in the areas. It is surprising how some people who have lived in these areas for 30 or 40 years seem to know just where these should be. If we had some engineering done on that, and some of these were put in, at least on a trial basis in the worst areas, I think it would certainly be worthwhile.

I think this is definitely the responsibility of the provincial government. It is really discouraging for people living in the area to attempt to discover who has the responsibility for our lakes and lake frontage. With the British North America Act the federal government has control of the waterways yet the province has the land underneath it. It seems rather confusing to the local people; they ask who takes over? In the United States, of course, the federal government does have control and in many areas it goes ahead and does some of this work. But here, we seem to be at loggerheads as to who should do it.

Personally, I think it is the responsibility of the province to take the initiative–start it and then go to the federal government for assistance. That's really the only way that I think we can go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's 6 o'clock and I could go on for 15 minutes but–

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 5, 1973

Heritage Ontario, statement by Mr. Welch ... 541

Tobacco insurance, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Spence ... 544

School budgets, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis ... 544

Removal of books from circulation, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Singer ... 545

Powers of security guards to issue parking tickets, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Singer 546

McWilliams insurance report, question of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer ... 546

Toronto downtown housing, questions of Mr. Grossman and Mr. White: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Dukszta ... 547

Integrated community housing project, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis ... 548

Public assistance application, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis ... 549

General welfare rates, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis ... 549

Compensation to crime victims, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Lewis ... 549

Conferences for women, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Lewis ... 549

Police seizure of company's books, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Deacon ... 550

Teacher negotiation legislation, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. B. Newman ... 550

Position of mining recorder, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Martel ... 550

Use of government aircraft, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Sargent ... 551

Report of Silver Shield mines, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Shulman ... 551

OHIP premiums, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Deacon ... 552

Regional government, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Deans, Mr. Givens ... 552

Maple Mountain development, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Rhodes ... 555

Espanola water condition, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Good ... 555

Wage rates on road project, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Bounsall ... 555

Family court procedures, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mrs. Campbell ... 556

Alleged use of strikebreakers, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Bounsall ... 556

Presenting reports, Agricultural Research Institute, Crop Insurance Commission, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart ... 556

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Taylor ... 557

Northern Development Act, bill to repeal, Mr. White, first reading ... 557

Agricultural Development Act, bill to repeal, Mr. White, first reading ... 557

Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, first reading 557

Devolution of Estates Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 557

Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 558

City of Hamilton Act, bill respecting, Mr. Reilly, first reading 558

Land Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Clement, first reading 558

Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 559

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Ruston 560

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Ruston, agreed to 590

Recess, 6 oclock 590

No. 15



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 5, 1973

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker: I believe when we rose at 6 o'clock the member for Essex-Kent had the floor. He may continue.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, another subject that I want to mention very briefly has to do with pollution devices on automobiles in both the United States and Canada. I am concerned about the 1973 emission controls. I read an article from the Detroit News of Oct. 22, 1972, and I think it is rather interesting:

> When an auto expert starts hoarding cars you have to ask yourself if maybe he knows something the rest of us don't. This summer Leslie Henry bought three new 1972 Mercury Comets. Henry is curator of the transportation collection of the Henry Ford Museum at Greenfield Village. He plans to store two of the cars until the first one wears out then start on the second, and he figures the three cars will last him 20 years. "I'll drive all three until the snow flies," he said "to make sure they are all okay, and while the guarantee is still good, but after that two of them go into storage."
>
> Henry believes this is his last chance to buy a good car. "I think auto performance is going away down starting with the 1973 models," he said, "because of the stringent emission requirements that legislation has put on cars. The standards are a lot tougher than they need be. A tree on your front yard will put out more hydrocarbons than they'll allow from a car. These new rules are going to adversely affect car performance, cars will cost more and they will require extra maintenance."

After talking to a number of people who have 1973 model cars I think that this gentleman certainly has hit the nail on the head. The auto industry is enjoying one of the highest sales years of its lifetime. But at the same time the gasoline mileage of the majority of cars is running from 14 miles a gallon down, and that is the majority of Canadian and American-built cars. A great number of them are doing about 10 miles to the gallon.

So one really has to wonder whether we are really, in effect, doing a great deal of favour to ourselves by having these emission controls so strong, though no doubt they are needed like that in California or Los Angeles and probably in some of the heavily populated cities.

I want to mention about—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What did they have, some for the country and some for the city?

Mr. Ruston: Could be. I wanted to mention, Mr. Speaker, about issuing of—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

I wonder if I can break in for just a moment. We have a group of visitors in the gallery, guests of the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mrs. Birch), the YPC group from Scarborough East.

The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: I'm glad to have that pleasant interruption, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Sorry to interrupt the hon. member but it was for a very good cause.

Mr. Deans: I didn't know there were so many.

Mr. Ruston: I am concerned about the issuing of sewage treatment permits in Kent county when I see what happened in Chatham township with the issuing of permits for Multi-Malls.

This permit, I understand, was approved by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) and Kent county health inspectors requested some assistance. The brief time it took to get the permit is amazing when in a number of areas in Kent county—the village of Merlin and the hamlet of Charing Cross—the health inspectors have refused to give sewage permits because they claim that

it would be harmful to the environment and cause pollution of the waterways.

If one or two small homes are going to pollute the waterways the way they say, I don't know what this place is going to do. It's going to have 300 homes and a giant shopping centre worth about $7 million or $8 million. One just wonders how they can get approval for such a project and others can't even get one for individual homes.

A matter of great concern to a lot of us is the plight a number of people find themselves in between the ages of 55 to 65. In my own area there are people who have lost their jobs or are partially disabled and they don't have much in the way of funds saved. They try to get financial assistance to help them along and this, to me, is one of the most serious problems I've run across in my riding. I find the people over 65 who get the new pension allowance that everyone receives in Canada now, get along reasonably well in most cases, but I find that the ones under that age are the ones most in need.

I recall a case I had not too long ago in which the man and wife were 64 or 63 years of age. She was receiving $175 a month pension as a retired schoolteacher but he was not really able to work although he wasn't completely disabled under the Disabled Persons' Allowance Act administered by the province. His condition worsened and we then applied for a disability pension under the Canada Pension Plan. He did qualify for that and received $51 a month.

That is still only $226 a month for a couple whereas at the age of 65 they would be entitled to over $300 under the present pension plan. I think, living in the richest province in Canada, a province that should be capable of looking after those in need, that we should be looking at a better system of payments to our senior citizens, especially those between 55 and 65 years of age.

I often think, too, that we should be looking at a system of a guaranteed income for anyone over 60 who wishes to retire. Some of them have pension plans—but some of them aren't too large—and if we could give an allowance to them so that they could live in comfort, a number of these people probably would go out of the work force and that would create many more jobs for younger people. I think that is something we should be looking at in the very near future.

I wanted to ask a question—rather than ask a question, I think I'll put it in this way: I would ask the Premier (Mr. Davis), and I am sure that someone will draw it to his attention, if his parliamentary assistant (Mr. McKeough) is now, or has ever been, on any retainer fee with the Canada and Dominion Sugar Co. Ltd., or the Union Gas Co.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The member is not going to speak like that about his constituent, is he?

Mr. Ruston: Yes. I might say to the hon. member for Cochrane South that he is a constituent of mine. However, I would like to know if he has been in the past or is now on a retainer fee with the Canada and Dominion Sugar Co. Ltd. or Union Gas Co. The reason I ask this is that there are a lot of rumours going around to this effect.

We had an application for an Ontario Development Corp. loan in my area—in the township of Tilbury West—for a tile company to make plastic tile. It was turned down. There are an awful lot of people who think that it was turned down because the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) had some financial interest in the Canada and Dominion Sugar Co. which owns Daymond Co. Ltd. which received an Ontario Development Corp. loan to put a plant in Huron county.

We know who the member for Huron county was. No doubt, he had quite a bit of sway and we ask that question now and hope that in the near future we will have an answer to it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that pretty well covers all that I have to say at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the very excellent job you do as Speaker of this House. The wit and sense of humour that you display here in your daily work is greatly appreciated by all. It is my sincere hope that you will occupy this position for many years to come.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet (Mr. Winkler) is even funnier.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: He is. He is much more entertaining.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I sit here in this House each day and listen to the members of the opposition parties take crackshots at the various ministers. The other day, I believe, the leader of the NDP (Mr. Lewis) called them a sorry lot. I would like to take just a minute at this time and tell it like it is, just for the records.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I serve a sparsely-populated area and we have many problems so I've had to call on each and every minister over the months that I have been here. I've had excellent co-operation, in many cases away beyond the line of duty. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you an example of what I mean.

The riding of Algoma-Manitoulin has many transportation problems and in order to try to solve some of these, I had to call on the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton). I told him about the very poor service that the existing ferry was providing to Manitoulin. I also told him about the total lack of air service to my riding and, of course, about the terrible condition of the roads and highways. Well, the ferry service was fairly easy to understand as the situation has been brought to the attention of the government for the past many years so the problems were well documented.

After having discussed the matter and had a large delegation in, the minister called a meeting with the federal Minister of Transport and the matter was resolved. There will be a new ferry on the Tobermory-South Bay run in 1974. I know there have been some recent newspaper stories to the contrary but, believe me, the right decision was made.

However, the road problem was another matter and seeing that the minister had never been to my riding it was decided that he would come and we would have a first-hand look at the situation. A date was set for the trip but shortly thereafter the minister had to go out of the country on business and the day before he was to be in my riding, he found himself leaving Germany.

He arrived home in the late evening and with only a few hours of rest, he got on another plane. At 9:30 a.m. on the appointed date, he arrived at the Gore Bay airport and travelled with me over 200 miles of roads in my riding to look at the problems. I think the Province of Ontario is very fortunate to have men of this calibre in charge of our ministries and because of this I feel the future of this province is indeed very bright.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to mention my Indian friends. In the riding of Algoma-Manitoulin, there are nine Indian reservations. For as long as I can remember there has been a great cry that the Indian people should be helped. But everything that was done in response to that cry seemed to be pretty much giveaway programmes or even direct handouts. Unfortunately, this tended to brand the Indian as a second-class citizen and a recipient of the charity of this country.

I would like to make it abundantly clear that I consider the Indian people in my riding to be first-class citizens who neither want nor need handout or giveaway programmes. As long as I am the member for Algoma-Manitoulin riding, I will never ask for this type of programme. I will ask for self-help programmes, the kind that will allow the Indian people to develop to their full potential; the kind of a programme that will allow them a better standard of livelihood and make them able to provide increased services for themselves.

I realize my criticisms apply mostly to federal programmes as it is only recently that the provincial government has become involved with Indian programmes to any great extent. These programmes, however, have been of a very constructive nature and will benefit the Indian people greatly but I think there are other ways we can be of assistance. For instance, we can help the Indian people in the development of their own police forces on the reservations.

At present the Department of Indian Affairs makes it possible for young men from the reservations to attend the Ontario Police College at Aylmer, but when these young men graduate and begin their work as policemen, if they work on the reserve, they receive a great deal less per year than the starting salary of our Ontario Provincial Police. This is not much incentive for the young Indian police graduate to stay on his reserve and give it the benefit of his training.

I feel we should have an integrated plan with the federal Department of Indian Affairs which would allow these policemen to enforce the provincial statutes on the reserves. I feel we should assist such a force with part of the costs of equipment, such as that needed for transportation, and a supplement to the present salary to bring it more in line with the scale used by other police forces.

There is no doubt in my mind that we

would reap great benefits from any investment we would make in such policemen. I am sure that they can make a great contribution to law enforcement in Ontario and, in many cases, they would get better co-operation from their fellow men on the reserves than might be given to the Ontario Provincial Police officers, as the situation now exists. I would like to stress the fact that such a force would be providing a real service and answering a real need. It is an example of the kind of programme I would like to see this government provide for the Indian people.

I mentioned before that I am not in favour of giving moneys or anything else and getting nothing in return. But I must say that there are areas in my riding where there is little or no opportunity for people to find employment, where able-bodied people are obliged to take welfare because there is simply no work for them to do, however, much they desire it.

I believe every able-bodied man and woman should have a job that would provide him and his family with a reasonable standard of living. For those people who through no fault of their own are unable to earn by their efforts, I feel we must provide better assistance. Our present method of assistance, in most cases, is inadequate for the disabled, the widowed and others who need help.

For those who can work and, in most cases, want to work we must find jobs. This can only be done if the government will develop pilot programmes in the various areas of my riding where there is not enough employment. Many of these people I speak of are unable to meet the age and health requirements for the mines or the paper mills which provide the main source of employment in my riding, yet they want meaningful work which will provide them with a livelihood and, in most cases, with a little help they could do it.

In my riding there is plenty of wood, stone and rock. Products made from this material and produced in those areas would provide employment, would not contribute to pollution and would eventually operate at a profit. To begin such production, they would need financial assistance because the people living in the area do not have, nor can they get, the money required for capital and operational costs.

The products I am thinking about are toys, souvenirs, jewellery and other industrial and household items. There are many, many dollars being spent today on these types of articles. More often than not these articles are made in some other country.

Souvenirs, for example, sold here to represent Canada are seldom made in Canada. I am sure visitors to our country would prefer—

Mr. Singer: Even the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet was funnier.

Mr. Lane: —to have something truly Canadian to remind them of their stay here.

Mr. Singer: He is much more entertaining.

Mr. Lane: Surely we should be able to supply them with a Canadian souvenir? We could, if there were pilot projects begun in my riding which would use the wood and other resources found in the area, allow the people who live in the north to make products from the north.

Mr. Singer: Isn't there a rule about reading speeches?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I am sure there is.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He is speaking about the north and those in the south over there are just making a useless noise.

Mr. Lane: Wood production could supply other things. It could answer the demand for rustic furniture to be used in cottages and on patios. Knotty pine and any kind of wood furniture could be produced in my riding if we had the finances to begin these projects.

The development of these projects would mean that we should reforest all the land in the general area which is not now productive and supervise it, so we could continue to have sufficient raw material to supply the industries created in the pilot projects. This reforestation would also provide much-needed employment.

I have recommended to the minister that a pilot project be started in my riding as soon as possible. I feel this would have many advantages. First, we would get people off welfare and into meaningful employment and, second, we would be providing souvenirs and other useful articles to visitors to our province.

We also have farmland—some of the best farmland in the country. Should we not be

producing fresh vegetables, canned and frozen fruits and vegetables for ourselves and the markets in Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie? All of these products are now being imported into the north with a considerable markup in cost. With a small investment, these could all be produced in my riding—just help in financing the greenhouses, freezing and canning facilities.

We do have the potential. We could develop small industries that would have a good chance of success. We could provide people who have no choice now other than living on welfare with work that would give them great satisfaction.

I am a great believer in getting 100 per cent value on every tax dollar we spend, but I don't believe it can ever be done with a welfare cheque; it has to be done with a paycheque. I am sure the money invested in pilot projects like those I have mentioned will provide those paycheques for the people who are well qualified to operate and work in this type of small industry, which would be compatible with the tourist industry.

It would also mean that many of our young people could find suitable work in the area. It is of great concern to me that they now have to leave the area to find meaningful employment, for of all the resources we have in the north our youth is our greatest resource.

Mr. Speaker, while I am speaking of industry, I must mention the tourist industry. My entire riding has a great potential for tourist development, and many of our young people would like to get involved in this industry but in many cases they lack finances. I know we have NODC and other agencies to go to for financial assistance, but it seems to me that up until now these plans have not been flexible enough and that too much consideration has been given to the past performance and financial statements of past years rather than consideration to the potential.

Many of these young people who would like to start in business do not have enough money on hand to have much owner equity in the business, and, as a result, many applications have been turned down. I really feel that NODC was set up to provide risk capital, and such being the case, if the area has the potential and the applicant has the ability, this should be the main factor in considering the loan.

Oftentimes, the financial statement for the past five years means very little, because many of the existing tourist businesses were started a number of years ago and the owner in many cases was a middle-aged man who did not want to spend big dollars to expand the business at his age. So if this is sold to a young person who could take full advantage of the potential, then past history means very little.

If the people in my riding are to get the full advantage that the area lends to tourism, then we must have more and better facilities and we must always be on the lookout as to how best to achieve the best results for our efforts and for our people.

In this respect I would like to point out that it is urgent that the government acquire the Ontario Paper Co. lands on western Manitoulin. I need not elaborate on the splendid recreational, timber and wildlife potential of these lands in Dawson and Robinson townships and on Cockburn Island.

With increased pressure for recreation close to major metropolitan areas, Manitoulin Island will become increasingly important as a destination for tourists. But we must not delay, because if these 80,000 acres should be purchased by some wealthy person and if he should prohibit its public use, it would be a terrific loss not only to Manitoulin but to the entire Province of Ontario.

I mentioned last year in my maiden speech that I felt the federal government had a responsibility in providing recreational and park land for future generations, and that I felt ARDA should be the vehicle through which this property should be purchased. I still feel the same way, but I must point out that property has been changing hands very rapidly on Manitoulin in the past few years, and I feel there is a great urgency to acquire this property now, and that it would be in the best interest of the Province of Ontario to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a few moments ago about the wildlife potential that the Ontario Paper Co. lands offered. I think it's fair to state that a very large part of my riding has a great potential in this field, but there are some serious effects on our deer herds as a result of wolves. The past winter was an exceedingly easy winter on deer insofar as the depth of snow was concerned. However, I have had a number of reports of deer killed by wolves in the winter feeding areas and on the lakes. As you know, I was very concerned about this matter when the wolf bounty was discontinued last year, but I was advised that predator control would be stepped up and, if need be, in problem areas, local hunters or trappers would be hired to help keep the wolf population in check.

Some will say we must not upset the balance of nature and that the deer and wolf population will take care of itself if left alone. Well, this may be true, but remember that hunters take thousands of deer every year. So our wolf population must be controlled.

I do not want to see the wolf exterminated, but unless they are controlled, deer hunting—which is profitable to many in my riding as well as very profitable to the provincial government through the sale of thousands of licences — will stop. The deer population is already seriously depleted even with having had the bounty control on wolves. Even apart from the revenue which deer hunting brings to my riding, the deer itself is a very beautiful creature and certainly must be protected. I hope this government will take all of these things into consideration and step up predator control in the problem areas.

Mr. Speaker, last year I mentioned my interest in the need for rent-geared-to-income housing for our senior citizens.

I am happy to say that during the past year the towns of Little Current, Gore Bay, Massey and Manitowaning have been given approval on this type of housing for their areas, and I'm sure more approvals will be forthcoming for other towns and villages in my riding.

My concern for proper housing for senior citizens goes beyond the boundaries of my own riding to the large cities where, because of high rent and the cost of travel and entertainment, many of our retired people have to just exist. I have suggested to the minister that consideration should be given to creating senior citizens' villages in my riding. These villages could be adjacent to existing towns or villages so all the services would be available.

It would mean that a retired person would have an opportunity to grow a garden, have some flowers and grass, get some recreation such as hunting, fishing, hiking, etc., at very little cost. The cost of recreation such as curling in a small town or village is only a fraction of what the cost is in the larger areas. With land cost in the area being only a fraction of the cost of larger areas the overall picture should be very attractive to the older person who would like this way of life.

I know in the past few years many people from various parts of Ontario approaching retirement have bought homes, and bought land and built homes on Manitoulin Island and other places in the riding for their retirement years. So if it is desirable for people who can afford it to move to this area for retirement, then it must be equally desirable for those who cannot afford to own their own homes.

It used to be that when we thought of retired people we would think of someone 75 years or over, but now it is 65 and in many cases younger. So instead of thinking in terms of five or 10 years of retirement, we are now thinking in terms of 20 or 25 years, which after all is a good chunk of a person's lifetime. I would hope that we will be able to give our older people a choice, and I would like to see this idea tried as a pilot project in my riding.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being accused of repeating myself, I must point out again—

Mr. Singer: Oh no, don't run that risk.

Mr. Lane: —as I did last year, the need for the equalization of prices for basic commodities—

Mr. Singer: Who wrote that speech? Who wrote that?

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): The member should listen, he might learn something.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) doesn't listen, I will say that.

An hon. member: How would he know?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): We listened to them this afternoon, so they should button up.

Mr. Lane: —the need for equalization of prices for basic commodities across the province. Food, gasoline, oil, etc. should be the same price to the people in the north as it is to the people in the south.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): And it should be reduced in the south.

Mr. Lane: I would point out that it costs more to get from point A to point B in the north because of distances involved. Along with this higher first cost is a second cost of higher prices for gasoline, and mother nature has arranged that we must heat our houses in the north for a longer period of time than do our friends in the south. So again, we have a second cost in higher prices for oil. Even if we take into consideration the cost of moving products north — that in itself would only account for a very small portion of the price spread.

Mr. Dean: The party the member supports is irresponsible, that is the problem.

Mr. Lane: I do not feel that we should take the competition out of trade, but I do feel that our government should take a serious look at this problem.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would draw attention again to the great need for a scheduled air service to my riding.

Mr. Laughren: The member mustn't tamper with the free enterprise system.

Mr. Lane: At the present time we do not have an air service. In fact, a good portion of the riding does not have any sort of public transportation at all. There are, however, airports at Gore Bay, Elliot Lake and Wiarton.

I would hope that either a private carrier could be found or another leg of norOntair could be established to service this area, because it seems to me that we can never develop to our full potential until we have a good dependable air service. Also, in this day and age surely all the people in the province are entitled to some type of public transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I realize I have ranged over a very broad area in my remarks, but these things are of great interest and concern to me and the people of my riding. Indeed, I hope that for the most part they are of interest and concern to many people throughout the province.

I wish to thank you for this opportunity to make these observations and comments at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to engage in this debate and to follow a member who speaks for some of the problems of northern Ontario and presents his solutions. While I may not agree wholeheartedly with them, I am glad that he is speaking up on northern problems.

While the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) is in the House I would like to say that it came as a pleasant surprise to learn from the Speech from the Throne that the government is going to raise the minimum workmen's compensation pensions — at least those that are greatly out of date and some that were established years ago, especially in the mining industry for silicosis and so on; they're so low now they're unrealistic. And I hope that when the government determines the figure that it will set a reasonable amount.

One other aspect of workmen's compensation that I'd like the government to consider is the board hearings that we have down in Toronto. At present they can be held only in Toronto; and if a person happens to live in this vicinity he can go to a hearing without it costing him anything, whereas if he lives a great distance away he has to pay if he loses. If he wins, though, he's all right.

Sometimes there is justification for having these hearings, but people are deterred because it is quite an expensive proposition to come down to Toronto from northern Ontario. If there were something the government could do to equalize this, it would be a slightly fairer application of the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Don't nod your head. Do something!

Mr. Ferrier: There is another problem I want to mention in passing; and it has something to do with my old clergy background—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): It isn't that old.

Mr. Ferrier: I can't get away from it—and I am sure the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) will support me on this. It has nothing to do with the regulating of Sunday retail selling in Ontario. I think that the move toward an open and completely commercial Sunday, if it ever comes, is a bad thing. We should try to preserve the kind of day we have for family purposes, as a day off when people can get together and—

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Go to church!

Mr. Ferrier: Go to church, for sure—and preserve this very vital part of Ontario's life. I hope the government will move in a positive way in this issue.

There are two things in particular on which I want to speak tonight. I don't think I will be very long; but one has to do with the whole question of the high school situation in what used to be the town of Timmins.

The Timmins High and Vocational School was built in stages; and, believe it or not, there are 11 different floor levels in that school today. The kind of congestion in the halls that exists there just boggles the mind.

The gymnasiums they have are poor. I could read reports that have come to me from various people who have toured it—and I've

toured it myself. The gymnasiums are inadequate. The building is sort of a hodgepodge, in that it has been constructed in a number of stages. There's no overall planned educational outlook for it.

There's no real cafeteria. The music room is down in the basement next to the automotive room, and it's so dry down there that I know some expensive musical instruments have been damaged; I saw a $400-$500 instrument that had cracked.

The school simply is inadequate. Of course, the Ministry of Education have recognized there is a problem, but their answer is to rebuild the worst parts over about five years. They've allotted $1 million this year if the school board will take it. The school board is supposed to deal with some of the worst problems on a unit basis, which means that once the demolition and new construction are done, everything is put back as if no more work was going to be done. Maybe next year they'll go ahead and authorize another section; but while that's going on there'll be all the noise and disruption and so on.

When it's all completed, even if they go ahead with this five-year programme, they'll still have many glaring inadequacies. The gymnasiums that they are proposing will be less than they have in another school in the same school board's district. It has about—well, quite a bit less population.

Timmins was a town that grew up around the mining industry; and as we all know, the mining industry is a depleting resource—and some day you think that you're going to reach the end of it. When the school was built, in stages, people still had the idea that they were going to a mining community; they were going to make their bundle and they were going to get out. Well, some did—but there were an awful lot that didn't.

Then the Texas Gulf situation came along. One of the largest ore bodies ever found was discovered there and there's now a major complex built up around that. There were some smaller ore bodies discovered and the community now has a long degree of permanency; so that we're not thinking in terms of a community with 10 or 15 years future, but many, many, many years.

Rumours go around the mining community, and I have been told by some—I don't know how much truth there is to it—that Texas Gulf has found a great deal more ore on its property which will extend the length of its mine even many more years than already projected. So the community is going to be there for a long time.

Here you have this old school. There's no outside facilities where they can have a track. They have a lot of portables where it can get up to over 80 or 90 degrees in the spring and in the fall, and where it's freezing cold in the winter. There's no parking in the fall and in the spring; the cars are all around the neighbourhood—and the whole situation is bad.

Now if the Ministry of Education goes ahead with its proposal to rebuild the school in stages, it's still going to spend probably $5 million and it's going to have a complex that is certainly much better than what is there now; but it's not going to be a co-ordinated and well-planned school complex. It's going to cost just as much and you're going to have many of the problems still there as far as the track is concerned and a field for outdoor athletics—all this parking and congestion and this type of thing.

The school board, in talking to the Minister of Education, (Mr. Wells), suggested that really we should be thinking of a new school and not these kind of repairs to what we already have. His answer was: "Well, we've got budget restraints on capital spending and we can't go above those; so you'll have to be prepared to accept what we offer."

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that that wasn't a very realistic answer as I understand it. The people are prepared to wait two or three years and let that money sort of accumulate so they can go ahead with the new school. They are not demanding that it be now; if they get the promise of this and the outlook of getting it, then they will be satisfied.

The support in the community is solid. We talk about having regional government. The government created a large city so there would be more decision-making at the local level and the local input would have some relevance—would have some say in what goes on there. You've got all kinds of people backing it; the teaching staff; you have the JC's, who have written a letter within the last few days to the Minister of Education—you've got the Chamber of Commerce. I don't know who all you haven't got, but it's a pretty solid community support.

I think one of the complications in the whole thing has been that we have just completed in the last year a high school for the French-speaking population. Now I would like to say that I am very proud of the town of Timmins and the leadership that the school board has given over the years. When the legislation went through to allow French secondary schools full public support, the

school board immediately reacted in a positive fashion and rented facilities and went ahead with the construction of a new school.

I think this is tremendously commendable to the school board and to the fact that the community has been behind that whole concept. But I think now that there is another glaring problem, the government should take a pretty careful look at it. Realizing the time that the community is now going to be there, and realizing how much is going to have to be spent over the years to come up with the programme that the government has tentatively outlined, I think that we should try—even if it is a little more money—to provide another school on another site—a new school.

I think the benefits that will accrue to the students, to the staff that work there, the satisfaction of the town that its wishes were taken into account and the government has reacted positively to them—I think that the reward will be great for all concerned. I ask the Minister of Education and his officials to go back and to study the thing once again; to consider all the implications of this and to see if they can come up with something that is much better than they have proposed so far.

The reason that it is being bandied around in the community is here in the JC's letter and it is written in an editorial in the Daily Press. They say the only reason why the government has acted so unsympathetically and has not considered the arguments on a rational basis, a reasonable basis, is because our riding is not represented by a government member. They are saying the government is guided in its decisions mainly by whether you are on the government side or not; and they quote in this article: "They say everyone is equal in the eyes of the law, but some are more equal than others."

So they are suggesting that—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Even this government wouldn't be that callous.

Mr. Ferrier: I wouldn't think that this government would be that callous about a school where the future citizens of this province are concerned; and where so many in the community itself are behind the idea of a new school.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): How about the bridge on St. Joseph Island?

Mr. Ferrier: Well now they got a bridge to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: I just wonder whether this pork barrel idea—I don't think it's the main reason, but I wouldn't be surprised if there is some validity to it. I would just like to say that this type of thing had better be decided on its own merits.

Mr. Stokes: The Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) wouldn't tolerate that sort of thing.

Mr. Ferrier: If you are going to have good government and you are going to make wise and fair decisions, then this kind of basis for making decisions really has little place in the overall scheme of things.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ferrier: I hope these supporters of the government party in my riding, I hope that they have misjudged their party. Maybe they know the party a lot better than I do, being a part of it, but I would hope that this isn't true.

Mr. Stokes: I think they are away off base.

Mr. Ferrier: However, there may be some validity to it.

Leaving that issue and going into another issue, the Ministry of Natural Resources has just gone through a phase of reorganization. It has created a number of smaller offices, I think they call it, or smaller regions. But then it has created an overall region with responsibility for quite a large area where formerly there were maybe four or five regional offices. In our case it created the offices at Cochrane, Timmins, Gogama, Chapleau, Kapuskasing, Hearst, Moosonee and Kirkland Lake; and there is to be a regional office overseeing all the work in that area.

I noticed in the appointments of the personnel to the regional office that has been set up in my area that all the top dogs are from the old Lands and Forest Department. And a lot of the unrest and the anxiety among the people from the forming mining section is very much justified; that is that their role in the new ministry is not given very much consideration.

In deciding where this office should go, the decision was made to put the regional office in Cochrane. I just do not think that was the best place to locate that office. There is no mining operation going on up in that section. There is lots of mining going on in the Timmins area and in the Kirkland Lake area. There are forest products operations going on in both those areas too. I feel the most

logical place to put that regional office would have been in Timmins. The second most logical place would have been Swastika. But no, it ended up in Cochrane.

Why did it end up in Cochrane? The member for Cochrane North and the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle) is reported to have said to one of the leading lights up in the Cochrane North area there was no way that office was going to come into an NDP riding. So I suppose they had to rule out Timmins at that point, just as we had to rule out Sudbury when the office was moved from there over to Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Germa: It's the pork barrel!

Mr. Ferrier: It's the pork barrel.

Mr. Laughren: Did I hear an oink-oink?

Mr. Stokes: The Conservative Party didn't make any friends over that because it alienated half of its civil service in that ministry.

Mr. Ferrier: I want to tell you this, Mr. Speaker, the Timmins Press said that the only justification is that it is the pork barrel theory of politics.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It is the Conservative theory of politics.

Mr. Ferrier: They are looking after the Conservatives. But I don't know why they didn't put it in Swastika; there is a government member there. Why wasn't he given some consideration? Maybe there is a pecking order and when he wasn't in the cabinet he didn't get second choice either.

I just think those kind of nearsighted decisions, made on the basis of who is the member, are not doing the government any good. I would say that when the government feels that it has to make decisions on this basis, it is beginning to crumble. I think they were very much worried, and I didn't realize the chinks were beginning to show until the results in St. George and in Huron.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): What was the vote you got in Stormont again? I haven't heard it, for 24 hours.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): The NDP didn't do so well.

Mr. Ferrier: My goodness, two of the ridings that returned the largest Conservative majority in the last election are now over here in the Liberal camp.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Sixty per cent.

Mr. Deans: Forty per cent voted against the minister.

Mr. Ferrier: I would like to say this to the hon. member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell), that probably the government is going to have to do this kind of pork barrelling more and more in the next two years, because its support is crumbling more and more and that will be the last-ditch effort where it tries to hold onto office and stay in power.

Mr. Laughren: More HOME lots in Scarborough, more HOME lots in Scarborough.

Mr. Ferrier: But the old pork barrel is pretty slippery you know, and I think you can slip from it.

Mr. Laughren: They should make the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy. That should do it,

Mr. Ferrier: One thing that I want to take issue on is the following from the Timmins Press. It said, "Every time our car hits a pothole in what we laughingly refer to as provincial highways in this riding, we feel a little more bitter about the pork-barrel theory of politics." I hate to brag—that is not given to my nature—but I'd like to put it in this perspective: that there has been more highway work, more roads paved and upgraded, and more work done in my riding in the last five years than I think in almost any riding in the province.

Mr. G. Nixon: A good government. We are looking after the member.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Except maybe Stormont.

Mr. Ferrier: I don't know what I have done to be the beneficiary of this aspect of the pork barrel.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: That statement will get wide distribution in the riding. The member has said that to all his constituents.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): And I'd be glad to compliment the government.

Mr. Ferrier: Anyway, I have come full circle, Mr. Speaker, and in bringing my remarks to a conclusion I should say a couple of things about that land-drainage committee of which I am a member. We have been into the ridings of many of the members here—

An hon. member: Has the committee drained all the NDPers out?

Mr. Ferrier: We have had hearings about many of the problems that are concerning the rural people of this province in their operations, and invariably we get the report that it is the best meeting they have ever appeared before, that the members of the committee have been prepared to listen and to enter into dialogue and to offer some helpful suggestions as to what might be done to improve the Land Drainage Act and the production of agriculture in the province.

I've been happy to have had some little input into that and I think that committee will provide, when the report is finally in, a very useful and worthwhile contribution to the rural people of this province.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, you are continuing to provide very excellent decision-making in the chair that you hold. You have continued to hold the respect of the members of this House and I don't think that anybody would say that you have an easy job. But I think the fact that people have the respect for you that they have, and that while we may not always agree we abide by your decisions, I think that speaks very highly of you. So with those remarks I'd like to resume my seat.

Mr. Lewis: That says how it should be. That's how it should be.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Perth.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join with the other members who have spoken in this Throne debate in offering my congratulations to you on the manner in which you conduct the business of this House, and of course I'd particularly like to make note of the way in which you have handled the question period in the last few days. I think it is a considerable improvement over the past.

I'd also like to just make a comment of congratulations to the retired member for Huron, Mr. MacNaughton. I know he was here as a member for a considerable amount of time and he was certainly a good neighbour.

However, since the recent by-elections—and I'm happy to say our party was 100 per cent successful in those by-elections – I'm most happy to be a little closer connected to the new member for Huron (Mr. Riddell), particularly now that he is a neighbour not only in the constituency but a neighbour sitting beside me here in the Legislature.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What did the former member say after that by-election? Did he say that the people of Huron would be sorry?

Mr. Edighoffer: I believe he was quoted in the newspapers as saying that they would be sorry.

An hon. member: I think he just had a bad night.

An hon. member: I would like to think so.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He had a bad night. He was bitchy and vindictive. He was sorry to have lost the seat.

Mr. Edighoffer: As a matter of fact, I think I recall one day in the House here he referred to himself as a tired politician, so maybe that's the reason for the retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I always look forward to this Throne debate. A lot of members, of course, spend a lot of time speaking on behalf of the people in their riding and this is what I've done on many occasions in the past, speaking on behalf of the people in the Perth riding—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) leaving?

Mr. Lewis: What about those women chairing arbitration boards? Has the minister made any decisions yet?

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, I would like to forgo some of that tonight because I know a lot of that information—

Mr. Stokes: Say something about Stratford.

Mr. Edighoffer: —and suggestions are already in Hansard. If the member for Thunder Bay insists, I would be glad to make a comment in particular about the Stratford Shakespearean Festival.

Mr. Stokes: Fine town!

Mr. Edighoffer: We in southwestern Ontario, along with all the other people in the province, are very proud of this great tourist attraction which has just completed its 20th season. Members might be interested to know that this company—I should say the Stratford National Theatre Company, which is the name given to the company when it is on tour—just recently completed a tour of Denmark, Holland, Poland and Russia. On their arrival home they had many dignitaries out to meet them. I believe one included the

Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. McNie).

Mr. Lewis: I would not call him a dignitary.

Mr. Edighoffer: He was kind enough to present them with a plaque commemorating their return home. I know this was appreciated. I certainly hope that this member as well as many other members in this House visit Startford at some time or other during this summer.

Mr. Lewis: Always. Every summer.

Mr. Stokes: Fine town. Wonderful hospitality. Expensive, though.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, I have looked over this Throne Speech several times, but really I have found the vagueness somewhat alarming. This could be one reason why the Premier's (Mr. Davis) office decided to send a copy of the speech, I presume, to each member to his home address.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that you are very interested and concerned about efficiency and economy here in this government. I thought it would be interesting to draw to your attention the fact that the Premier's office didn't see fit just to hand us one of these Throne Speeches. They went to all the trouble to put them in large envelopes and mail them to our home addresses at a cost of 32 cents each. Believe it or not, I received my copy on March 24, which was considerably after the date the Throne Speech was read here in the House.

I'd like to suggest that this could be—

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Take it up with the Postmaster General. He's one of the member's party. He does a great job.

Mr. Edighoffer: For the information of the member, I just happened to keep the postmark. The speech was given on March 20 and the postmark is March 22. So one can't really put all the blame on the postmaster.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The member for Fort William didn't win on that one.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, we find in many parts of the province that growth has been very rapid. I find in the area which I represent that the growth in the population and industry and tourism is not moving upward as quicky as some of us would like to see it. Many comments have been made in the past stating that highways are an adequate means of transportation, and this is one of the stimulants needed to produce desired results.

Constant pressure has been brought to bear on the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) because we really need better access for our area. A group of our area representatives met the minister last fall and now a feasibility study is taking place in part of our area. I thank the minister for his co-operation in this regard, but I urge that this study should be completed as soon as possible.

In reference to highway planning and studies, I would like to mention for the minister's benefit—I'm sorry he's not here tonight but I'm sure he'll read this in Hansard—that I did receive his letter dated Jan. 31, in which he referred to a Lake Huron-Georgian Bay area highway planning study. In that letter he stated that he was very pleased to forward to me a copy of a complete technical report for that area in Ontario. He also enclosed two copies of a summarized version of the report which, he said: "I trust will be of interest to you."

Mr. Speaker, when I received that summary I thought it looked very familiar to me. I went through my files and—after rummaging through my files I pulled out the exact summary which a former minister released three or four years ago. There is no updating in this report except that the letter intimated there might be some in the fuure. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications is more up to date than this suggests. The Lake Huron-Georgian Bay area to which I refer is a great tourist area and it needs better attention than it appears to be receiving.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a moment or two on OHIP, the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. Since the Provincial Auditor dealt at some length with the plan, much attention has been given to this matter by the public in all parts of Ontario and, I think, for a very good reason.

On March 29, the daily paper in my area saw fit in its editorial to make some clear comments and it's well worthwhile to place them on the record as they refer to OHIP and other matters. I would like to quote from this editorial on this matter. The headline of the editorial said:

FIFTY-MILLION-DOLLAR LOSS COMES FROM TAXPAYERS' POCKETS.

Premier Davis and his cabinet now know how the federal cabinet feels every time Auditor General Maxwell Henderson lets loose with his annual report on gov-

ernment misspending and extravagance. Mr. Henderson's counterpart in Ontario has revealed in his report that Queen's Park can rival Ottawa in slipshod methods of spending and collecting money.

To begin with, there is the sum of no less than $10 million in fines that were levied by our courts but somehow never got collected. Even that, however, pales beside the funds which are, in actuality, owing to the government's health insurance plan.

In February and March of last year no less than $50 million in premiums was lost because the government didn't get around to collecting it or, more accurately, made the decision not to collect it. In addition, under-billing by OHIP cost another $5 million. The $50 million in uncollected premiums is most significant in that it is precisely the amount that Health Minister Richard Potter had to request from the government to see OHIP through for the year. In other words, if the premiums in question had been collected, Queen's Park would not have had to hand over $50 million extra of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Without telling us what had really caused the need.

Mr. Jessiman: What $50 million?

Mr. Edighoffer: To continue, "C. D. Howe—"

Mr. Jessiman: An old personal friend of mine, too.

Mr. Edighoffer: Great.

Mr. Jessiman: Great person!

Mr. Edighoffer: As I was saying:

> C. D. Howe, the dynamic and influential cabinet minister of the Mackenzie King and St. Laurent governments, once brought down the wrath of the opposition by saying, "What's a million?" The Ontario government has gone much farther than Mr. Howe and seems to be saying, "What's $50 million?"

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I think this gives you a general idea of how the people feel around the province.

In regard to health insurance, I find I have a fairly heavy load of constituent work. Included in this workload is a substantial amount of correspondence covering identification, general coverage, premiums and claims. The Provincial Auditor, and I believe it's on page 92 of the Provincial Auditor's report, stated:

> The . . . requirements for efficient claim processing have not been met mainly because of the errors present in the enrolment and claim information submitted to the plan. The sources of this information are the subscribers and the physicians providing health services.
>
> The quality of the information submitted by them is subject to only limited control by the plan. Consequently, the computerized system has produced claim rejects that have from time to time accumulated in quantities that were too great for the plan staff to investigate and correct.
>
> To pay these claims, plan management has elected to override or bypass the main controls in the computerized system. These controls are basically designed to ensure that payments are made only on behalf of insured persons, and that the claim is in fact payable . . .

Then the auditor continues on for the rest of that page. Over on page 94 he also states:

> The most significant deficiency in this bypass system was the fact that claim payment was made without confirming that the recipient of the rendered health service was an 'insured person'.

Many times, Mr. Speaker, I have heard it suggested that the identification card is insufficient. This is the credit card age, and I feel it is time the government set up a system whereby each person covered will have a card similar to a Chargex card or an oil company credit card so that each person receiving service will acknowledge receipt of that service.

The government has spent a considerable sum of money on commercials to tell the people that they are responsible for the price of health costs. Credit cards, by having the patients sign for the service received, would make people much more aware of the costs; and they would be a safeguard from the one deficiency mentioned by the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to make a passing remark about Ontario Hydro, because of the increasing costs. Last week, my leader placed before this House the case of the Ontario Hydro office building just a stone's throw away from here. I know I'm going to think about that building every time I pay my Hydro bill during the next 30 years.

I just can't comprehend the need for Ontario Hydro to accept the terms on a proposal basis. If the building is needed, I see no reason why it could not have been built in some less congested area or decentralized in several other areas of the province.

An hon. member: Very smart idea!

An hon. member: Quite right!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Edighoffer: The reason I mention this concern is that on Feb. 14 of this year I received a very lengthy telegram from the western Ontario regional office of Ontario Hydro in London. I won't read it all, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Who paid for that?

Mr. Edighoffer: —but the substance is contained in a few sentences so I'd like to quote this telegram so the hon. members will know what's really going on in western Ontario. This is dated Feb. 14:

LATER TODAY, WEDNESDAY, A CHANGE WILL BE ANNOUNCED IN ONTARIO HYDRO'S RETAIL ORGANIZATION IN WESTERN ONTARIO AND AS A MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE, WHOSE CONSTITUENTS ARE AFFECTED, WE THOUGHT YOU WOULD BE INTERESTED IN THE DETAILS.

THE 11 AREAS IN OUR WESTERN REGION ARE BEING CONSOLIDATED INTO SEVEN BY ENLARGEMENT OF THE RURAL TERRITORIES SERVED BY [SO ON AND SO FORTH].

THE CONSOLIDATION IS PART OF A PROVINCE-WIDE PROGRAMME OF REORGANIZATION BEGUN SOME YEARS AGO, WHICH ACHIEVES A SAVING TO RURAL POWER CONSUMERS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS ANNUALLY WHILE MAINTAINING SERVICE AT A DEPENDABLE LEVEL.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): A bunch of hogwash!

Mr. Edighoffer: It goes on:

THESE PRESENT MERGERS ALONE WILL SAVE ONTARIO HYDRO, AND ULTIMATELY ITS RURAL CUSTOMERS, $247,000 A YEAR IN OPERATING COSTS.

And that's just in the western Ontario area.

The other sentence which I found must interesting in the telegram was:

IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT ONTARIO HYDRO DO EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO COMBAT RISING POWER COSTS.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Gee whiz! And they're going to spend $180 million on College St.!

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Would my friend mind repeating that?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, say that again.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Yes, say it again.

Mr. Ruston: Look at that—$180 million on College St.!

Mr. Edighoffer: The sentence reads:

IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT ONTARIO HYDRO DO EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO COMBAT RISING POWER COSTS.

Mr. Singer: Yes, that's a good idea.

Mr. Edighoffer: To me, Mr. Speaker, that last sentence doesn't seem to correspond with the decision to contract for the new office building at a cost of $6 million a year for 30 years.

An hon. member: Holy smoke!

Mr. Ruston: They're running us right down.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, the people in my area are concerned about regional government and in particular about the cost. On page 5 I believe, of the Throne Speech, I believe, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor read, and I quote:

> My ministry has received proposals regarding regional government both east and west of Metropolitan Toronto and will introduce legislation in this regard. My government believes that a strong and reformed local government is in the best position to determine its own priorities and proposes to transfer to strengthened local governments more authority and responsibility for many of the decisions that relate to local matters.

Mrs. Campbell: And shorter term of office.

Mr. Singer: Education costs and all that sort of stuff.

Mr. Edighoffer: This all sounds great if we really don't think about it.

The first sentence refers to proposals from east and west of Toronto. This covers a lot of territory, and the way the parliamentary assistants have been beating the bushes, this could extend over a wide area.

Then the second sentence implies that it

is felt now that some of the local governments are not strong enough to carry out their present or additional duties. This feeling has been presented in many different areas by government spokesmen.

I thought the House might find it interesting to know that I've been interested enough to follow the speeches given by one of the parliamentary assistants to the provincial Treasurer (Mr. White), the hon. member for York East (Mr. Meen). I don't see him here tonight, but again I'm sure he'll reread this speech—

Mr. Lewis: He's out making a speech.

Mr. Ruston: He's probably giving one of those speeches someplace.

Mr. Deacon: That's right. He's still busy trying to explain why it's a reasonable type of government.

Mr. B. Newman: Government that listens.

Mr. Edighoffer: On looking over many of the speeches that he has given recently, I read one delivered on Feb. 5 of this year to the Ontario Association of Rural Municipalities; it was headlined, "Fears, Fallacies and Facts." In the course of his remarks he asked a number of questions, but two of them I found rather interesting. I quote from his speech:

> Don't we have to ask whether that reeve is ready for all the problems that are likely to beset his township in the years ahead, assuming they haven't begun to engulf him already? Can he, and his council contend with urbanization, pollution, congestion, traffic, and the increasing demand for services.

I found this most interesting because I suggest that these elected people can, if they are given the right tools. I think of one case in particular, regarding pollution, which the parliamentary assistant mentioned. I think of the town of Palmerston in my riding. We had a snowstorm a few weeks ago. They seemed to be having trouble with their sewage disposal system. I just read in the Palmerston Observer an article headlined "Something Has Really Hit the Fan."

Mr. Singer: Spell it out.

Mr. Reid: Name names!

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, it appears that the plant is not large enough to handle the town. Each day the town has to take 15 tons of sludge that is pumped out of the settlement chambers at the plant and spray it as fertilizer on farm fields. This seemed to work well until this snowstorm came up and many of these fields were inaccessible.

The Ministry of the Environment said that in such an emergency the town should spray on the site of the now abandoned Palmerston landfill garbage dump. The town did this because it thought it had the approval of the Ministry of the Environment. As they were doing it, they received word from the county health unit that this was impossible, because they were within 600 ft of a drainage ditch or natural watercourse.

Mrs. Campbell: The government that plans.

Mr. Singer: The government that listens.

Mr. Edighoffer: I am giving you this, Mr. Speaker, as just a typical example of how a town can be caught between two bureaucratic departments if the government is too remote.

Mr. Singer: But they listened.

Mrs. Campbell: But not to each other.

Mr. Ruston: They don't speak to one another.

Mr. Edighoffer: Referring to this parliamentary assistant's speech—I believe it was in the same speech—dated Feb. 5, he decided to make a comment about the school boards which were amalgamated a few years ago. He said:

> I am referring, of course, to what happened to Ontario school boards during the time when our present Premier was Minister of Education. Under his programme of modernization, some 4,850 school boards were dissolved to make way for 150 boards of broader jurisdiction. The result is no longer a matter of opinion or debate. It is a fact that these newer, stronger boards have been far better able to cope with the problems of urban growth, to meet new educational needs, to control spiralling costs, and to take advantage of certain improved forms of technology.

Mr. Deacon: Who was saying that?

Mr. Edighoffer: This was the parliamentary assistant to the provincial Treasurer. To continue:

> Yet that programme of consolidation aroused much criticism and hostility at the time. Today there is scarcely a trustee or taxpayer in all Ontario who would defend the old system.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the government obtain a little more information about the feeling of the people of the province, because I wonder why the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) is receiving so many delegations for more money today.

Mr. Singer: Because he holds interesting meetings to which he only invites Tories.

Mr. Edighoffer: Oh, that is the reason.

Mr. Singer: That is the reason. And he complains that they are giving him a snow job.

Mrs. Campbell: He is.

Mr. Edighoffer: I enjoy reading the speeches of the member for York East. I would like just to refer to a speech to a Lions Club on Feb. 12, 1973. The topic was "My Role in Regional Government." He referred to the Niagara region. I will just quote various short paragraphs.

> Finally, the communities of the Niagara region are communicating more effectively with Queen's Park than ever before. Later this week, for instance, the chairman of the Niagara Regional Council, John Campbell, is coming to Toronto to discuss his proposed budget with us, and we expect to clear up this matter in a single meeting.
>
> That's a far cry from the old days when the budgets of 26 separate municipalities would each have required 26 separate meetings. If that isn't an improvement in our machinery for governing municipalities, I don't know what is.

Again, Mr. Speaker, according to my colleague, the member for Welland South, delegations are forever being received with their requests for more money.

Now, I really enjoyed his speeches so much that on Feb. 22 when he spoke to a PC association—

Mr. Ruston: PC? What would that be?

Mr. Edighoffer: I think that is Progressive Conservative Association.

Mr. Ruston: Pretty conservative and not very progressive.

Mr. Edighoffer: Again he was speaking on behalf of regional government and during that speech—well he said a lot of things—

Mr. Ruston: Didn't amount to much, did it?

Mr. Edgihoffer: —but during that speech he said one sentence which shocked me a little bit, and I quote:

> We believe that a great amount of the power which we are using now should be passed to the municipalities as soon as they can handle it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: They can levy their own taxes; they can determine whether they are going to build expressways; they can do all those things.

Mr. Ruston: Oh boy, isn't that something.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North)**:** Is the member for Perth for or against it?

Mr. Ruston: Doesn't that sound swell—"when they can handle it." What an arrogant bunch.

Mr. Deacon: When does the Premier decide when they can handle it?

Mr. Ruston: The arrogant Conservatives.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, on March 7—you see how interested I am in his speeches—the same parliamentary assistant spoke in the city of Stratford, which happens to be in my riding!

Mr. Ruston: Great place!

Mr. Edighoffer: I am sorry I wasn't able to attend because he just didn't offer to take me along.

Mr. Ruston: The member was lucky.

Mr. Singer: If we had only asked.

Mr. Stokes: The member didn't ask, that is what the member for York East said today.

Mr. Singer: Yes, if we had only asked we could have come to the meeting.

Mr. Reid: He might have let us on the government aircraft.

Mr. Singer: In or out of Ontario?

Mr. Edighoffer: He was very fortunate because the meeting was reported in the newspaper the next day and one of the comments reported stated:

> By 1975 we hope to work out the jigsaw puzzle to show what may be considered outside boundaries of regions.

And he was referring to regional governments. This, Mr. Speaker, is most frightening to the people in my area.

Just recently the county hired a full-time planner at its own expense to work with the local elected officials to maintain orderly development. I see no reason why the local people with this initiative cannot continue to plan and govern as efficiently and effectively as possible.

I get the impression from the people I talk to—and these are people in elected positions—that they are even now afraid to ask the provincial government for advice on making changes for fear that they will step in, present a proposal and then say: "Think about it for a couple of months."

We in our area would welcome any suggestion if the government can back it up with facts and figures showing that efficiency and economy will be maintained.

I was happy, of course, to hear the provincial Treasurer in his speech on April 3 to the Association of Counties and Regions in Ontario say:

> There are no secret studies in the works and we have no specific plan for local government reform in any part of Ontario not already covered by our published proposals.

We will see in the very short future how correct that statement is.

Mr. Ruston: I think he has got them, but he has just buried them a little deeper.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, I have come close to the end. I have covered a few different areas, but to sum it up I would like to read an editorial from the Listowel Banner dated March 29, with the headline, "Auditor's Report Could Be Tip of Iceberg." I will quote so that I won't get any of the words incorrect:

> As the fictional lawyer, Perry Mason, used to say on television, "The truth will out." By "the truth," Mr. Mason was referring to the plain truth, sometimes called the unvarnished truth. That is the kind of truth that packs the wallop of a 10-oz boxing glove delivered by a heavyweight. It can hardly be compared to that disguised truth which sometimes can be so polished that it actually sounds like good news when it's really so bad.
>
> Ontario residents are still reeling from the result of the release last week of the first detailed public look at government spending in this province. It was something of a revelation. It's hard to imagine how anything as efficient as the "big blue machine" could be guilty of such blunders as that made by the Ministry of Health when it somehow or other neglected to collect $50 million in premiums.
>
> Add to this the fact that the head of one of the province's many royal commissions had a taxi bill that ran up to over $3,000; that cabinet ministers and their families, booking charter flights for God knows what, charged them to the former Department of Lands and Forests; and that the province borrowed almost $6 million from Ottawa to help finance municipal projects but allotted only $75,000 of this amount and you end up with what somebody has aptly described as a rat's nest.
>
> What bothers us is that this is the first year the province has received this kind of Maxwell Henderson-type report. We can't help but wonder if similar blunders and stupid, if not shady, practices in past years haven't added greatly to this province's debt. We'll never know what was buried in those rosy financial reports of days gone by.
>
> We have taken a jab at the "big blue machine" but in all honesty we must say that any party—right, left or centre—which has been in power as long as the Conservatives have in this province would be in the same position. The PCs have held a virtual dictatorship position in Ontario for over three decades. That's a long time to keep your eyes and ears open.

I'll read the whole article.

Mr. Ruston: Oh, yes! By all means; it is a good article.

Mr. Edighoffer: It really refers to all of us. Now I'll continue to quote:

> When we think of the Ontario Conservatives our mental image is not that of a "big blue machine" but of fat cats sitting in the sun, licking the cream off their faces.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Edighoffer: Just wait a minute.

Mr. Ruston: Not as fat as that member is.

Mr. Singer: All nine Tories are avidly listening.

Mr. Edighoffer: To continue:

> Personally, we prefer to see a government with a lean, hungry look.

Mr. Deacon: Some of them aren't fat cats.

Mr. Edighoffer: It goes on:

But not enough of the other fellows contesting seats give that impression either. And so we get an auditor's report like the one we got last week.

It's great to be able to point the mad finger in somebody else's direction but don't forget we're the ones who have put those in power where they are for 30 years. We know it doesn't make it any easier to bear but we're getting the government we deserve. No more, no less.

Mr. Ruston: I must subscribe to that paper.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, just so that—

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Get an LIP grant to look after it.

Mr. Edighoffer: Pardon?

Mr. Evans: Just get an LIP grant to look after it.

Mrs. Campbell: What about a snap, crackle and pop?

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, so that the iceberg referred to in the headline of that editorial doesn't expand any more above or below water, I wish to close by saying I wholeheartedly support the amendment placed before this House by my leader on March 26, 1973.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Stokes: Sock it to them!

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): There are only eight of the member's colleagues to support him.

Mr. Stokes: Sock it to them! There are only eight of them.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join in this debate. Quite frankly, I had intended to spend a considerable amount of time in writing out a speech so that I might read it here but after having heard the comments of the hon. member for Downsview, I don't think it's safe to read speeches in the House.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I would have been after this member. I have a little sympathy for the other fellow.

Mr. Rhodes: He would be after me on that?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Rhodes: First of all, I'd like to say that I would like to join with others who have congratulated the new members of the Legislature, the members for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) and Huron (Mr. Riddell). It was interesting to note the comments of the member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer) who pointed out that they were the new members from the previous by-elections. I believe that right now on the desk of the member for Downsview is a copy of the article written by a former member of this House—a former New Democratic member, Mr. Walter Pitman—in which he has some comments to make on the by-elections.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I have read them.

Mr. Rhodes: There is a degree of truth in the remarks by Mr. Pitman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Oh, I've read it.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): We read it.

Mr. Rhodes: I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have the hon. member for St. George here, because a year-and-a-half ago, when I first came into this House, a number of jibes and comments came from the Liberal benches referring to someone changing parties and becoming elected. I am pleased to note that at that time I was a "turncoat," but I understand the hon. member for St. George is one who has found great wisdom and has joined the benches of the Liberals. So perhaps we have something in common.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A many-coloured coat!

Mr. Singer: That's all though!

Mr. Reid: Except she's headed in the right direction and the member for Sault Ste. Marie isn't.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, before I get to make comment on some of the items I have in mind, I would like to draw one thing to your attention, sir. I say this without malice toward any member of this House, but I do wonder whether we should not find some way to avoid bringing strictly municipal matters into the Legislature for discussion.

Mr. Reid: How about we ban political matters too, as the Premier (Mr. Davis) would like it?

Mr. Rhodes: Very often in the House matters that are strictly of a municipal nature are brought forward, especially during the question period. I am sure you would agree that if all members of this House were to bring their particular municipal problems here we would spend an awful lot of time dealing with them.

Mr. Reid: We can't get an answer out of the civil service.

Mr. Rhodes: These are matters that are being handled by municipal politicians, duly elected by the people of the various municipalities.

Mr. Singer: Who do exactly as they want.

Mr. Rhodes: I am assuming, and I think correctly so, that they are qualified. Some of them have reached such high and lofty positions as to become members of this Legislature, which proves they were very qualified when they were municipal people.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They would have been better to stay where they were, they could have done something.

Mr. Rhodes: I think a lot of our time is lost in dealing with what are purely municipal problems and would well be left at the municipal level. If they have a particular problem, then they could come here.

Mr. Singer: Like we could in education.

Mr. Rhodes: It's interesting to sit through the days of the debate and listen to the members of the opposition criticize, quite vehemently, the individuals who serve in the cabinet—

An hon. member: The member is too blind.

Mr. Rhodes: —picking out the ministers one by one and attempting to dissect them, which I suppose is the function of the opposition as long as it is done in a critical fashion that is constructive. But it's rather difficult for me—

Mr. Lawlor: That's what the government always says.

Mr. Rhodes: —to accept that people will sit and use such terminologies as "incompetent," as has been used, "sorry lot," as has been used—

Mr. Singer: What's wrong with those words?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): They only apply across the floor.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't think they really mean that, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: Of course we do!

Mr. Rhodes: I don't think they really mean that. They are simply saying that they themselves would like to have the opportunity to sit on these benches and would like to do the job themselves.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Doesn't the member feel what we feel that about the fellows opposite sometimes?

Mr. Rhodes: It would perhaps be well if some of them would take the time to join with the ministers and find out what their activities are—

Mr. Singer: Yes, we ask questions and they won't tell us. They say: "I don't care to discuss that today, or tomorrow or the next day."

Mr. Rhodes: The very ministers these members criticize, criticize for their incompetence, criticize for their inability to do their job—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Rhodes: These same members are very quick to go to those ministers. I see them trotting across the floor regularly and asking them to do something for their riding—

Mr. Lawlor: They leave us with very little alternative. Who are we going to talk to? Better to talk to a nincompoop than to nobody.

Mr. Rhodes —which the ministers very graciously do because it's part of their job. And the other feature of it is these are the same ministers on whom demands are made to go all throughout this province to carry out their duties; I don't feel it is just to criticize these people, no matter who they are—

Mr. Singer: No, they are beyond criticism.

Mr. Rhodes: —for not doing their job; because they are doing their job; and a very onerous one it is too.

Mr. Lawlor: I don't blame the hon. member. If I were he I would say the same thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: Unfortunately for the hon. members opposite, none of them have had the opportunity to enjoy that position.

Mr. Lawlor: We are getting ready.

Mr. Rhodes: And none of them have had the opportunity to really assess what the responsibilities of the job are.

Mr. Drea: Nor will they.

Mr. Rhodes: I will not go so far as to make that prediction. In the year 2,000, God knows what may happen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: Well Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that members from northern Ontario—and certainly members from my riding, Sault Ste. Marie—have stood in this House for many years and have complained about the condition of the highways in northern Ontario.

I certainly am not going to change that tradition, because I am satisfied in my mind—as I am sure other hon. members from the north are—that there is a definite and distinct need, now, for something to be done to improve the highways in northern Ontario.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): If they can spend $1.3 billion in Metro Toronto—

Mr. Rhodes: It has to be done in the very, very near future.

Mr. Singer: All those municipalities; be careful!

Mr. Rhodes: Now I have listened with sympathy, I must say, to the members from Metropolitan Toronto—the member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens), the member for Downsview, the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon)—my goodness, do they have anybody outside of Metropolitan Toronto? Oh yes.

Mr. Ferrier: They haven't got many from the north!

Mr. Rhodes: Anyway, they have talked about the problems here in Metro; and when one comes down here from the far northern hinterland as I have, and the hon. member for Cochrane South and the others from Thunder Bay and the Sudbury area—

Mr. Reid: And Rainy River!

Mr. Rhodes: —we do understand, after being here a while, that they do have major problems here. There is no question about that.

Mr. Stokes: They are in a dilemma of their own making.

Mr. Rhodes: Many of them they have created themselves, but they are there.

Mr. Reid: With the government they have over there—naturally!

Mr. Laughren: It wasn't our government.

Mr. Rhodes: What I am simply saying is that—if I can come from the north and recognize these problems and sympathize with the members in the Metropolitan Toronto area, for goodness sake can't they recognize the problems we have up in the north?

Mr. Singer: We do, we do. It's the cabinet that won't do anything.

Mr. Rhodes: I stood here in this House the other day—

Mr. Reid: It's not this party!

Mr. Stokes: Give it to them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: I stood here the other day and made a comment about the problems we have in the north. The member for Downsview very quickly interjected that I wouldn't understand the problems in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Reid: Sault Ste Marie hasn't got those problems.

Mr. Stokes: He is talking right at the minister? He is the only one there.

Mr. Rhodes: What I am saying is that something must be done to improve highway conditions in the north.

Mr. Stokes: Sock it to them!

Mr. Rhodes: May I simply draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, one particular area of highway in northern Ontario that is of great concern to me, and that's the area of Highway 17 that runs from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury, a distance of approximately 185 miles.

Mr. Singer: The former member for Sudbury did his best.

An hon. member: His best wasn't good enough!

Mr. Rhodes: Let me say this: I am using 1971 statistics—

Mr. Singer: Elmer made an annual speech for 11 years—

Mr. Rhodes: —but in 1971 in northern Ontario—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Give the member for Sault Ste. Marie a chance to speak.

Mr. Ruston: He is not saying anything!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): He is saying more than the member for Essex-Kent. We listened to him and he didn't say anything.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, in what might be called northern Ontario, that area from roughly North Bay to the Manitoba border; 245 persons lost their lives in highway accidents in 1971.

In the area between Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury a total of 35 persons were killed.

Mr. Stokes: And that's one of the better parts of the north.

Mr. Rhodes: When we look at the mileage of paved highway in northern Ontario, the 185 miles from Sudbury to Sault Ste. Marie make up five per cent—

Mr. Singer: Wouldn't the member have thought that the great Tory government would have done something about it?

Mr. Stokes: After 30 years?

Mr. Rhodes: —and yet 15 per cent of the fatalities occurred on that highway from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury.

In the whole of northern Ontario we have approximately 10.8 per cent of the total population of this province. In the area between Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury—and I think I am being a little generous here; I'm including the metropolitan area of Sudbury, the city of Sault Ste. Marie and the communities in between, as well as Elliot Lake slightly to the north—approximately 240,000 people reside. With 245 fatalities, there was almost one killed per 1,000 of population on that piece of highway in northern Ontario.

Mr. Singer: One would think the government would have done something about that.

Mr. Rhodes: If we had the same average throughout the province, 7,700 persons would have been killed in the Province of Ontario. (See retraction on page 628).

Mr. Singer: Shocking—absolutely shocking.

Mr. Rhodes: I think something must be done, and must be done soon, to improve that highway's condition.

Mr. Singer: Right.

Mr. Foulds: Too bad the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) isn't here to hear the hon. member.

Mr. Rhodes: In the north we have to travel long distances between our communities. It must be convenient for those who live in this part of the province to be able to go from city to city with a degree of speed and with the highways in a condition that can handle the traffic. I think sometimes they have to be extremely brave to do it, but I think they do it and do it well. But when the closest municipality is 185 miles to the east and 400 miles to the west, highway travel becomes very vital, not only to the individual wishing to communicate between these cities for business purposes, but for the moving of goods, the moving of services between these communities.

As an example—and I say this because I think it is common for many people in the southern portion of the province—recently a task force on housing was formed and is presently going about the province.

Mr. Singer: Where, oh where, is the Minister of Transportation and Communications?

Mr. Rhodes: When I received the list of where these people were going, I found out that they would be in Thunder Bay and they would be in Sudbury, but they were not going to visit the community of Sault Ste. Marie, which is a city of approximately 85,000 with a surrounding area of 100,000 people.

Mr. Singer: Does the minister ever listen to the member?

Mr. Rhodes: When I inquired and asked why it was so, I was advised, "Well the people from the Sault Ste. Marie area can commute to Sudbury or they can go to Thunder Bay."

Well of course it is ridiculous. It turns out the reason for it—and I say this again without malice—you just don't understand the distances that we are living with in those communities.

Mr. Stokes: They are treating the member with disdain.

Mr. Rhodes: So I think really that you must recognize the need as it applies to transportation needs in the north.

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister listen to the member?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: In the Throne Speech one of the points that was brought out by His Honour was the need to control the use of land, and it pointed out the fact that the Planning Act and other legislation related to land development will be put under review.

Mr. Stokes: What about those mobile home parks they won't let you establish?

Mr. Rhodes: The thing I want to say to you is this, that we in northern Ontario have long said that we recognize that you are rapidly using up all of the land in this area. You are building on it faster than you can clear it in some cases. We are saying that what we have in northern Ontario is a lot of land, a lot of good land that can be used for good industrial development.

Mr. Stokes: And they won't let him develop it.

Mr. Rhodes: I am asking you to recognize the need for that industrial growth of secondary industry in northern Ontario. I am asking you to recognize it by putting this industry in that part of the province.

With today's technology and the advances that have been made in pollution control and environmental consideration, industry can be developed in these areas without doing harm to the environment, by starting from square one and building. To attempt to do that in this area now is very difficult. You are using up valuable land that is needed for agricultural purposes, for recreational purposes! valuable land that should not be used for paved parking lots or industrial development, but should be left as it is, as usable land either to be farmed or to be used for park area or to meet your very great need for residential development.

But come up and see what we have to offer. I think that industry can locate there. It is going to require some government consideration. You are going to have to look at incentives for these people to get them up there. There is going to have to be serious consideration given by the federal government. My Liberal colleagues might talk to their colleagues in Ottawa about this.

Mr. Drea: What about Sudbury?

Mr. Rhodes: We are in the same spot in northern Ontario— as was shown on television last evening I believe—as the people are in western Canada. Freight rates are killing us. It is almost impossible to get your material out, and it costs a great deal to get it back in again.

Mr. Reid: Don't tell us, tell them.

Mr. Rhodes: These are the things that are important.

Mr. Drea: Tell Ottawa.

Mr. Rhodes: We need jobs in northern Ontario. These jobs can be brought about by industrial development and growth in our communities. We want to keep our children at home. We want to keep our young people in our northern communities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Why doesn't the minister jump in bed with them?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Because the member is supporting them now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am not worrying about the member either.

Mr. Deans: I can tell he isn't.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, we spend a considerable amount of money in building schools and educational facilities in northern Ontario. Our product, which is our youth, comes out of these fine educational facilities, which we pay for in taxes throughout each year. Yet they find no jobs in their own communities. They must come down here into this metropolitan area that is supposed to be the great end-all where opportunity is. Yet they would be better to stay home, because in coming down here they only add to the problem that we are told exists here, and we recognize exists here.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): That is what regional government does.

Mr. Rhodes: If they could stay and do something in our part of the province we would be much better off, and I think the province as a whole would be better off.

I don't for one minute think this should all happen overnight, as has been suggested is going to happen; the wave of a wand, a change, if there was a different government it would all have happened. I don't believe that at all. I don't believe for one minute

that if the New Democrats were in power this would have been done. And I don't believe for a minute that it would have been done with the Liberals in power.

Mr. Reid: Oh, yes it would.

Mr. Rhodes: I honestly believe that progress is now being made now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that you can walk into my riding any time you like—and I want anybody to walk around—and tell me what has been done by the federal government in my riding to help that area grow. So let's not get too excited about what the great Liberal Party would have done at all.

Mr. Stokes: They built a forest research school. That's something this government hasn't done.

Mr. Rhodes: Not in my town, they didn't.

Mr. Stokes: They did in Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Rhodes: Well, it is a different Sault Ste. Marie. I would say that the hon. member for Thunder Bay must be lost in that vast, huge riding of his, because if he can show me a forest research school in Sault Ste. Marie, I woud be pleased to find it and I've lived there all my life.

Mr. Stokes: I will take the member around some time.

Mr. Rhodes: Would he do that? He is too busy catching pickerel.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to touch upon the Ontario Municipal Board—

Mr. Reid: One of them is wrong.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It is evident it must be the member for Sault Ste Marie; the member for Thunder Bay is never wrong!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Will the member for Sault Ste Marie proceed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: I think, Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the member for Thunder Bay, his choice of words was wrong. He is referring to a forest insect pathology laboratory and research facility. It's not a school. If that's what he is referring to, the hole is dug.

Mr. Stokes: That's what I am referring to.

Mr. Rhodes: Oh well, it is not a school.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Rhodes: Anyway, I'd like to touch on the Ontario Municipal Board for a moment.

Much has been said about the inadequacies of the Ontario Municipal Board and some of the problems that they face each day in attempting to handle planning and what have you. I personally am not a great fan of the Ontario Municipal Board, but I don't know what could take its place.

The Ontario Municipal Board has performed a very useful function as far as the citizens of my community are concerned. The Ontario Municipal Board has worked effectively. It has been that court of last resort that many citizens look to as the only protection they have from municipal politicians, from planning boards and what have you.

I think the Ontario Municipal Board has done a good job in the past, and if there is any criticism of them it is because they have had too much work to do. I think a lot of the things that are sent to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval could well be left off their agenda.

It seems utterly silly that little planning things or simple rezoning, where there has been no objection from anyone, have to be sent to the Ontario Municipal Board for their approval and it simply drags on for months. These sort of things could be handled effectively, I think, by changing—

Mr. Reid: He doesn't like anything about this government.

Mr. Rhodes: —and I'm pleased to see in the Throne Speech that is going to happen. There is going to be a look at the Ontario Municipal Board, and that's something that I'm looking forward to having happen. Credit the government with a very good step forward.

Mr. Singer: The minister waited all night for that!

Mr. Rhodes: I'm so pleased to have the hon. member for Downsview present. I miss him when he is not here.

Mr. Singer: The member does? I will stay for the rest.

Mr. Rhodes: And I must say, Mr. Speaker, when he came in this morning I didn't know whether to applaud or salute that tie, it's a beautiful thing.

Mr. Singer: One modest dresser to another.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, another item in the Throne Speech that I was interested in was the move to increase the government's activity in forest management. If you live in northern Ontario that is a very important factor.

Our economy is dependent to a great extent upon the forest industry. To do something to enrich that forest industry and to make sure that the forests of our province are going to be a good resource is important. The government is taking that step and I'm looking with interest to see how effective it can be.

I think it is essential that it be done now, and that we get moving into keeping that resource as it is. The cost of the product is getting higher as a result of it having to be hauled so much further to mills. I don't have to tell the members for the other northern ridings about that, but I want to see that resource management and the reforestation programme carried out.

In tourism, again there is a move by the government to provide more assistance to the tourist industry. I agree it may sound parochial, but it is important to our economy in the north; tourism is a great industry for us. It dumps untold millions of dollars into the economy of this whole province. And we want this to happen.

Mr. Laughren: A real tax base there.

Mr. Rhodes: A real tax base is the comment from the gentleman from the Nickel Belt riding.

Mr. Foulds: With a note of irony in his voice.

Mr. Ferrier: Some of the NOTO people weren't saying kind things about the government in their last issue.

Mr. Rhodes: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the member.

Mr. Ferrier: Some of the NOTO people weren't saying very kind things about the Premier in their last issue.

Mr. Rhodes: I am not too concerned about what the NOTO people might say about me or about my colleagues.

Mr. Ferrier: They are the member's supporters.

Mr. Rhodes: This simply goes to show that we don't jump up and down every time one particular group applauds or pulls the string, unlike some members of this Legislature that I know, or members of certain parties that I know.

Mr. Laughren: Except the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Ferrier: The members opposite jump for the Chamber of Commerce pretty well.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't have to jump for the Chamber of Commerce either. I simply say that despite comments from the member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Reid: The government just jumps when Mr. Moog pulls the string.

Mr. Lawlor: That is the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Rhodes: If the member for Nickel Belt wants to stand in this House and say openly and publicly to the people of northern Ontario, or for that matter of all of this province, that tourism is bad for this province, then by all means I will give him the time to do so now.

Mr. Laughren: It does not provide a tax base and the member knows it.

Mr. Rhodes: Tourism has paid a lot of money; it has helped to keep a lot of people working. All one has to do is take a look at what's happening.

It's a great thing about the members of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker. They continually attack those things that provide jobs in this province. I understand that my friend from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is going to take that on a little later on in this debate, and I want to listen with interest.

Mr. Laughren: The substandard wages too.

Mr. Lawlor: When International Nickel breathes, the party over there freezes with complete paralysis from the neck up.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I understand there are a number of speakers left to go on before we adjourn for tonight. One in particular whom I want to listen to with a great deal of interest would be the member for Port Arthur, I think it is, who is apparently going to follow shortly. So I will simply conclude by saying this, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Foulds: Just as soon as the member sits down.

Mr. Stokes: Say to this government that if they ignore the north they do so at their own peril.

Mr. Laughren: Cross the floor.

Mr. Rhodes: I am convinced that in the last several years this government has shown a very keen interest in helping northern Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Like Highway 17.

Mr. Rhodes: I am satisfied that we are going to do that.

Mr. Reid: What was there in the Throne Speech that referred to northern Ontario? What was there?

Mr. Rhodes: I think with regard to the reference in the Throne Speech to air transportation—

Mr. Reid: Three airports for three northern Indian reserves; nothing else!

Mr. Rhodes: Let's wait and see what's going to happen.

Mr. Foulds: Nothing for the north and the member knows it.

Mr. Rhodes: We don't have to worry about what is going to—

Mr. Laughren: Support our amendment.

Mr. Reid: A fertilizer plant up in Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Rhodes: I didn't realize the member for Rainy River was so touchy. But I think he relates better to Manitoba anyway.

Mr. Reid: Did the member read the Throne Speech? What is in there about northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He is running for the leadership, didn't the members know?

Mr. Drea: He was running for the leadership.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh I thought he was!

Mr. Reid: We have 22 running for the leadership. We have lots of talent.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, what I will do now is thank you for your attention and allow my friend from Port Arthur to continue.

Mr. Singer: He is one of the few Tories who has a sense of humour—one of the very few.

Mr. Reid: All of them have got to have it to sit over there.

Mr. Lawlor: The member could have been far more critical of his government than that.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne should more appropriately be entitled the "Drone from the Throne." It is almost as if Dalton Camp was on leave of absence this past year. Under the delusion that he is supplying the federal Conservatives with sure-grip ballet shoes, he is in fact probably at this very moment slipping sophisticated banana skins under the heavy-footed two-step of droopy-eyed Bob.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the Throne drone—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I just have to hear to understand what he is saying.

Mr. Foulds: —looked like a scissors-and-paste job of leftovers from press releases, unimplemented legislation, and those unused, prefabricated speeches—

Mr. Singer: Who wrote that?

Mr. Foulds: —delivered at Rotary Club luncheons.

An hon. member: That's what it was.

Mr. Singer: Who wrote that one?

Mr. Foulds: The only other speeches delivered this session which rival it in unequalled inflated verbiage—

Mr. Singer: Who wrote that one?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): It sounds like an old reply to the Throne Speech by the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. Singer: He used to deliver that off the top of his head. He didn't have to read it.

Mr. Foulds: —are the interjections by the hon. member for Downsview and the statement this afternoon by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) on Heritage Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: That statement this afternoon, like the Speech from the Throne, was full of great vocabulary but the syntax certainly lacked any panache—and that is leaving aside the content. One can quite easily leave aside the contents of that statement this afternoon, and the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): And the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Yes, right; but he won't go away.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He is going away, by heaven.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I might.

Mr. Foulds: Such a collection or resounding twaddle I have never heard; except of course from the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry. If the member wants to talk about me I'll stay.

Mr. Foulds: That is my last mention.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the despair that I feel about this government; the tremendous ennui, frustration that one must feel every time one enters this chamber; the feeling that, "My God, here we go through the ritual again"—in spite of that feeling, I feel that one must keep trying—keep trying to penetrate the armour and the insensitivity of this government.

Mr. Lewis: And the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) in particular. Just take a look at him.

Mr. Foulds: Let's just contemplate a few of the gems from the Speech from the Throne. How resounding it all does sound.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Now take it easy. We know the member can read.

Mr. Foulds: Take this one, Mr. Speaker, on page 6: New policy initiatives in the energy field are a matter of active and intensive consideration."

Now, that's not just a phrase, Mr. Speaker. It's not just a sentence in the Speech from the Throne, but a whole paragraph. Let's just roll those orotund tones of that one around again:

> New policy initiatives in the energy field are a matter of active and intensive considerations.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Pretty impressive.

Mr. Lawlor: Should have said "energetic."

Mr. Foulds: Listen to the bugle call. Listen to the trumpeting. But what does that sentence, nay, that whole paragraph mean?

Mr. Drea: Did the member write that himself? He didn't write that.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He did though. I watched him.

Mr. Foulds: In plain English, "New policy initiatives in the energy field are a matter of active and intensive consideration," means in effect, Mr. Speaker, we're thinking about what the hell we're going to do with energy. That's what it means. The member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough), the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence), the Premier (Mr. Davis) and even William Kelly are all together thinking—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mainly William Kelly.

Mr. Foulds —about what this province is going to do with energy. And before I go on in a masochistic way to the other—

Mr. Drea: Why doesn't the member put some in his speech?

Mr. Foulds: —delights of the Throne Speech, I would like to take a look at a few of my favourite cabinet ministers and a few of my favourite government members.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): It is an old pastime over there. Delete that. We have heard it before.

Mr. Foulds: I really don't think the member for Scarborough West—and I admire and respect him enormously—

Mr. Drea: The member had better.

Mr. Foulds: —really did justice last week in his review of the galaxy on the cabinet and government benches.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): I was insulted. The leader of the NDP missed me.

Mr. Foulds: There is little hope in the Throne Speech, so perhaps we'll have to look forward to the budget. That gets me to my first favourite cabinet minister, the Treasurer (Mr. White). He is always the doughty battler full of bumptious skill, good humour; a delightful opponent; the dead-end kid of the Conservative cabinet.

Mr. Deans: He's a miserable, useless—

Mr. Foulds: Carry on. I love this interjection.

Mr. Lewis: He said he's a dead-end kid.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Don't the members agree about him?

Mr. Foulds: Not quite. The Treasurer isn't quite the great white hope of the "big blue machine," but he is certainly the most rotund lightning rod for his slightly shifty-eyed friend who sits occasionally to his right.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Very occasionally.

Mr. Foulds: I take that back, Mr. Speaker; that's a little too harsh. The Premier can't really help it that if, in the remaking of the Premier, everything in fine precision has been remodelled except his eyes. Do you notice how they dart about—darting is probably a better word than shifty—

An hon. member: Yes, I've noticed.

Mr. Foulds: —like two alert, slightly doubtful but alive sparks imprisoned in a hollow outer shell. I noticed him on television the other night, Mr. Speaker. I don't often get a chance to observe him in this Legislature.

Mr. Deans: Nobody does.

Mr. Foulds: He was at that point reading his artful and yet hollow speech to the oil barons in Alberta. Those eyes kept darting around the audience, not quite exuding the confidence that the whole, sleek, well-tailored, persona does here in the Legislature.

Mr. Deans: He was looking for prospects for Bill Kelly.

Mr. Foulds: Did Hansard get that? He was looking for prospects for Bill Kelly.

Those eyes seemed to be saying, "How am I doing, fellows?" And they weren't really getting any positive response. They certainly weren't getting the positive response that the Premier gets from the sycophants here in the Legislature. In fact, those eyes looked a little bit as if they were watching a tennis match.

You know, I really have a great deal of sympathy for the Premier. I'd like to relate a story if I may, an anecdote that happened to someone whom I know quite intimately.

Mr. Drea: Why doesn't the member stick to the script?

Mr. Foulds: The Conservative Party, I understand, is still using the services of a market research company from Detroit. They are surveying the province, I'm told, on the average of once every two weeks or so to find out what the public is thinking. You see it's a government of reaction in the real sense, not only reaction in the conservative, legislative sense but reaction to popular opinion. They have no concept of leadership.

Mr. Laughren: They are working on the member for Wellington-Dufferin now.

Mr. Foulds: The surveyor came into my home, as a matter of fact, and asked my wife if she would care to answer a few questions. After the first six pages of things about—

Mr. Drea: Did the member for Nickel Belt write that? I didn't think so.

Mr. Foulds: —prices and the member for Scarborough Centre and other nonpolitical matters, it became apparent as the survey went on it was in fact a political survey. The key, turning-point question was: "There has been a lot of controversy lately about whether Mr. Davis should be called Premier Davis or Prime Minister Davis."

Well, my wife happened to have been in the Legislature a year ago December, late one Thursday evening when we were discussing the supplementary estimates of the then Department—soon to be Ministry—of Community and Social Services. My good friend and colleague from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) had raised the matter of the inadequate allowances paid to those on general welfare assistance and under the Family Benefits Act and that sleek group over there had pounded their desks in derision at the member for Sudbury East.

That, Mr. Speaker, seared itself indelibly on my wife's mind, so when this surveyor asked, "What do you think Mr. Davis should be called?", because the Premier had been there, along with the other cabinet ministers, calling down derision upon my colleague from Sudbury East, she said something in very unparliamentary language. Roughly translated, I think you could report it in this House as saying, "I think Mr. Davis should be called a fat, complacent person of unknown parental origin."

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That means she is a good NDPer, I must say.

Mr. Foulds: Now I like the Premier, Mr. Speaker. I think that underneath that programmed exterior, underneath that false confidence, underneath that complacency—

Mr. Drea: Notice he guards his back.

Mr. Foulds: —underneath that arrogance, there is a human being striving to get out.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Foulds: And it's that Bill Davis—

Mr. Drea: He keeps his hand behind his back.

Mr. Foulds: —the one that never has any chance, that I wish well; the one that never has a chance to live.

The Premier's character has the stuff of tragedy in it—tragedy on the scale of Willie Loman.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, that's not bad.

An hon. member: That's pretty good.

Mr. Lewis: That's not bad.

Mr. Foulds: Now he might have to get a reference to get that one, but that's about it.

Mr. Laughren: He is Willie's oldest son.

Mr. Foulds: The inner being I wish well and freedom. The outer being represents all that is false, harmful and insincere in politics and in political life in this province.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I watch the Premier with fascination, with the awe, the horror and the compulsion of watching a tragedy.

For comic relief I turn to the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells). Now there's a minister that one cannot watch with any sense of impending tragedy, no darting eyes there—

Mr. Laughren: It's already happened.

Mr. Foulds: —except, with increasing frequency, as the member for Scarborough West pointed out, to the often vacant seat of the Premier, seat No. 7.

No, the Minister of Education is fascinating in a totally different way—handsome, dashing—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, no!

Mr. Foulds: —jaw jutting out, well tailored—

Mr. Lewis: I dissociate myself.

Mr. Foulds: —he represents all that is good in the man who reads "Playboy," the grade 8 boy who has never quite grown up because he still doesn't quite know what girls look like without their clothes on—

Mr. Laughren: He's a locker-room boy.

Mr. Foulds: —so he turns to the tinted and glossy pinks of the Playboy centrefold.

Mr. Lewis: I assure you, that's quite true.

Mr. Laughren: Not bad, if not "Penthouse."

Mr. Foulds: But I must give the Minister of Education his due—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. Rule No. 16(a), 12, reads as follows:

> In debate, a member shall be called to order if he speaks disrespectfully of Her Majesty, or any of the royal family, or the Governor General or the administrator of Canada, or the Lieutenant Governor or the Administrator of the province.

Now, it seems to me that the hon. member should be permitted a certain amount of leeway and humour in his speech—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Did he say something bad about him?

Mr. Foulds: Not yet.

Mr. Speaker: —but he is speaking of the Premier of this province and I think he is just going a little bit too far.

Mr. Deans: No, no, he is speaking of the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker: He is going a little too far.

Mr. Drea: Come on, clean up the act. It's five after 10.

Mr. Laughren: What a lot of nonsense!

Mr. Foulds: To the point of order, and continuing my remarks, you interrupted me at a most opportune time, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): He isn't dry behind the ears yet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Clean up the act.

Mr. Foulds: I must give the Minister of Education his due.

Mr. Drea: Clean up the act.

Mr. Foulds: After his jaunt to Florida he has been doing his penance. He has been in his place during question period at least three days in a row, a capital and consistent performance.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, right.

Mr. Laughren: And unusual.

Mr. Foulds: Before I move back to the inanities of the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: Illustrate it; illustrate it.

Mr. Foulds: —I'd like to turn kindly, if I may, to the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett).

Mr. Drea: He looks a lot better than the member does.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister of Education is wishing a thunderbolt would come down.

Mr. Foulds: It was just yesterday that the thought clicked in my mind.

Mr. Lewis: Save us, save us from the Burt Reynolds of the Legislature.

Mr. Foulds: We've got, not just one—

Mr. Laughren: That's the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko).

Mr. Foulds: We've got—

Mr. Drea: The member's colleague just flipped; he must make sure he says who it is.

Mr. Foulds: We've got not just one but two bush-league John Turners in our midst, the one from Peterborough—and the member for Peterborough (Mr. Turner) is an ingratiating chap, almost as ingratiating as the Minister of Education. Why, I am told that the member for Peterborough still thinks that the members of the Legislature are his constituents. He offers them rides in his station-wagon, he buys them coffee—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's an excellent member he is talking about.

Mr. Foulds: —he says hello; a good fellow; as Chaucer would have it, a hail, well met fellow.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Foulds: No, but the other, the second John Turner we have, is embodied in the personality of the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), the same hard, glinting determined look as the real John Turner, the one who danced with Princess Margaret —and I hope I don't speak disrespectfully of the royal family, Mr. Speaker—and the one who later became the federal Liberal Treasurer. The look of a man who wears contact lenses.

Mr. Drea: Does the member?

Mr. Foulds: Do you remember when he first came into the House, Mr. Speaker, how he fiddled with those glasses? No more of that now. Now he fiddles with his suit coat button as he answers all inquiries during question period in that basso profundo voice.

Mr. Drea: At least he has a suit coat on.

Mr. Foulds: But enough of this frivolity, Mr. Speaker. I must push things on to a higher plane, I quite agree.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, get off the Premier.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to talk now in what my colleague from Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) likes to phrase as "in a conceptual sense" about the cabinet and the government.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Foulds: Here we have two distinct types of situations in the cabinet. We have the ministers, the individuals such as the Minister of Education, who in 3½ years has served in three ministries. One of my constituents called him "a permanent revolving cabinet minister." Then we have the permanent revolving cabinet ministries, such as the Ministry of Treasury, Economics, and Intergovernmental Affairs.

In the short 15 months since the present Legislature was constituted, we have had three Treasurers, all cast in the same mould, abrasive, hearty, sometimes profound—seldom but sometimes—but three of them within 15 months! Is it any wonder that we have no sense of direction in this province? Instead we have a very strong sense of indecision.

As my colleague from York South (Mr. MacDonald) has pointed out on some occasions, the visible symbol of the whimsical direction taken by this government with regard to regional government is that at the present time this government doesn't have a separate person of cabinet rank now responsible for regional government.

The hon. member for York East (Mr. Meen) just isn't going to get his cabinet post in spite of his hard work, doggedness and determination.

Now back to the Throne Speech itself. On page 8 there is this delightful quotation: "On receiving the recommendations of the task force of the Ministry of the Environment, my government will introduce legislation on the disposal of solid waste."

How many in the cabinet, Mr. Speaker, felt a pain when those words were read?

Mr. Laughren: I think all of them.

Mr. Foulds: Note once again, not just a phrase, not just a sentence, but a whole paragraph! How many in the cabinet felt "My God! He's talking about me?" I suspect there was a certain churning in the stomach—disposal of solid waste! "My God, the boss is going to legislate me out of existence."

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would, turning much more seriously now and with a good deal of sincerity—

Mr. Drea: The member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa) didn't write this, did he?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, as a matter of fact I did.

Mr. Drea: No, I was talking to the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to turn with some sincerity to the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell). I remember the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrooke) being very gracious about my own first contribution to this Legislature not so very long ago and I would like to return the compliment.

If I may paraphrase the member for Sarnia, as well as my memory serves, I think that the contribution of the member for St. George speaks well for herself and for her party. I would be less than honest, I must say, if I wished the member and her party well politically but I do in a personal and very real sense welcome her presence to the Legislature and wish her well.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to things of substance in the Throne Speech if I could. But alas there are no things of substance in the Throne Speech.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I didn't think there was anything in it.

Mr. Laughren: He will add substance to it.

Mr. Martel: It's difficult to find.

Mr. Foulds: I am going to deal briefly with a few of the issues that I think should have been mentioned in the Throne Speech with regard to northern Ontario. A number of important matters that require immediate and serious attention in northern Ontario were deliberately ignored.

For example, in a passing way, there were exactly three mentions of that part of the province—but there was no mention of much-needed highway development in northern Ontario; there was no mention of assistance for unorganized territories even though the former Treasurer and the Premier himself had said during the last session of the House that something in this regard would be forthcoming to help them with their financing problems. No new programmes to improve health care delivery in the north were announced.

I know it sounds to the people from southern Ontario a bit like a broken record, nevertheless, it's the only weapon we have—to keep reiterating the social and economic injustices that are visited upon the people from the north. To me the most disturbing announcement was the one that proclaimed with a great deal of smugness and self-satisfaction that a third school for the deaf would be opened here in southern Ontario, in London. Our children in northern Ontario must still travel all the way to Belleville if they have a hearing disability because there is no centre for deaf children in northern Ontario.

The ministry and the department talked with some emotion and with slight justification about the improved programme for getting those children home on weekends so that the ties with the family are maintained. But they cannot get the children from Belleville to northern Ontario and back for a weekend. Once again it is a clear case of discrimination against the people who live in northern Ontario.

The government announced a reforestation programme. It is welcome, yes, but long overdue also—and necessary because neither private industry nor the government itself has kept pace with the cutting of our forests in the past. There is no mention in all of the Ministry of Natural Resources, reorganization of a re-emphasis on the unit forester; no mention of the fact that we have been overcutting softwood trees in northwestern Ontario; no mention of any concrete proposals in this regard.

I am frankly worried about the announcement that the government will be implementing some of the recommendations of the interim report of the select committee on land drainage of which the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) is the chairman. Although his far-fetched idea about the giant reservoir in northwestern Ontario has not reached the recommendation stage, people in northwestern Ontario are disturbed about that idea and the press that it received and the lack of denial by the provincial government—to the extent that the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) wrote to the Premier imploring him to ask that committee to refrain from visiting northwestern Ontario because he feared for their safety.

When the matter was raised in this House the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) laughed it off as if it were a joke. Well, it

may be a joke but it is a very bad one. It is a joke that will destroy the way of life of a number of native peoples in northwestern Ontario, and that, Mr. Speaker, is something for which we will not stand. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a very real reason why there has been a resurgence, particularly in northwestern Ontario in the last year, of that perennial topic—separatism. That is not talk that I like to hear.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): He didn't even mention he was going to have a lake.

Mr. Foulds: The hon. member for Fort William says he did not mention it. The member is not a member of that committee and was not present when the statement was made. Frankly, I would rather trust the reporter from the Canadian Press than the later contradiction and denial of the member for Lambton.

Mr. Jessiman: I read what he said. I read what was quoted.

Mr. Deans: That is an exaggeration and the member for Fort William knows it. How could he have read what was said?

Mr. Jessiman: I read what he said.

Mr. Foulds: Was there a transcript of the hearing?

Mr. Lewis: Oh come on! That implies more than any of us are prepared to believe.

Mr. Foulds: The member's denials are based on ignorance. He didn't deny it when I raised it during question period. However, Mr. Speaker, I know I should not engage in crossfire. I should continue with the debate, a formalized ritual.

One of the things that intrigued us in northern Ontario as we read the Speech from the Throne was the provincial assistance for the development of airstrips and airports in the north. I would hope that that token gesture would be implemented as quickly as possible. I would also hope that the—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Would that be for jets?

Mr. Foulds: Well, it may be for private jets you know.

I would hope that the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) would give particular attention to something in the riding of the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) about which, strangely enough, he doesn't seem to have made strong representation to cabinet. That is the extension or the improvement of airport facilities at the town of Kenora.

It is very interesting that members of the Conservative government were invited to attend a meeting with the Kenora and district Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber of Commerce had transportation waiting at the Kenora airport for the arrival of the ministers of government and lo and behold they didn't arrive. The ministers found it more convenient to fly to Winnipeg and drive back, by their own passive admission indicating that the facilities at Kenora were inadequate for the kind of traffic that is now being generated in that area.

Mr. Stokes: We flew to Fort Frances last fall and had to land at International Falls, Minn.

Mr. Foulds: Right; right on!

Mr. Stokes: They couldn't accommodate us.

Mr. Foulds: Then the cabinet members had the gall to stand up at the meeting to point with pride to phase 2 of Design for Development: Northwestern Ontario Region, and tell the people about the development of airports and airstrips in northwestern Ontario. Not one of them had used the present service. Is that because it was inadequate? Is that a passive admission of their neglect of the north? I think so.

One other small matter has been intriguing me for some time, and I raise it in the form of a rhetorical question. Sitting on my desk for the last two weeks has been a press release from the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. The press release goes into some great detail and has some hallelujahs of praise about an 11-man Ontario tourism team that left for Spain on the weekend before the press release was issued.

Mr. Singer: In a government plane?

Mr. Foulds: Well, the minister later said that all those who weren't government members had to pay their own way. But when one goes through the list of those people who are on the mission to Spain, there are a number of civil servants—and that's fair enough—but when one goes through the list and looks at the locations of the residences, one finds such addresses as the Royal York Hotel, Toronto; Cleveland's House, Post Office, Muskoka; 267 Bathurst St., London 15; The Continental Inn, Barrie; Arrowhead Ranch,

RR2, Collingwood; Wigamog Inn, Haliburton; Suite 8, 15 Clapperton St., Barrie; One Thousand Islands Travel Council, 209 Ontario St., Kingston—

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): What is the hon. member reading?

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): A bus schedule!

Mr. Foulds: —development branch, Ministry of Industry and Tourism, Hearst Block, Queen's Park; and, finally, one address from North Bay.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Does the hon. member know what he's reading? Does he know?

Mr. Foulds: Not one representative on that mission—

Mr. MacBeth: Of what mission?

Mr. Foulds: If the hon. member had been here and listening instead of yapping, he would have heard.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: Of that tourism mission to Spain—

Mr. MacBeth: What is he reading?

An hon. member: He doesn't even know himself what he's reading.

Mr. Foulds: Of that tourism team to Spain —do you want me to—

Mr. Singer: Start over again.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, to clarify things for the hon. member, I'll read the whole release into the record.

Mr. Speaker: I think not. No. Order. It would be out of order on the basis of repetition.

Mr. Martel: He's not. He's reading—

Mr. Foulds: I'm not.

Mr. Speaker: No. It would be repetition.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, if I may crave your indulgence.

Mr. Foulds: All I read were the addresses attached to the release.

Mr. Speaker: I heard them quite clearly.

Mr. Foulds: To clarify things for the hon. member I'll read the entire release—

Mr. Speaker: No, that would be out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: Well, if I may speak extemporare, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Paraphrase it all!

An hon. member: Extemporare?

Mr. Foulds: For the hon. member and his enlightenment, the minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Jessiman: Has the member taken any trips lately? Have there been no trips for him up to Nickel Belt lately?

Mr. Foulds: Not lately. No. The member for Fort William should look at the public accounts and see who had the big expenses.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: Who claimed his mileage back and forth from Thunder Bay? Who went by plane, which was cheaper?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Foulds: Now the press release on the mission that I was speaking about, Mr. Speaker, before—

Mr. Deans: What was that the member was saying about claiming mileage and taking the plane?

Mr. Foulds: Which was cheaper, yes.

Mr. Deans: Who did that?

Mr. Foulds: I'm not sure but I think if the member takes a look at the public accounts and sees the variation in figures he might get a hint of who it was.

Mr. Deans: What was that? I didn't get that.

Mr. MacBeth: Cheerful Tom!

Mr. Deans: Does the member know something about this?

Mr. Laughren: The member for Fort William must be careful.

Mr. Foulds: This tourism mission to Spain was sponsored by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. There was an 11-man team from Ontario. All of the representation on that team—

Mr. MacBeth: Well, where do you think the team was going to come from?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr. Foulds: All of the representation on that team, Mr. Speaker, was from southern Ontario except for one person from North Bay.

An hon. member: Oh, that's the point!

Mr. Foulds: An 11-man team with one person from the north and nobody from northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Jessiman: There just happened to be one from Fort William riding on that team.

Mr. Foulds: There was? Did he get a free ride?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Foulds: Why wasn't he—I find this intriguing, Mr. Speaker. It is really quite delightful.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't quite hear the interjection.

Mr. Foulds: There was an unknown appointee on that mission whom the Ministry of Industry and Tourism didn't feel fit to name in the press release. It is really intriguing. It's amazing that—

Mr. Jessiman: There was fine representation from the city of Thunder Bay.

Mr. Martel: Was the member for Fort William there?

Mr. Foulds: This is really intriguing. Once again, the Ministry of Industry and Tourism has overlooked certain members who went along for a free ride, I gather. Let's leave Industry and Tourism to the hon. member for Fort William. He's very good at it; he enjoys it. I'd like to get back to the Speech from the Throne, if I may.

Mr. Laughren: If it wasn't for the Peter principle, the member for Fort William would be successful.

Mr. Foulds: I'd like to contrast the provincial government's attitude towards two professional bodies in this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The member for Nickel Belt shouldn't run down people he doesn't know anything about.

Mr. Martel: He's not running down people. It's a principle.

Mr. Foulds: One gets a hint of this in the Speech from the Throne on page 14.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Martel: He never even gave the name.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member for Port Arthur would defer to the hon. member for Sudbury East he might get the floor.

Mr. Martel: He's just looking for a little support.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: There are more pre-palaeolithic Tories in the House tonight.

Mr. Martel: They think there's a full moon out tonight.

Mr. Jessiman: The member for Port Arthur should check with the member for Thunder Bay because this is his report on the same trip.

Mr. Foulds: Same trip? The member for Thunder Bay?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Foulds: To Spain? The hon. member for Thunder Bay has gone to Spain?

Mr. Lewis: The member for Thunder Bay would not go to Spain.

Mr. Martel: He'd return to his car quietly.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If he did, he wouldn't get out.

Mr. Lewis: That's why he wouldn't go.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: If the member for Thunder Bay had been appointed to the committee, I'm sure the Ministry of Industry and Tourism would not have overlooked it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Foulds: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to the Speech from the Throne

and contrast the government's attitude to two professional bodies in this province by little key phrases in the speech. On page 14 it says:

> My government will present legislation with respect to negotiations between the teaching profession and school boards.

Mr. Martel: This is a pretty good place to adjourn because it's a new policy.

Mr. Deans: Yes, move adjournment.

Mr. Foulds: At the bottom of page 15 it says:

> Further legislation will be presented to you to strengthen the position and clarify the role of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario.

On the advice of my colleagues and all members of the House, because I am getting into another aspect of the speech, a rather detailed analysis of the Reville report, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate at this time.

Mr. Foulds moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rise on what I hope you will consider a point of privilege—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): There is no such thing in the House.

Mr. Rhodes: —before the House adjourns. Well, a point of something or other, Mr. Speaker. I am rising on one of the simple points that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) does regularly, whatever it is.

Mr. Deans: I see. He is not capable of one of those points.

Mr. Rhodes: Earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I referred to a statistic in which I said—and I hope I quote what I said—that, if I used the figures that I would relate to northern Ontario to southern Ontario, it would indicate a fatality rate of 7,700 persons. That was erroneous; I used the wrong figures, and I apologize for using those figures, because they are not correct.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): What are the right figures?

Mr. Speaker: I must say that the remarks of the hon. member constituted neither a point of order nor a point of privilege. However, they are now on the record, and the record stands corrected.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No. As a matter of fact, how do you correct an error in Hansard?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 5, 1973

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Lane, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Edighoffer, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Foulds 595

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Foulds, agreed to 628

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 628

No. 16



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, April 6, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1973

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from Bialik Hebrew Day School of Toronto and Dr. S. J. Phillips Senior Public School of Oshawa. In the west gallery we have students from the Welland Centennial Secondary School of Welland.

Statements by the ministry.

TOUR OF LIVESTOCK MARKETING FACILITIES

Hon. A. W. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation to the members of the House, I would like to advise through you, sir, that the Ontario Food Council is co-ordinating a tour of livestock marketing facilities in the Toronto area on Monday starting at 9 a.m. Generally, it is for the benefit of the members of the Queen's Park press gallery.

The gallery has already been invited to attend and notice has been posted on the bulletin board of the press gallery. Formal invitations will be provided along with background data of the places which will be visited. I understand this will be done today.

A bus will pick up those who wish to take the tour at the front door of Queen's Park on Monday at 9 a.m., and will return to the press gallery, Legislature building, in time for the 2 o'clock question period. I would like to extend an invitation to any or all members of the Legislature who wish to attend and to participate in this tour, to avail themselves of the opportunity.

The tour will include the Ontario Stock Yards market, one of the packing houses and the meat cutting facilities of one of the major supermarkets in the area. The general purpose of the tour is to give the inside story on marketing margins, dressing percentages and the facts and figures on waste, shrinkage, markups, etc., in the various proceses of the packing industry.

Lunch will be served, and a round-table press conference will wind up the tour. Those involved at the press conference who will be available to answer questions after the tour has been completed will be members of the Food Council—I am hoping that the chairman, Mr. Williams, will be able to attend—Fred Campbell, the general manager of the Ontario Stock Yards, Keith Leckie of the Meat Packers Council; and one of the men from Canada Packers, whose plant I believe will be visited. I do not intend to participate in the tour, nor will I be attending the press conference.

In 1969 and 1971 the Ontario Beef Improvement Association sponsored farm tours for the benefit of food editors, farm editors, feature editors and members of the Consumers' Association of Canada. In each case two premises in the Toronto area were visited, including a cow-calf breeding operation and a feedlot. On each occasion between 80 and 90 people attended. In 1972 a similar tour in the London area was conducted and was similarly well attended. Certainly the knowledgeable and responsible reporting of those who attended the other tours is a clear indication of the success of these ventures sponsored by the Ontario Beef Improvement Association.

I sincerely hope that the tour planned on Monday will result in all those who are fortunate enough to participate in the tour gaining knowledge of what actually happens in the marketing, processing and distribution of livestock, an industry which means so very much to the total economy of our province.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer: Do recent statements attributed to him about the timetable for regional government indicate any change in the policy that had been previously enunciated? Specifically, is there any possibility that the government's timetable for the implementation of regional government in Hamilton-Wentworth may be

delayed? Secondly, will the minister make public the recommendations for Haldimand-Norfolk, which have been available for more than a year, even if he has to extract certain recommendations that might be of a land-sensitive nature?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Well, I certainly hope we wouldn't have to postpone Hamilton-Wentworth, Mr. Speaker. I had a meeting yesterday, as I think I mentioned, with the reeve of West Flamborough, who is the warden of the county; I think they want to go ahead. I have a meeting at 11 o'clock today with Mayor Copps and 18 of his councillors; I rather think they want to go ahead. So my answer to the first question is that I am very hopeful we can deal with Hamilton-Wentworth during this session.

Insofar as Haldimand-Norfolk is concerned, I am sorry I am not well informed on this. At the convention of the Association of Counties and Regions of Ontario, on Tuesday night, the wardens of Norfolk and Haldimand counties asked me to expedite the report. I have undertaken to do that, and I would hope to have that in their hands within the next week or two.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But the report has been in the minister's hands for a year.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, certainly it has been in the ministry for a period of time but, as I say, I am sorry I am not informed about the details of it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would it be possible, with the rather more conciliatory approach that the present Treasurer is taking in this matter—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Conciliatory?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, sure. If we are to accept his statements that as far as he is concerned the pressures on regional government are somewhat lessened, and that there is no rigid timetable which cannot be adapted to the needs of the community, is it possible that there can be a further delay, as was requested in Brant and Brantford yesterday of the Premier (Mr. Davis), in the requirement that the commissioner in that area make his report by the summer of this year?

Hon. Mr. White: I would like to take a little longer and do it better if that is necessary. If there is strong feeling that the report should be delayed, I would like to accommodate the people in the area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have one last question, and that will be it as far as this subject is concerned. Will the minister give some formal statement regarding the reconsideration of the 150,000 population limit which was the established guideline for the last four years on proposed regional government areas?

Hon. Mr. White: I think I owe it to the House to make a formal statement on that subject. I've been spending most of my time on the budget, but immediately after the budget I would like to try to put in more formal sense the remarks I made yesterday in response to a question. I don't see any magic in 150,000 or any other criterion established by experts. I think it calls for judgement. I think probably every case is a little different, and I wouldn't lock myself into 150,000 or any other specific.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that as a result of his bungling there are communities in the Wentworth area which previously were in agreement but which are now bickering among each other?

Hon. Mr. White: No, sir, I am not aware of that.

Mr. Deans: One more supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. V. Singer (Downsview): Are you not going to let me ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: No. We've had three supplementaries. The hon. member for Downsview realizes full well that questions must be matters of public urgency.

Mr. Singer: No, I don't.

Mr. Speaker: A question from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Singer: When you can decide that policemen's duties aren't matters of urgency, then I don't realize it at all.

USE OF INDIAN PROGRAMME FUNDS FOR WOUNDED KNEE EXPEDITION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the hon. Minister of Community and Social Services. Is he aware of a statement made by

a Mr. Myers, ostensibly a field worker for the London branch of the American Indian movement, indicating that $5,000 of provincial funds, that had been allocated for a northern Indian youth development programme, had been spent by Indians in the southern part of the province and from Buffalo to finance an expedition to Wounded Knee in support of the Indian situation there?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge no funds have been allocated to any Indian organization for expenses to go to Wounded Knee.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I hope the minister will undertake to look into this matter, because the statement has been made publicly and been quite widely reported already in the London Free Press.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

PHILCO-FORD LAYOFFS

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: Was he informed in advance by Philco-Ford in Don Mills that they intended to transfer a considerable section of their manufacturing of auto radio assemblies to Brazil?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Harris, I believe, the public relations officer for Philco-Ford, wanted to see me on Wednesday. Unfortunately, I couldn't see him personally, but he came to the office and informed us that from 40 to 75 of their employees would be affected by this layoff.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, in fact the information from the company came to the minister virtually on the day when they made the announcement? There was no advance consultation with the ministry over a period of time?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, the first time I heard about it was on Wednesday.

Mr. Lewis: Wednesday.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Did Mr. Harris indicate when these layoffs would occur? Would they all come at once or would they be over a period of time?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Can they justify them is the main thing.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: To my knowledge, he didn't give me any specific date as to the time of the layoffs; he didn't say exactly. However, we made sure of telling him of the provisions of our Employment Standards Act and we have also offered the services of our employment adjustment service.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is there any statutory obligation for an employer contemplating this kind of action to inform the Ministry of Labour some time in advance? If not, will the minister put such a statutory obligation on the books?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: It is a matter I will be glad to look into.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: I think one more supplementary would be in order.

Mr. Bounsall: When will the minister consider setting up a plant shutdown relocation compensation fund for workers who are tossed out of their jobs in this way, the funding to be paid for by the industries in this province?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I think this would be a federal responsibility more than a provincial one.

Mr. Lewis: The government can't allow plants to behave that way.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario South—I'm sorry, does the member for Scarborough West have further questions?

TORONTO DOWNTOWN HOUSING

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

Can I ask the provincial Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman), whether the Province of Ontario is willing to grant to the city of Toronto the right to purchase the land now held by the developer at Dundas and Sherbourne Sts. which apparently it is the city's wish to do?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I was given to understand, shortly before the House opened, that there was information coming

to me from the Ministry of Revenue which might answer that question. If I may, I'll wait until that information arrives here.

COMPOSITION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GERIATRICS

Mr. Lewis: Thank you. I hope the Speaker will allow the Treasurer to answer at that time.

May I ask a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services? How is it that the minister's advisory committee on geriatrics has nine members, not one of whom is a woman?

An hon. member: Old age.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That's a very good question, Mr. Speaker, and I for one believe we should have more women in this field. The hon. member knows that we have several women on our board of review and I will certainly look into this matter and try to appoint women to the committee.

COMPOSITION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REHABILITATION

Mr. Lewis: A further question of the Minister of Community and Social Services: How is it that the minister's advisory committee on rehabilitation has 11 members, not one of whom is a woman?

COMPOSITION OF LABOUR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Labour: How is it that the Ontario Labour Relations Board—governing a work force of which, as my colleague from Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) indicated yesterday, almost 40 per cent comprises women—is a board of 14 members, not one of whom is a woman?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I have already answered a similar question previously, I guess.

Mr. Lewis: That was about arbitration panels.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, that's right, in connection with arbitrators. I've asked my hon. friend to give me a list of women who could possibly—

Mr. Lewis: The minister has it.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, I got it last week.

Mr. MacDonald: Can't the minister find any qualified women in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would ask the member to give us time so that we can examine their qualifications.

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask by way of a supplementary, what kind of perverse discrimination does the minister practise in his ministry which is supposed to uphold the law in this area?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, the hon. member knows fully well the Minister of Labour is not one to discriminate. Far from it. I'm responsible for the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, the minister should follow it.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Read the Code some time.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I think we have one of the best women's bureaus in this country.

Mr. Lewis: The minister need not give us this token stuff about a women's bureau. He doesn't even enforce his legislation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: That's right. As soon as one raises this issue in this House all those yapping boys over there go apoplectic. Well, we've had enough of it.

Interjections by hon. members.

COMPOSITION OF RESEARCH FOUNDATION BOARD

Mr. Lewis: It's a very predictable thing that I'm going to persist.

A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Trade and Tourism: How is it that the Ontario Research Foundation Board has 25 members, not one of whom is a woman?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very fair question and one which I shall look at. There are some vacancies, I believe, coming up on the research board and we will review the possibilities of appointing some ladies to that board.

COMPOSITION OF NIAGARA PARKS COMMISSION

Mr. Lewis: Right. A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Natural Resources: How is it that the Niagara Parks Commission has 10 members and not one woman is among them?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, in this connection may I point out that the St. Lawrence Parks Commission has three, before he asks me a question on that particular matter. I will look into this and if a vacancy occurs, I will certainly give it every consideration.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary to this minister, how is it that Quetico Park advisory committee and the Algonquin Park advisory committee, with 16 members on each committee, do not have a single woman member?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The Quetico Park committee—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I am going to disallow that question. The matter was brought up during the debate last evening and there was a long list of boards, commissions and so forth given. The numbers of members were given. The member today is simply going over the entire list and I think it's repetitious and does not constitute proper questioning.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is interesting that questions which are raised in the Throne debate—on which there is no exchange, of course, in this House; they're just raised—you would rule out of order when they are raised specifically the next day. It is also interesting that you choose to rule this particular subject out of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked about four questions pertaining to identically the same topic.

Mr. Lewis: I have stopped. I'll wait for other—

Mr. Speaker: He is repetitious, and in fact I—

Mr. Singer: Why can't you be consistent from day to day?

Mr. Lewis: I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker. I'll ask them on Monday.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I'll recognize the hon. member for Downsview at the proper time, but I don't recognize him now.

Mr. Singer: No.

Mr. Speaker: In connection with the questions of the hon. member for Scarborough West, I had doubt that they were of urgent public importance in the first place.

Mr. Lewis: We consider them of urgent public importance, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately I am the one who has to make the decision.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, well, it is a decision that is unbecoming to you.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is a valid question. The hon. member for Ontario South.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Natural Resources. I'd like to ask him if the statement that was made yesterday by the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent)—that he personally saw the minister loading medicinal supplies in the form of booze into one of the government's aircraft—is true?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Now that's of urgent public importance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the member brought that up, because when the question was asked of me yesterday by the member from Owen Sound I missed the first part of it and did not answer—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, as you are aware the matter that the hon. member raised was brought to the attention of the Legislature in the debate on the Speech from the Throne—

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore it is out of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —and surely you can't allow that kind of a setup exchange when you won't allow the same thing to happen from this side?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I mean, I'd like to hear about the booze that he was loading in his

plane, according to the hon. member, but you will understand, sir, that it was raised in the same debate which you would not allow information to be raised from today.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member doesn't want to hear the answer, eh?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He doesn't want to hear the answer.

Mr. Speaker: I might say that my suggestion and my comments on the questions raised by the hon. member for Scarborough West were not simply because they had been brought up in the Throne debate, as suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The questions today were repetitive. They were almost the identical sort of question directed to individual ministers, and I don't think they were of urgent public importance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: But you certainly consider this more important than the questions I asked, is that it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I don't know which question the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. Lewis: The question that's of compelling urgent public importance—the question about the booze on the minister's plane. You have time for that.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, to the members, I have to make the decisions. There is no point in debating it. I'll attempt to make the decisions to the best of my ability.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's right. Let's hear about the booze.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order. I may say that I think the minister's character has been questioned, and I think it is of urgent public importance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. With all of the—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order. I want to draw to your attention—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member—

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. If they wanted to clarify that point, the minister could have risen on a question of privilege or whatever he wanted and clarified it. He didn't need to have this neat little setup—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's not very neat.

Mr. MacDonald: —between a backbencher and himself to intrude on the question period.

Mr. Speaker: I must say to the hon. members that I did not clearly hear what the hon. member for Ontario South asked as a question.

Mr. Martel: Is wasn't worthwhile hearing.

Mr. Speaker: There was too much noise going on in the chambers.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order: The hon. Minister of Natural Resources has the answer to a question previously asked.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): It had better be good!

AYR-BLENHEIM LAND PURCHASE

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, the hon. Leader of the Opposition raised a question in connection with my recommendation to the Management Board of Cabinet to approve the expenditure of funds for the purchase of land in the Ayr-Blenheim area.

The question expressed concern for the loss of good agricultural land in the area if the proposal to build a reservoir proceeds.

The Grand River has always posed very severe water management problems and during the 1930s the Grand River commission was established to try to solve some of these problems.

During the latter part of 1970 and the early part of 1971 the management services division of Treasury Board undertook a very comprehensive study of the Grand River watershed in order that a properly co-ordinated programme for flood control, municipal water supply and waste disposal could be designed and implemented.

I'm taking the liberty, Mr. Speaker, of providing the hon. Leader of the Opposition with a copy of that report, which was released in the fall of 1971. The report was provided to all the municipalities on the watershed and has been available from the Grand River Conservation Authority office on request.

This report contains a number of recommendations over a considerable planning period. It recommends a programme of studies, which we hope will eventually pro-

vide the information needed in order to answer the problems of providing municipal water supplies for Guelph, Hespeler, Preston, Galt, Waterloo, Kitchener, Brantford and other municipalities in the lower end of the watershed.

Two major options are considered: The possibility of providing adequate water supplies from the river system and associated ground water-well fields, and the possibility of a pipeline from Lake Erie.

In answer to the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with the proposed Ayr Reservoir, I would refer to page 68 of that report; and I'd like to quote from it:

> Since the Ayr reservoir is an essential component of one of the two main water management options, and since we further feel that additional studies are likely to confirm its superiority, it would be wise to ensure land is available for the dam and for the impoundment if and when required.
>
> We recommend that land for the proposed Ayr reservoir of the Nith River be purchased as it becomes available but that the dam should not be constructed, nor detailed design carried out, until the results of further studies and evaluations confirm it as part of the long-term water supply system for the megalopolis.

With reference to the concern of the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the loss of agricultural land, I refer to page 6 of the report and recommendation No. 8, which states that communities in the Grand River basin should exercise moderation in planned growth.

In this connection the Grand River Conservation Authority have opposed proposed severances of farmland into smaller holdings, and I am advised that they will retain lands acquired in the Ayr-Blenheim area in agricultural use until such time as a final decision is made with respect to construction of the dam and reservoir.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware of the objections stated by local residents and formally by resolution of the downtown council? And is he further aware that flood control is not normally put forward as the reason for the dam, but that the main reason is to recharge the water table for the use of some of the municipalities in the area?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are aware of all the matters which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised, and we are very cognizant of their feelings in that area; but we do think that the recommendations of this report are the ones we should be following. We are only assembling land as it becomes available.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: The decision to go forward with the dam, however, has not been finalized, has it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, the decision has not been finalized.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

COMPLAINT ABOUT OMB

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Attorney General. Could he tell us now what action, if any, he is taking as a result of the correspondence sent to him with reference to the Ontario Municipal Board hearings on the West St. James Town matter? I believe he couldn't recall the spelling of one of them the other day, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps that is now clarified.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Yes, the letter was from a Mr. Weitz; I have obtained it and I have been in touch with the Ontario Municipal Board about that matter. That hearing is still proceeding, and I don't think we should interfere with those matters. I am satisfied that that hearing, as it is proceeding, is fair and impartial, and the people there are being heard. I have had two letters from the gentleman mentioned by the hon. member; I have not seen a transcript of that hearing at the present time—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The minister then has come to a conclusion without the facts.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Now, just a minute. What that particular person wanted to do was to read part of an article that was written; what had to be provided there was evidence, personal opinion in reference to the matter now under consideration. The matter is still under consideration before the OMB, and I presume the hearings will be concluded shortly; I think we are now in the fourth week of hearings.

Mrs. Campbell: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Attorney General not realize that the request was made that the hearings should not continue until certain people

in that area have had the opportunity to obtain counsel? The name specifically is Mrs. Helen Valli, who also wrote to the Attorney General on this matter and asked that he intervene to permit them to have a stay until legal advice could be obtained.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I would think that in four weeks they could get counsel.

Mr. Shulman: How can the minister come to the conclusions before he examines the evidence and before he reads the transcript? Is this the usual way he works?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, it is not up to me at any time to deal with the evidence before the OMB. What I am concerned with is that the people there have a right to make submissions on the matter that's at present under consideration, and that they are treated fairly and equitably in this matter.

It has been stated that they perhaps have not had an opportunity to obtain counsel, or to give evidence. I am not satisfied as to that.

When the hearing has proceeded as it has —it is now in its fourth week—they have heard many witnesses but the conclusions have not been reached. I should never interfere with any decision that is made by that board. They are being heard in a proper and fair manner and I have checked into that.

Mr. Shulman: The Attorney General said himself he hadn't read the transcript.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I should not be reading the transcript until it is completed and I should not interfere with the decision-making process, but the hearing should be conducted in a fair and equitable manner, and it is and I have confidence in that board.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development regarding the investigation by his engineers of lake-shore flooding problems and the successful and unsuccessful methods of dealing with them: Has the provincial secretary any report to make that would be of general application, that might help people if announced at this time?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): From an engineering point of view I think not, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, we received further evidence and a further report on damage along the lower Great Lakes shores. We have seen the work being done by the Canadian Centre for Inland Waters which has had, and has at the moment, a team of experts working on assessing the damage, assessing what protective works are capable of helping.

The problem, as the hon. member may know, is that very often what helps one particular property owner works to the destruction of his neighbours on either side. And, therefore, although I can't get into the debate as to what particular form of structure should be used along the shore, the evidence that has been presented to me and some of my colleagues in the resources field suggests that any scheme should be generally consistent or we shall find, as I said, different property owners essentially making the damage greater insofar as their neighbours are concerned.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Centre for Inland Waters—I guess the greatest pool of expertise on this—is a federally-financed group. I was advised yesterday that their assessment as to damage will be available during the next week or two. But to give some idea of the extraordinary costs involved, Mr. Speaker, merely to do the study of damage on the lower Great Lakes Canadian shorelines, they estimate, may reach the figure of $3 million for the study itself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. A supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes, has the department looked into the possibilities of using a new German device, which is a 100-ft. plastic-covered polyester tube that is filled with water. It has a 2½-ft diameter and could be easily assembled and inflated with water right on the site as a device for the temporary restraint of flood waters.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I know that such a device, whether it be the German one or a Japanese one, is within the knowledge of the engineers. If we are speaking of flooding I would judge—and I will check—that this is something which can be assessed practically.

If we are dealing with shoreline erosion of the catastrophic type we are looking at these days, my guess is that it would be useless.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary.

Mr. Ruston: Has the minister given any consideration to having funds on a long-term low-interest plan so that people can protect their property themselves? As he is aware, one cannot use local improvement funds for the frontage of a cottage or a permanent home on the lakefront; it can't be done on the local improvement basis. Are there any funds available which could be used for this purpose—I mean which would be assessed to the property owner, perhaps, but still paid for over a period of 10 or 15 years?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I was involved in a discussion earlier this week with a number of persons who had raised the question of a loan fund. I undertook and, indeed, have been able as of this week to bring forward to the government tentative proposals in relation to the development not so much of a loan fund but of a system of guaranteed loans which residents could use for the purpose of repairs and protection of their homes. This is not extended, of course, to the much larger question of shore protection.

On the question of shore protection, Mr. Speaker, if I may mention it, one thing that I think we should all be concerned with is the complications that are involved or could be involved in the question of ownership of the shoreline. As one looks at the shoreline one will find in one place abandoned cars used as a breakwater; one will find half a dozen different other forms of breakwater used.

Yet in many of the areas no one can tell me whether those shores belong to the owners who are dumping the material on to the beaches or whether they belong to the people of Ontario. The issue of how one treats the shoreline is computed by the legal question as to whose is the shoreline that is being protected.

Mr. MacDonald: We settled that one a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

The Minister of Community and Social Services has the answer to a previous question.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE APPLICATION

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The other day the leader of the New Democratic Party asked me a question concerning the refusal of assistance under the General Welfare Assistance Act to an elderly person.

The Supreme Court of Ontario early this week ordered the board of review to reconsider the case of this person who had been refused general assistance under the General Welfare Assistance Act by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. This elderly landed immigrant to this country is claiming assistance under that Act on the ground that she is a person in need because she lacks a principal family provider.

The board of review on July 5, 1972, upheld Commissioner Anderson's ruling that this person was not eligible for assistance because her son had sponsored her entry into Canada under the federal Immigration Act. He had given an undertaking under that Act to support his mother and was, therefore, a principal family provider under the Act.

I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is at present being very actively reviewed by the board of review. I feel that at this time it would not be appropriate on my part to make any additional comments.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Is the minister still responsible for the North Pickering development? If so, do his plans for proceeding reflect the Minister of Revenue's opinion and policies that the public interest is best served by enabling fast-buck developers to produce the housing?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, I am still responsible for the project in North Pickering.

Secondly, I am not sure that I have heard the remarks by the Minister of Revenue to indicate the statement referred to by the hon. member for York Centre. I do say to the member that the decision as to how the lands will be developed in the future is one that the cabinet and this government will make and announce in this House.

Mr. Deacon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, yes.

Mr. Deacon: Does the minister agree in principle with selling land to housing developers in such a way that they can gain a profit on the shortage of land and, therefore the higher prices of land; rather than having controlled prices at which they can sell that land and the lot for building purposes?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Pardon?

Mr. Deacon: For housing purposes.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Yes, for housing purposes. Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated very clearly that the decision as to how the lands will be disposed of in North Pickering in the future will be made by this government, and this House will be informed.

We have not arrived at any decision as to exactly how the planning will take place, other than we have retained a firm of consultants to do a master plan for the entire North Pickering community.

But we have made no policy decisions, Mr. Speaker, on exactly how the division of lands will take place; and how they will be developed—whether it be under private ownership or public ownership.

Mr. Deacon: Surely it is profiteering in land.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

INVITATION OF MEMBERS TO MEETING

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. Is it the Treasurer's intention to invite members of the Legislature to the meeting this morning with the city of Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't intending to do that, but several of the Conservative members have asked if they could be present, and I said yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) had the same problem yesterday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We had the same problem yesterday.

Hon. Mr. White: When that happened I wondered about extending an invitation to all of—

An hon. member: Repetitions.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I just had the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) come over and ask if it would be all right if the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. McNie) and he went to the meeting, and I said yes. Then I had my hon. friend, the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Ewen), ask if it was all right if he came to the meeting, and I said yes. At that time I wondered about extending an invitation to other members from the area—

Mr. Reid: The minister resisted the temptation.

Hon. Mr. White: And I decided against it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: As a supplementary question, just for the record: Is the Minister not inviting other members, other than Conservative members, to the meeting with the city of Hamilton?

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Lewis: Write the Minister of Education!

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I didn't invite anybody—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The Minister of Agriculture developed that policy.

Hon. Mr. White: They asked if they could come. And because of their intensive interest, I said, "Certainly—help yourself."

An hon. member: Well, there you are!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Please, sir, may I come too?

Mr. Bullbrook: As long as the member doesn't say anything.

Mr. Lewis: The minister blatantly nods.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is all heart.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Does the member want to come too?

FOOD AND FUEL COSTS IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Reid: No, I don't want to come.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Develop-

ment, and I think maybe this should be directed also at the Treasurer. In view of the rather superficial study of costs of food and gasoline in northwestern Ontario that was commissioned by the provincial secretary or the Minister of Natural Resources, after the abortive meeting in Dryden and northwestern Ontario, what action is the government going to take to try to even out prices of food and gasoline and fuel oil in northwestern Ontario?

Mr. Martel: Have another study.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a matter essentially for the Treasurer, but I can't allow the description of the Dryden meeting as being abortive to stand on the record unchallenged. I think anyone who was present—

Mr. Reid: And they were only Tories.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Well, why wasn't the member present?

Mr. Reid: Because I wasn't invited; that's why!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Because the member didn't read the invitation that invited him! That's why he wasn't there.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And the next question?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: If the member would like to come to one of these meetings, please attend.

Mr. Singer: He just has to find out where they're having it and when!

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's non-answer may I redirect the question to the Treasurer?

Mr. Speaker: No! The hon. minister dealt with it.

Mr. Reid: No! Now, wait a minute.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt—

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Supplementary!

Mr. Speaker: All right. The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENERGY POLICY

Mr. Givens: I'd ask the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: Has the government made a decision as to which minister will be answering for energy policy in this Legislature? Will it be the Provincial Secretary, or will it be the new parliamentary secretary (Mr. McKeough), who apparently cannot answer questions in the House?

Mr. Reid: Well, neither can he answer questions.

Mr. Givens: Who will be answering on the matter of energy policy for the government from here on in?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to the question will be available to the members in the House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: —in a matter of a few days. I would say to the member for York-Forest Hill that it was announced, if he will recall, that the parliamentary assistant to the Premier would be reporting to the Premier as of the first of this month with his recommendations as to the structure, which will include reporting on energy and responsibility for energy matters in this House. That particular document, according to his undertaking, has been delivered to the Premier. So my answer to the question is, as I said, that in a matter of days the structure and the way of communicating will be available to all of us.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

OMB MEMBERSHIP

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): I have a question of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Why is it that the Ontario Municipal Board has 16 members, none of whom are women? Further, what does he intend to do about this kind of blatant sex discrimination within his ministry?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have thought for a very long time that we haven't done a very good job getting women into senior positions. My suggestion to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabi-

net (Mr. Winkler) some months ago was that we quantify the number of female employees above a certain level. In fact, he did that shortly afterwards, and there turned out to be something in excess of 700 women who were earning more than $12,000 per year.

Mr. Lewis: The civil service has 63,000 or so.

Hon. Mr. White: I had a discussion with two of my senior staff last night, in which this matter came before us.

Mr. Givens: Both male?

Hon. Mr. White: I asked them to—

Mr. Lewis: Which members of his staff were they, pray tell?

Hon. Mr. White: They were Dr. Terry Russell and Mr. Duncan Allan. It was in my office at 11 o'clock last night. I said to them that I thought the only way we could accomplish the purpose was to quantify the existing situation by finding out exactly how many women we had, not necessarily by salary, because I think that in itself is not test enough—

Mr. Lewis: I would think that's true.

Hon. Mr. White: —but at a certain status within the ministry. If that number is represented by X, we should determine to increase that to 2X 12 months hence and to 4X 24 months hence. This is going to bring about what might be called negative discrimination.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's reducing it to a formula.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: That's right; when women are given opportunities, then men are discriminated against. Is that it?

Hon. Mr. White: No. If we are going to establish quotas, which I think is the only way of solving the problem, if one has a competition and a young man, let us say, scores 80 while a young woman scores 78, if we are going to meet the quotas, it's my hunch that during the transitional period we are going to have to take some number of women who scored 78, because we are dealing with a culture in which women have not been oriented since birth into these vocational pursuits. It's just a fact of life.

Mr. Bullbrook: What is the Treasurer going to do when he gets something that's complicated if he has to go on ad nauseam over this?

Hon. Mr. White: I'm going to tell the member for Sarnia and his simple-minded next-door neighbour that this problem isn't going to be solved overnight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. White: I said that with a smile.

Mr. Speaker: The time for questions has elapsed.

Mr. Bullbrook: When we get to 4X everything will be alright. I can't believe it.

Hon. Mr. White: If I may make reference to the question asked during the question period—

Mr. Speaker: The time has elapsed.

Interjections by hon. members.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Speaker: A point of privilege, the Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, since the member—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Now we will find out about it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —for Ontario South brought the matter up during question period and since the opposition did not want to hear the answer, I thought this would be a way to clarify the matter that was brought up by the member for Grey Bruce. I missed the point of his question yesterday, which was reported in today's Globe and Mail, but he accused me—

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. W. Newman: No way!

Some hon. members: Sit down!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: You make up your own point of order!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member will just permit me the courtesy. In view of all of the noise in the chamber, I couldn't hear a word the hon. minister said. I would ask him to repeat it for my benefit.

Mr. Singer: Which minister?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the member for Ontario South brought the matter up during the question period and the opposition did not want to hear the answer—

Mr. Shulman: Is this a ministerial statement?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —I think it is right that I bring this matter up as a point of personal privilege. It relates to a question that was asked of me yesterday by the member from Owen Sound, and reported in today's Globe and Mail, in which he accused me of hauling large quantities of booze in government aircraft.

I would point out to him and to other members of this House that this is entirely wrong—it is incorrect. I know I can speak for all the members of the cabinet in saying that they too have not indulged in the transportation of this commodity.

Mr. Reid: That's what they have executive assistants for!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would say to the members of the Liberal Party, and knowing the member from Owen Sound, that if there is anybody hauling booze out of the Island Airport in Toronto, the member from Owen Sound must be looking into a mirror.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Bales presented the fifth annual report of the Ontario Legal Aid plan, for the year ended March 31, 1972.

Mr. Ewen, from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following appications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

City of Peterborough;

Hoblin Homes Ltd.;

City of London (No. 1);

Town of Oakville;

City of London (No. 2);

City of Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TOWN OF OAKVILLE ACT

Mr. J. R. Smith, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, moves first reading of bill intitiuled, An Act respecting the Town of Oakville.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON ACT

Mr. Timbrell, in the absence of Mr. Walker, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA ACT

Mr. Villeneuve, in the absence of Mr. Morrow, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON ACT

Mr. Timbrell, in the absence of Mr. Walker, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My point of order, sir, is that a member of this House may not make an allegation about another member unless he is prepared to substantiate it.

On Tuesday night—and I refer you to page 478-1 of Hansard—the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was referring to the corrupt mess in government, and he made an allegation in the form of an innuendo that a certain Mr. Moog who built Canada Square, which was referred to here, had helped build the Premier's cottage, or did repairs on it. He made this innuendo, sir, without any substantiation in the House.

I suggest if it had come from any other member he would have been called to order immediately. Surely such an allegation, particularly against the Premier of this province, cannot be allowed to pass unless there is some substantiation.

Mr. Reid: We have come full turn now.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, full turn around.

Mr. Shulman: I have made many allegations and I have substantiated them in each case.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Attorney General agreed with that, I take it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What's that about the pot and the kettle?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask you to examine Hansard and, after you have done so, to make a ruling and either demand that there be substantiation or withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker: Did I understand the hon. member to say it was on page 478-1 of Hansard?

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure whether or not I was in the chair at the time. I might have missed it as well. I will be glad to review it and see what action need be taken.

Mr. Drea: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, you might like to read the next line after that. I had some comments to make.

Mr. Lewis: What was the next line?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about the member for High Park's allegation that the Attorney General was a front man for the Mafia? Have you looked into that?

Mr. MacDonald: If they are embarrassed over there why don't they do something about it?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): I am very pleased this morning, Mr. Speaker, to resume the debate in the atmosphere in which we adjourned last night. The verve and vitality and raucousness of the chamber seems to have continued overnight and I appreciate and enjoy the atmosphere.

Before I proceed with my planned remarks I would like to make a few observations, especially regarding the matters raised yesterday during the Throne debate by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) and the questions raised this morning by the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis).

We want to emphasize that in this party we feel very strongly about women's rights. We feel very strongly about the scandalous way in which this government has not taken the initiative to redress the imbalance and increase the opportunities for women in government commissions and within the civil service itself.

We in the New Democratic Party do consider this a matter of urgent public importance. The fact that the injustices have existed for centuries does not mean they should be tolerated one day longer. I must say with deep and profound regret that Mr. Speaker did not consider it a matter of urgent public importance. Even more alarming are the evasions in the replies of the various ministers questioned, especially the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon). Those replies have always emphasized that we in the opposition should supply them with names of capable women.

If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, that admission surely speaks volumes about the attitudes and the lack of capability of the ministries concerned. Surely it is the responsibility of the Minister of Labour, under whom come the Human Rights Code and the women's branch and that kind of legislation, to take the initiative in these areas. The answers that we receive are frankly paternalistic and sexist and we cannot tolerate them. We will not tolerate them and we will continue to hammer away at this during this session.

Last night when we adjourned I was comparing two statements in the Speech from the Throne with regard to professional groups in our province. To pick up the thread of my remarks, if I may quote again from page 14, we have this neutral, objective sentence: "My government will present legislation with respect to negotiations between the teaching profession and school boards." There is no hint of what the legislation will be, no hint of the direction it will take.

Turning to the bottom of page 15, there is another sentence: "Further legislation will be presented to you to strengthen the position and clarify the role of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario." Why this obvious favouring of one profession over the other?

I think the answer to that is obvious. Every member of this Legislature now knows of the letter sent out by Ross DeGeer to every doctor in this province. I would like to quote a few excerpts from that letter.

By the way, I received a copy of the letter from an anonymous doctor within my own riding who obviously felt put upon but didn't feel he could reveal his identity because of the pressure brought to bear upon him by the medical profession in his own community. He, at least, had a sense of fairness and thought that we in the opposition should know what was going on.

Anyway, the letter goes:

Dear Dr.:

> Many doctors have expressed the need for greater participation by members of the profession in the political process. We have no way of knowing your personal political affiliation but we do know that a high percentage of your profession are supporters, active or otherwise, of the Progressive Conservative Party provincially.
>
> Most doctors are extremely concerned that their provincial government should provide the public with good medical coverage while giving full consideration to the needs of the profession, and interfering as little as possible with the doctor-patient relationship. They are also concerned that provincial medical services be efficiently and fairly administered.

Here comes the clincher.

> When related to other provinces, we believe the record of PC government in Ontario has been as good as the profession can reasonably expect.

"As good as the profession can reasonably expect," Mr. Speaker. No thought about if it's as good as the public can reasonably expect.

That letter, as a column by Mr. O'Hearn in the press gallery pointed out, amounts to blackmail—blackmail of the medical profession. What they are saying is: "Boys, if you want your interests protected, kick in with the dough. Do your part. Send money."

An hon. member: The Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) will.

Mr. Foulds: What kind of objectivity can this government have in dealing with the spiraling medical costs and with the medical profession in this province if they have begged the profession to support them in this abject way?

Now, Mr. Speaker, that attitude towards the medical profession, and the attitude toward the teaching profession is expressed in the Reville report. The Reville committee was appointed by order in council of the provincial government of Ontario on Nov. 5, 1970 to inquire and report upon: (a) the process of negotiation between teachers and school boards; (b) the roles of the various professional and trustee organizations in the bargaining process; (c) the matters to be properly subject to negotiation.

I would like to start this main portion of my remarks on the Reville report by giving two quotations. The first quotation is this:

> No recommendation, no suggestion, no argument, however persuasive, can be advanced in the educational forum without first testing its validity and its effects against the principle that our educational system exists for the child, so that he may create, grow and perceive better, the world within which we live.

The second quotation, Mr. Speaker:

> The committee believes that the Province of Ontario has designed an educational system which is eminently qualified to satisfy the aspirations of all individuals and that the members of the teaching profession and the school board trustees have played significant and laudable roles in this development. Nothing therefore must be allowed to disturb the efficiency and proper functioning of the educational system, and it is to this end that the committee has directed its efforts.

The first quotation I have given, Mr. Speaker, comes from the foreword to the Minister's Advisory Committee on Teacher Contract Bargaining in the Province of Saskatchewan. The second quotation comes from the Reville report, to give it its proper name, the "Report of the Committee of Inquiry of Professional Consultation and the Determination of Compensation for Ontario Teachers."

What a world of difference there is between the attitudes of those two statements. The first statement in the Saskatchewan report indicates concern with education. It indicates an interest in the creativity of the educational system. It also emphasizes the basic reason we have educational systems in the civilized world—for the development of the child.

Now take a look at that second quotation. It indicates the smugness and complacency that exists regarding the Ontario school system. It emphasizes the mechanistic. It has no

mention of the creativity and the development of the child. It doesn't see education as being creative. Note the heavy emphasis on the words "efficiency" and "proper functioning."

I would submit that the reason the teachers of this province are upset about the Reville report is not merely because their rights are being curtailed, but because they can see the very harmful effects implementation of legislation based on the Reville report will have on the creative development of curriculum that has taken place to some extent in Ontario in the last few years.

This creative development of curriculum has taken place, not at the ministry level, not at the board of education level, but at the grassroots level. Teachers all over this province, in the past four to five years especially, have been creating dynamic and innovative courses of study in math, science, theatre arts, English, history and man in society; to name a few with which I am personally familiar. But the conjunction of the present blind and mindless feelings on education spending compounds the teachers' fears and justifiable suspicions in this regard.

The present mindless feelings, by the way, are as faddish and foolish as the mindless spending that took place in education in the 1960s under the then Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

My own views about the Reville report are well known to most teachers in this province. Let me just summarize them for the benefit of the Legislature.

1. Implementation of the committee's recommendations will effectively eviscerate the various teachers' federations in the same way that the government's legislation last spring left the CSAO powerless.

2. The implementation of the committee's recommendations will not only drastically limit the teacher's role in safeguarding his own rights but will effectively deny him and his professional organization the opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to the development of educational policy.

3. The recommendations deprive him of any effective muscle to ensure that matters other than those with obvious financial implications are negotiable. Working conditions, hours of work, the number of classes a teacher must teach, the pupil-teacher ratio, the extended school year, are all subjects that are excluded from negotiations by the Reville committee report.

4. Recommendations No. 9 through 17 of the report propose a series of advisory committees to deal with matters such as curriculum development, educational policy and so on. These committees will have trustee, teacher and some community participation, but it is important to note that the boards of education will have the right to veto any of the recommendations of these committees.

5. Recommendation No. 5 of the report itself is particularly discriminatory against teachers. It allows the trustees to have the right to have a representative committee of trustees and also to have "such other persons as the trustees shall determine". This gives the trustees additional power in negotiations. For example, the trustees can hire on their own behalf a professional negotiator to carry the brunt in the negotiations. The teachers are denied this right; this is clearly unjust.

To sum up then, at a point in time when the atmosphere and attitudes in education have emphasized the importance of the contribution the teachers can make and must make to the development of educational theory and practice, this report clearly emphasizes that the major area of concern for the teachers' professional organizations should be purely economic.

This is a backward step. The committee has two clear biases. One clearly ignores the commitment of teachers to their work and to their profession. The other is against the collective bargaining processes and trade unionism in particular.

It is obvious that the committee did not approach the inquiry with an open mind. The glossary of terms and jargon coined by the committee betrays its distaste for the collective bargaining process.

I quote from page 64 of the report, appendix A, entitled "A glossary of joint negotiations and joint consultations terminology (with comparisons drawn from labour relations terminology and jargon)". It's very indicative of the sterility of the thinking of this report.

"Arbitrator" becomes a nicer word, "adjudicator"; "griever" becomes "complainant"; "adversary proceedings" become "consultations"; "union shop" becomes "mandatory professional membership"; "work-to-rule" is "partial withdrawal of services"; "conciliation" and "mediation" become "third-party assistance"; "management rights" are transformed into "trustees' responsibilities", and most important, "bargaining rights" become "negotiation privileges".

The preconceptions of this committee are betrayed by its language, its illustrations and

its misrepresentation of the collective bargaining process. For example, the committee states in the body of its report, on page 18: "That industrialists are the most informed of all groups on the real effects of the collective bargaining system."

I would suggest that the employees involved in the collective bargaining system are equally aware of both the limitations and the advantages of the collective bargaining process.

The report further states without documentation that:

> Recently two strikes alone, one at International Nickel and the other at the Steel Co. of Canada, cost the Ontario economy half a billion in lost production.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a malicious selection of the facts:—(1) these strikes took place more than three years ago; (2) the most recent result of collective bargaining in the two cases cited resulted in a complete settlement of all issues for a three-year period. The Steel Co. of Canada settled Aug. 1, 1972, with a three-year agreement and no strike action. International Nickel Co. at Sudbury and Port Colborne, settled July 10, 1972 with a three-year agreement and with no strike action.

The committee's report then develops a superficial generalization of the collective bargaining process coming to the completely unfounded conclusion: "Thus the right to strike became a right to seize and close the business."

It is disturbing, to say the least, that the committee felt no responsibility whatsoever to make an effort to document this blatant bias.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the status of the Reville report is unknown. It is in limbo. The minister, up until January, personally phoned me from time to time, on several occasions to let me know quite specifically that nothing was happening with regard to the Reville report; that it was just a report and it was going through the processes of consideration within the ministry; that the Ministry of Education had not yet decided what it was going to do with the monster it had spawned.

However, we did get a statement the other day that there will be legislation coming in this session with regard to teacher-board negotiations. In answer to questioning yesterday, the minister refused to indicate at what point in time that legislation would be brought forward during this session; and he refused to indicate the direction that the legislation might take.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government is playing cat and mouse with the Legislature, with the teaching profession, with the school boards and with the public of this province.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Sounds like a "rebel's" report!

Mr. Foulds: That's right!

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this ministry will, in its usual fashion, bring this legislation in during the last week of this session; try to ram it through before too many people can get upset about its implications.

Let there be no mistake. If this government thought it could get away with introducing legislation based on the reactionary recommendations of the Reville report it would do so. One has only to look at the legislation the present government brought in last spring governing the Civil Service Association of Ontario. That legislation took away from that association its right to bargain in all those areas of interest that every working group should have the right to negotiate; that is working conditions, fringe benefits and so on.

Secondly, I would like to make a commitment, as the present education critic of the New Democratic Party, and on my party's behalf, that we will fight any legislation which is based on the Reville report which denies the teachers the right to negotiate their working conditions. And I want to say here and now that we will fight that kind of reactionary legislation with every legislative means at our disposal.

But having said that, I would like to turn for a few minutes to the teachers themselves and their attitudes to the collective bargaining process and to the teachers' attitudes towards trade unions.

First of all, teachers rightly consider themselves professionals; but unlike doctors, lawyers, architects and so on, they don't have the economic model to set their own fees—nor do I think they should have. Teachers must negotiate salary increases and working conditions with management as represented by boards of education and school boards.

Teachers in Ontario have never come to grips with the fact that, whereas they are professionals, they are also workers. They have never come to grips with the fact that they work collectively as a group, even though they, as individuals, have tremendous

freedom with regard to methodology, techniques, and even curriculum within their own classrooms.

In Ontario teachers cling to their threadbare blanket of respectability. They confuse professionalism with being able to set their own fees and with being self-governing. In my view, this is a misguided conception of what professionalism means. To my mind professionalism is merely doing your job with excellence no matter what occupation you are in. It has to do with quality of work, not with what kind of work in which you are involved.

I have seen professional actors and professional stage managers on the amateur stage who did not get paid a cent, but who have devoted themselves to their jobs with every ounce of talent, energy and creativity that they have. I have, in fact, been fortunate enough to see a professional section foreman on the CNR. Here was a man who through his own initiative and his own talent and his own assessment of the job learned and grew and knew more about that job. He performed his job not with abject devotion to the company, but he performed the job because the job itself was worth doing well.

I must say that the trend in terms of self-governing and the trend of setting fees for one's own select group, are in fact going the other way. Doctors, lawyers, architects and so on, are going to have their present-day so-called professionalism curtailed by society. After all, why should doctors arbitrarily set their own fee when it is the public who pay, and when they are providing a service that is essential to our present-day society?

Therefore, it seems to me that teachers must accept their role as professional workers. They must adopt a positive attitude to the collective bargaining process and to their right to strike. Let me say clearly that I think they should have both.

Let me remind you that strike does not mean mass resignations. Strike means to be able to withdraw your services and have the right to return to work after the dispute is settled. Let nobody be fooled by the Reville report's recommendation for "an adjudicative tribunal."

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That's pronounced "Reville."

Mr. Foulds: Sure it is not fudgesicle?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the member is going to be using his name quite a bit, it is pronounced "Reville."

Mr. Foulds: Reville?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's it.

Mr. Foulds: Let nobody be fooled by the Reville report's recommendation for an adjudicative tribunal to settle disputes between boards and teachers, because that term is merely a fancy euphemism for compulsory arbitration. The joker in that particular deck is that all appointees to that so-called objective tribunal will be by recommendation of the Minister of Education. Such a tribunal will be much more conscious of the government's wishes than it would be of the needs and merits of the community or of the teacher.

It seems to me the teachers must accept the fact that they are engaged in a collective-bargaining process. Ed Finn, legislative director of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers, rightly pointed out in an article in the Toronto Star on Nov. 6, 1972, that there was no golden mean between the extremes of genuine collective bargaining, which is after all an adversary system, and company unionism which involves the master-servant relationship.

Company unionism is tolerable only if the employer is truly and consistently benevolent, and genuinely intent on treating his employees fairly at all times. We all know that description does not fit all school boards in the province. It may not even fit a majority of them. It certainly doesn't describe the ministry, and that is the fundamental flaw in the Reville report.

We must recognize that in any human endeavour there is not going to exist at all times reasonable harmony, so that when teachers and boards sit down to discuss their mutual interests, there will be conflicting views. Although sweetness and light might prevail at times, what recourse do the teachers have when they encounter an intransigent and stubborn board? According to the Reville report, they can only throw themselves on the mercy of an outside arbitrator who might or might not prove sympathetic.

That is not collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker; that is collective begging. I think it is time teachers realized they don't, at the present time, have free collective bargaining. You cannot have free collective bargaining unless you have the right to strike.

A lot of people will be very upset about that. They will say school is an essential service and the education industry in Ontario is an essential industry. I would agree with that; but the timing isn't essential. In

an 18-year career of schooling, if a student misses a week or two during the school term because of sickness, no one gets upset. In fact he may learn more outside of the walls of the school building.

Similarly, if a contract has not been settled and the teachers withdraw their services for a period of time, I don't think a great deal of harm is going to be done to the student as a result of being out of school.

There are times when I think a great deal of good might result from their explorations in their own community. Teachers themselves can work out a mechanism, if necessary, for making up that time so that the students don't lose in their overall school year.

If teachers have the right to strike, and if that means that teachers have to embrace the principles and practices of trade unionism, then so be it. I do not think that employing the principles and practices of trade unionism to protect their own interests, and what is more important to protect the interests of the educational system of Ontario is going to be a backward step at all.

In fact, somehow we have to protect the educational system. At the present time it would appear that only teachers could do that; God knows the present minister and the ministry can't. Teachers will not be able to protect their true professionalism unless they come to an honest understanding of what it means to have collective bargaining and to be able to use those processes wisely for the benefit of the educational system in Ontario.

I would like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, if I might, to another topic which, it surprises me, has not been touched upon before in this debate. On page 12, I believe it is, of the Speech from the Throne, the Lieutenant Governor read:

> My government will ask you to approve the appointment of an independent commission to redistribute the electoral districts of the province and redefine their boundaries.

I think that is probably a good thing. I am convinced there are some glaring inequalities at the present time to be eliminated, but I think the terms of reference must not be so binding, so inflexible as are the terms of reference for the federal electoral boundary commission, which resulted in a loss of seats for northern Ontario.

There is a fine line which must be trod here but the principle involved in the bill or in the commission—whatever device is used to set up the commission—must achieve the very laudable aim of ending the gerrymandering of seats for the benefit of the government party. That principle must not impinge upon the right to access and proper representation of people in remote areas.

The major problem that any sensitive politician faces over and over again, Mr. Speaker—it is a question I have often pondered myself—is do electoral politics, in fact, work? Are the traditional methods of political action meaningful and valid? Looking around this chamber this morning one sometimes has very grave doubts about it. The attendance and the responsibility that members sometimes show is mind boggling.

Unfortunately, a growing segment of our population feels this is not so—that the traditional methods of political action are not meaningful and valid; that electoral politics and parliamentary democracy are increasingly unresponsive to the aims and aspirations of the ordinary man on the street.

This growing suspicion of politicians and the political processes is reflected in two obvious ways. A survey taken in the United States about a year and a half ago indicated that politicians came 17th on the list of professions in terms of how the public perceived them in trustworthiness.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That is actually an improvement.

Mr. Foulds: They were one place ahead of used car dealers.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Doctors were first, remember.

Mr. Foulds: What a fall was there for the member for Oshawa to go from first to almost last! From No. 1 to 17!

Mr. McIlveen: At least I have evened off. I am about eighth on the list.

Mr. Foulds: Is he about 8th now?

Mr. McIlveen: Yes, I am about eighth and the member for Port Arthur is away down at the bottom.

Mr. Foulds: This growing suspicion of the political process is also reflected in the turnout for general elections of boards of education across the province.

Mr. Renwick: The member for Oshawa had better get his jabs in now. He won't be here after the next election.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He is a journalist of note now! His writings are quoted.

Mr. Foulds: I suppose that has dropped him another couple of notches, too, with the credibility gap created by those columns in the Oshawa Times.

Mr. McIlveen; I am going to syndicate that.

Mr. H. C. Parrott (Oxford): I don't blame him—that is a good and worthy intention.

Mr. Foulds: He is going to syndicate it? That is an awfully touchy word to use in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I know I must direct my remarks through you and not to the rabble to my left and behind me, which is getting aroused somewhat at the present time. I suppose by 11:30 in the morning the coffee has coursed through the veins and has activated some of the blood cells so that a bit of oxygen is getting to the enlarged nerve ganglia at the base of the spine and they are, basically, coming alive.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): We are being gassed to death.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): The member is going to make me bring up in a minute.

Mr. Foulds: This growing suspicion of the political process, as I said Mr. Speaker, is reflected in the turnout for general elections of boards of education across this province.

For example, when the first election for the reorganized Lakehead board of education took place some years ago, not in conjunction with the municipal or mayoralty election, only about 17 per cent of the electorate turned out. There is no doubt that in North America there is a growing alienation of the populace generally, and especially among young people, from the traditional forms of parliamentary democracy and electoral politics.

In a current phrase, a number of people are opting out. This leads to two possible, unfortunate results. Given enough frustration and enough anger, the present apathy will turn to other forms of political action which, in fact, may be violent.

Certainly a system, no matter how well intentioned and how objective, if it does not meet the needs and desires and aspirations of the people it purports to serve, will only turn people off further and in ever increasing numbers. A growing number of people will treat the present parliamentary democratic process with cynicism, disdain, apathy, contempt, growing suspicion, and finally hostility. When that hostility reaches a certain peak, these people will seek to destroy the process. The only way to avoid this is to have people feel genuinely that they can participate in government, that they can influence government, that they are heard and that they can contact directly and personally their elected representatives.

Let me relate an anecdote which illustrates the phenomenom observed by every elected representative in this Legislature from northern Ontario, a phenomenom that is often labelled by his colleagues as northern paranoia.

Last Feb. 7 I'd been working in my office here at Queen's Park until sometime after midnight on a brief to the federal electoral boundaries commission. I walked down to my hotel room, picked up a late edition of the Globe and Mail and came across an editorial in that paper of Feb. 8, 1973, entitled: "A Way to Representation by Population." That editorial started this way:

> Representation by population is one of the principles which must underlie democratic government or it is not democratic government. As the principle is diluted, so is democracy diminished. This is true, because if one elected representative represents 50,000 people and another only 25,000 people, then the 25,000 speak twice as powerfully as the 50,000 in determining how the country shall be run.

On the surface, that has a certain appealing logic to it. However, in that context, which was a federal context, the Globe went on to argue that the Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Prince Edward Island should be set aside as special cases. Aside from that, the rest of Canada would be divided into ridings with as exactly equal population as possible, regardless of the size of the riding, and each riding would elect one member of Parliament.

The Globe went on to argue that the word "geography" made it impossible for a member to personally cover the whole riding. He should be given staff "to go out and meet the electorate and bring its problems to him." The size of the staff would be determined by geographical difficulties—difficulties of transportation and communication. The Globe then goes on to say:

> We would then, no matter how large Canada's population grew, or where it grew, have a system which gave all of its citizens equal voting power and equal representation in the Parliament that shapes our country.

The editorial then went on to indicate that such a system works effectively in the United States and to say that each member of the House of Representatives represents 468,972 people. But it works because the United States has allowed, the editorial said, its representatives staff to reach the electorate.

I want to meet that argument head on, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I don't think the present political situation in the United States is one that we should try to emulate. The obvious alienation in urban centres, the growing violence in the United States and the accelerated disdain and distrust of the electoral process that are obvious in the United States must not be re-enacted here in Canada. I would submit it is this very fact that elected members of the House of Representatives in that country have staff meeting the electorate, rather than meeting the electorate themselves, that has largely contributed to that alienation and to that growing sense of distrust of government in the United States.

If it is at all possible in Canada and in this Province of Ontario, we must avoid that. If that means avoiding the strict principle of representation by population, then by all means let's do it.

Secondly, if special consideration is to be given in the Canadian context to Prince Edward Island, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, why not to northern Ontario in the Ontario context?

For example, the present riding of Thunder Bay is substantially larger than Great Britain, and five times as large as Nova Scotia. It is, in fact, as large as the Yukon in area, and it has three times the population of the Yukon. If the democratic process means anything at all, surely it means ongoing involvement and participation by the citizens in the elective process and not just once every four years at election time. In so far as the strict representation by population inhibits that involvement and that participation then the cliche about representation by population can be undemocratic in the true sense.

For us in the north it is important that our voice be heard, because elected members represent not only numbers of people, they represent a special attitude of mind and special areas of interest that are thrust upon us as northerners because of our geographic location and because of the isolation within which we live and operate. If the healthy diversity of this nation and this province is to be maintained, these distinctive attitudes must be forcefully and articulately presented in the councils of the nation and of this province.

It does no good either to the country or the province or the interests of northern Ontario to deprive us of any elected representatives. When we see an argument such as that in the Globe of Feb. 8, is there any wonder there is a kind of gut feeling in the north that we are being discriminated against and that we are being exploited?

The third argument against the attitudes of southern Ontario as expressed in that Globe editorial is that it perceives the elected representative only as a person who votes on legislation which is presented to him on a platter by Toronto-based technocrats, and that is the only way he expresses his region's attitudes. It does not understand the full responsibility of the elected representative, which is to help shape legislation.

If the elected representative is to shape legislation adequately he must be fully in tune with the attitudes of the citizens he represents. He can only be fully in tune with those attitudes if he has had time and opportunity to be among them and to listen to them.

There is another responsibility of the elected representative; he must also act as a leader to his electors. He must keep them fully informed of the attitudes and actions of government, and of the developments that are taking place in other parts of the province. This may not be his major responsibility, but he does have a responsibility to try to explain the province to his local constituents. I must say that I find it very difficult to try to explain to my constituents the attitudes that are often expressed in this chamber.

Sometimes even I, with my capabilities and talents, Mr. Speaker, find it impossible. Certainly no hired staff person could do that.

Those of us who live in the north are only too well aware of the slowness of economic growth and development in our area. We are only too well aware of the lack of facilities and amenities. We are only too well aware of the lack of libraries, museums, art galleries, science centres, and so on—all things which are available to people here in southern Ontario. There is, I submit, a growing sense of frustration because of these economic, social and cultural disparities.

We perceive very clearly that government inaction has failed to develop the area; has failed to help the area keep pace, in growth and development, with the rest of the province. We now also perceive that at the

present time we could very well be deprived of whatever political voice we have had in the past.

I would like to summarize quickly and briefly the major arguments I have seen over the last few months on behalf of northern Ontario maintaining, at least maintaining, its present representation.

The elected representative must spend a good deal of time travelling back and forth between Toronto and his riding. In the case of at least two of the present northwestern Ontario ridings, Thunder Bay and Kenora, he must also spend a good deal of time travelling within his riding.

I think that argument has been pretty fully and adequately put, but I would emphasize it is almost impossible to give residents of a riding such as the present Thunder Bay riding the service to which they are entitled. It is only the incredible physical stamina and efforts of the member representing Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) that give them that service at the present time.

A person who lives in Winisk or Kakabeka Falls should have the same accessibility to his elected representative as a person living in Metropolitan Toronto or in a metropolitan Ottawa riding. Accessibility, too, is a democratic ideal for which we must strive. Ideally, of course, politics is a two-way process; the elected representative must not only talk to his electors, the electors must also be able to talk directly to their elected representatives.

It is not good enough to say simply, "We will provide a northern Ontario member with additional staff so that the electors can be serviced." I submit to the House that a politician, by his very nature, by his very position, is unique and his electors feel that uniqueness about him. They feel, rightly, that if they can present their case directly to him, he will have a better understanding of their concerns and needs.

If those concerns and needs are communicated through the hired staff of an elected representative, we will inevitably get a kind of funnelling; a kind of editing taking place. We must try to avoid this as much as possible. As much as possible the interaction must take place directly between the elector and the politician.

In long-range terms, I think that ridings in Ontario should be classified in three ways when the legislation is brought forward: (a) That urban ridings must be considered as such. Perhaps the figure for an optimum number of population in those urban ridings could be pegged, at let's say, 85,000; (b) that there are a number of mixed urban and rural ridings and that the optimum figure for those ridings could be pegged at roughly 65,000; (c) that there should be a special classification for northern Ontario ridings and perhaps the optimum figure of population for such classifications could be about 40,000 or 45,000.

Within those broad classifications, it seems to me, there should be a 25 per cent variable factor—(a) for communities of interest; (b) for natural boundaries; and (c) to take into account traffic patterns.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And the preservation of historic ridings.

Mr. Foulds: I think such a proposal has the benefit of meeting the problem of accessibility, of accountability of the elected representative and of two-way communication.

To sum up, it seems to me there is a general feeling, in northwestern Ontario particularly, that we have suffered because government policies have not encouraged development and, therefore, the population growth has not kept pace with the rest of Ontario. Having suffered economically, culturally and socially, we are very sensitive about being made to suffer politically. We must not lose the representation that we now have.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that there is a growing frustration and anger in northwestern Ontario, especially in view of the fact that, in our terms, in some areas we have grown. The population, for example, around the city of Thunder Bay has increased.

My own provincial riding, in northern terms, is a very compact one. It stretches only 30 miles east of the city of Thunder Bay and 30 miles west. There are approximately 6,000 to 8,000 voters in the rural part of that riding, but those 6,000 to 8,000 voters, frankly, do not receive the service available to the voters in the urban part of the Port Arthur provincial riding. For one thing, all the government offices are centered in the city of Thunder Bay itself and that's inevitable. For another, my own constituency office is more conveniently located in the urban core of the riding.

If that is true of my riding, which is among the most compact in northern Ontario—it is only about 3,000 sq miles—how much more true it must be for a far-flung constituency such as the Thunder Bay riding.

Gentlemen, if the government designs a redistribution scheme which attempts to diminish the representation in northern Ontario, it does so at its peril. If such a scheme is even a remote possibility, it imperils the democratic process, because constituencies such as Kenora and especially Thunder Bay are already unmanageable. Only the incredible efforts, as I said earlier, of the present member for Thunder Bay have made that riding at all manageable.

The government will discredit the parliamentary process by any attempt to diminish northern Ontario representation. It will encourage apathy and alienation among the electorate by any such attempt.

Coupled with the stupidity of certain ideas emanating from the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) about using northwestern Ontario quite literally as a backwater for the Great Lakes, is it any wonder that talk of northern Ontario separatism is surfacing once again? If you don't watch it, one fine morning there may very well be a defended border at the French River, and I of course would not like to see such a development.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): There goes the empire of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier).

Mr. Foulds: But I certainly would understand it. The years of frustration brought about by the neglect of northern Ontario—so typified in this session's Throne speech—makes such talk and such actions possible and understandable.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member makes reference to the possibility, and insinuates that a reservoir may be built in northwestern Ontario, as suggested by the chairman of the select committee on drainage. I want to make it very clear—and I want to put it on the record today—that while this may be a suggestion of the chairman of the select committee, it is not a recommendation of that committee.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well Mr. Speaker, surely that is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh sit down; let's hear him out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member has sat down.

But surely, Mr. Speaker, if a member in a speech makes certain suggestions which he puts forward as his opinion and if another hon. member disagrees with him, he can't raise them on a point of order. He can take the opportune moment when his turn comes to enter this debate, or any other debate, to put his position forward.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That's elementary, my dear Watson.

Mr. Singer: The hon. minister disagrees with what the member has been saying; let him speak in the Throne debate instead of rising on a spurious point of order.

Mr. Foulds: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker:

The reference was made in the speech because no minister of government has yet denied that such a scheme is possible.

If the member—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, please.

Mr. Foulds: If you please, Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

If the present minister wishes to make a statement to the effect that the government is not considering such a scheme and will not consider such a scheme in the future, let him do so and the residents of northwestern Ontario will be very happy indeed.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that—

Mr. Speaker: I don't think the minister replies; he has to save it for question period or some other time.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That's exactly right.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The government has no intention of going ahead with the reservoir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: I have finished my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Just have the hon. member for Lambton get up in his place and deny that he said what he said.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I just want to put the government's position.

Mr. Singer: Or both of the members get into the Throne debate for a change.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We will.

Mr. Lewis: He wants to build that reservoir, and the minister doesn't want him too. He has more influence with the cabinet than the minister does.

Mr. Foulds: The minister said it will not be done.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Is the hon. member for Port Arthur through; or does he want to proceed?

Mr. Foulds: I have finished my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take part in the Throne debate. I bring to the attention of you and the members of this Legislature some of the problems that concern constituents in my riding, and voters of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that I am not a crowd drawer, but of course I never was. So I am not disappointed at the audience; those who are in their seats this morning. However, I know what I have to say may not be too enlightening either.

However, I wish to extend congratulations to the Speaker, whose task is not an easy one; and I feel he is filling his duties in a very fair and able way. And I wish him well during the rest of his turn in his honourable position.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Did the member say fairly able or fair and able?

Mr. Spence: Fair and able—I hope I did.

Since the last session the Liberal Party has acquired two new members, and I know that their presence will contribute greatly, not only to the Liberal Party, but also to this Legislature as a whole—

Mr. Lewis: We are quite sure about that.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): So are we.

Mr. Spence: —and also, Mr. Speaker, to the debates which take place. Members of the government have attempted to brush aside these two by-election victories, which are the result of the personal reputations of the individual candidates. But it is useless for the Premier (Mr. Davis) and his colleagues to deny that these by-elections were a shock and a disappointment to them.

There is no question that both hon. members—the hon. member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Riddell) have many fine qualities and I have no doubt that will become more abundantly clear during the months ahead. Let not the government blind itself to the fact that these by-election results indicate a very real concern among the public about the centralization of power at Queen's Park and the rapidly increasing costs of the provincial government, government waste and the high cost of assessment and many more things I could mention.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech this year could not be described as an exciting or inspiring document. Judging from the comments of my own constituents the people of the province found the speech vague and unsatisfactory, offering little relief for their difficulties, such as high taxes.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the people have not forgotten that during the election campaign of 1971 this government maintained that it would not increase taxes if a Conservative government was re-elected, and that just a few months later, in 1972, the hon. provincial Treasurer increased taxes on automobile licences, marriage licences, birth certificates, gasoline, tobacco, liquor and many other items. The entry fees to provincial parks and Ontario Place were also increased.

So in just a few short months after the election the people of the province began to ask themselves if they could have faith in the words of this government. They asked one another, "Is this the government's way of footing the bills for all those fine things that were promised to us at election time?" That was just the beginning of the disillusionment of the people of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech we were promised land-use curbs, and certainly some action is needed in this connection. I think almost everyone will agree that something must be done about this. The question is how, when and where, and who is to take the lead? There are so many people involved and so many problems. One of the big difficulties is that, for the most part, land for any purpose can only come from the agricultural sector. In the old days it could be taken from the bush, but not any more, Mr. Speaker.

There are so many needs crying for attention. People need food, which can only come from a thriving agricultural industry. They need places to live, places to work, places for recreation, but we have to get our priorities right. Why is it always the farmer and the agricultural industry which bear the consequences of this modern-day good we call progress?

Land is needed for subdivisions and they take it from the farmland. Land is needed for recreation and they take it from farmland. Land is needed for airports and they take it from the good farmland. How long can this go on?

Obviously strong and effective action must be taken and without delay, Mr. Speaker. A first step would be to establish a government committee of all parties, which would gather opinions and statistics, hold hearings, and then after a thorough and urgent study of the problems involved legislation must be drafted and discussed in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention the agricultural industry at this time. The year of 1972 was a very costly and discouraging year for many farmers. On June 11 there was a very heavy frost which caused a tremendous loss of thousands of acres of wheat, corn, beans, potatoes, tobacco, tomatoes and fruit. In most cases the crops were replanted, but the weather became very wet, which meant that the crops did not mature as they should. In fact, many of the crops did not ripen as they should have, which meant a poor harvest. So many farmers had double expense and work in replanting, with poor returns for their labours and their expenditures.

For instance, in many cases the elevator people would not buy some of the farmers' crops because they had not matured properly. I know that pears, plums and other fruits actually fell off the trees and were lost. I know of several fruit farmers who had to seek work in industry because they had such heavy financial losses. Generally, the year for those in agriculture was a costly and disappointing one with the light harvest of grain and beans.

Another great difficulty was the serious shortage of farm labour. Those in the labour force do not wish to work on farms because of the hard work involved, because they feel they can earn higher wages in industry. This means that our farmers have to buy new machines to operate their farms and harvest their crops. These machines come very high in price and many farmers have had to stop farming because they simply cannot afford to buy this very dear equipment. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Agriculture has some plan about the labour problem to put before the Legislature when his estimates come up.

There has been a great deal of publicity lately about the tremendous increase in the price of food. Our womenfolk are protesting and talking of boycotting meat. We read about those organizations such as WASP—Women Against Soaring Prices—and I know that when women become determined about something and start banding together, they are a force to be reckoned with.

It's only natural that they should be concerned about the way prices are skyrocketing. Governments may come and governments may go but women all over the world always have to feed their families. It is obvious to everyone that the situation in the food industry and in the agricultural industry is reaching a point of crisis and all levels of government have to take fast and effective action to improve this.

Mr. Speaker, the light yields of grain and beans this past year, and the consequence of the shortages, has helped to bring about the high prices. It has cost more to feed hogs and cattle and sheep and with the increasing world demand for pork, lamb and beef, something has to be done, and soon. As I say, there is a shortage of experienced farm labour and many of the older farmers are retiring and going out of business. The younger men who might have taken over these veteran farms are discouraged when they look into the prices of acquiring farms, the cost of the necessary machinery, the long hours, and frequent small net returns. Consequently more and more of the farmland of this province could lay idle unless these young farmers are given higher net returns.

Food shortages are going to become worse and the prices, Mr. Speaker, I would say, will be going even higher. Of course, we all realize, Mr. Speaker, that there is a segment of the population which can afford these current high prices for meat. But there is a very large percentage of our population which simply cannot afford these prices. I ask the Minister of Agriculture and the government to look into these increases in prices and the tremendous difference—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister of Agriculture is paying careful attention.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He should resign.

Mr. Spence: —between the prices paid to the farmer and the prices paid by the consumer. Also, there are many complaints about the poor butchering at the present time, about the poor quality of meat, and the fact that the price of the cheaper cuts of meat have increased much more proportionately than the more expensive cuts.

For years now I have been asking in the House, as have many of my colleagues, for progressive, constructive action to be taken to preserve the agricultural industry in this province. So often the action taken has been too little and too late. I can only hope that now, at last, something really will be done, not only for the sake of the farmers of the province but for the sake of the consumer as well.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but say that I am constantly disappointed in our present provincial government. They seem to be so obsessed with their great and glorious schemes—their regional government plans, their modern office blocks, and other things like the great white elephant on the lakeshore and this new fangled Disneyland transportation system we are hearing about —that they have overlooked the basic necessities of life which are certainly much more important to the average Ontario taxpayer.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, what can be much more basic than the water supply and the sewage systems which many of our towns and villages in the ridings are at present in the process of building? Of course, the Ontario government is giving increased grants for these purposes, which are a great benefit to these municipalities, but they will have to be making payments for over a quarter of a century to carry out these schemes and to control pollution.

To help with these payments, the towns and villages desperately need small industry to be established in these areas. If help cannot be given in this way, the only alternative open to these municipalities would be to increase the tax rate beyond anything the pensioner can afford to pay. Homeowners on fixed incomes will simply not be able to meet the tax bills nor will the widows and the women with families to raise on mothers' allowances. These small towns and villages simply must have small industries. These small municipalities cannot continue to survive unless the government, through government development programmes or by some other means, takes some positive action.

I can only hope that the minister will have an encouraging report when his estimates come before this assembly. The government seems reluctant to help develop a rural community, yet I see that Ontario Hydro is building a new office block, which will cost some $40 million, right here in Toronto, on University Ave. in an area where the transportation facilities are strained to the utmost at rush hours. The overcrowding of our downtown area is already causing tremendous problems. Far from taking action to relieve these urban pressures this provincial government seems to be going out of its way to make matters even worse with projects such as the Hydro building in this location. This is further evidence of the government's obsession with centralization.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the protests from many sectors of the public, this government has made it clear it intends to continue its plans for regional government which are causing grave concern in many rural areas. In fact, many taxpayers in the province are actually frightened at the reports they have heard of the high cost incurred in areas where a form of regional government is already established.

Every report that I've ever read in newspapers outside of Toronto, Mr. Speaker, is unfavourable to regional government. All reports state that the costs have increased tremendously under these schemes. I have read that most costs will be up this year. In one article I read it said the costs will be $3.5 million higher in 1971 than in 1970 under the old form of county government, in spite of a grant of some $1 million, which actually cuts the regional levy for 1971.

These transitional grants are only for five years, and the taxpayers know that after the five-year period they are going to have to foot the bill for this extra cost of regional government. This government is acting under false pretenses when it tries to sell the principle of regional government to the rural people, without telling them what it will cost. The government knows all too well what the cost of regional government is going to be; and with the cost of education, sewage systems and water supply systems, rural communities will be unable to meet the tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, during the recent by-election campaign in Huron, I had an opportunity to talk to a few citizens of the area. They were very concerned that the government would find some method to force regional government upon the people in the rural areas if the Conservatives won in these two by-elections. I think that to some extent this

is the feeling of the people in many areas throughout the province.

On March 30 the London Free Press reported that the Premier had announced that his government had no intention of imposing regional government in all sections of the province, but proposed strong county rule. Perhaps this means that the Premier, in spite of protesting that the results of the by-elections do not reflect public opinion generally, really thinks otherwise and in fact has learned a lesson. If he has learned anything about the feelings of the people, that certainly is very gratifying. But the people have learned something too since 1971; that is, that what this government says and what it does are two different things.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, last, but not least, I want to say a few words about the report of the Provincial Auditor. This gentleman has always had my great respect; and Mr. Spence certainly bears an honourable name, in my view—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Is that the only nice thing the member can say about him? There is much more.

Mr. Spence: However, in all the years that he has held the position as Provincial Auditor, this is the first time I can recall a report that was so critical of the government. The record of government abuse of taxpayers' money and of wasteful spending is so outrageous as to be almost unbelievable. Of course, this is the last report of Mr. Spence, since he retired at the end of 1972; and perhaps he felt that he would like to leave the house in order before he left it to someone else's tender mercies.

Whatever his reasons for producing this report at this time, and whether or not he was motivated by the disclosure made by the public accounts committee last year, I do know that this report has certainly caused a great deal of consternation among the members of this House and the public in general.

It has always been my understanding that the Provincial Auditor should be impartial, a kind of guardian of the money of the people of this province, a servant of the people—not the government—who will report on government spending of the taxpayers' money and make sure that the money is spent according to the wishes of the people as laid down in the Acts of this province. Yet each year, when the estimates of the Provincial Auditor are before the Legislature, the Auditor sits alongside the government, giving confidential answers to the provincial Treasurer, who then interprets the information to the House as he sees fit.

If the Provincial Auditor is in fact the impartial guardian of the taxpayers' money, and if he is to curb abuses and waste on the part of the government, then surely he should sit at the Clerk's table in that neutral area in the centre of this assembly so that the opposition parties will have the same opportunity of sending questions directly to him rather than receiving their answers through the interpretation of the Treasurer.

I realize that the Provincial Auditor's report is discussed in detail in committee, but if the Provincial Auditor is to be present in this House to supply information to the government, in all fairness the same opportunity should be available to all parties so that the members, press and public alike may know what the Provincial Auditor has to say. His written answers should be read into the records, where appropriate, rather than the predigested answers supplied by the Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other matters I could talk on but when the budget comes down no doubt I will try to have a few words to say then. I thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for this opportunity to take part in this debate. I was all prepared last year to take part in the debate on six different occasions. On those six different occasions, I had my wife with me, and this morning I have my wife with me again.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): She's certainly the better half.

Mr. McIlveen: That's right, the better half, and it shows that once in seven is lucky.

I had a speech all ready last year to congratulate you on your appointment, Mr. Speaker, and I was going to do that again today, but yesterday I heard the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) take you apart because you heard much better out of your right ear than you did with your left ear, with the "ayes" and the "nays". But I was beginning to think that the way the questions were coming up in the question period that you didn't hear the rump at all, and this

rump here is by far the loudest section of the whole House. It is by far the best section, too, I must say.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): They are never critical of the government.

Mr. McIlveen: Who aren't?

Mr. Young: The rump.

Mr. McIlveen: Not yet; give us time.

An hon. member: The member for Yorkview hasn't been listening.

Mr. Young: It's the base of the party.

Mr. McIlveen: That's right.

An hon. member: We are the most constructive section on this side of the House.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): It's a great training ground.

Mr. McIlveen: Mr. Speaker, I notice that I was mentioned in dispatches by the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) the other day. I was going to have something to say about that but I am going to wait until he does some damned fool thing again and then I will do it in my column.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Dont wait for him to do that. He only comes here to listen to himself.

Mr. McIlveen: I know, but we will have it the next time. I thought in my maiden speech that I should at least deal with problems which are associated with my own riding.

Mr. Young: There aren't any problems there!

Mr. McIlveen: The people have a lot fewer problems now than they did in the last four years.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): That's why the member is here.

Mr. Young: Does the member think this government will listen to a Tory member any more than it listens to an opposition member?

Mr. McIlveen: Oh sure, why shouldn't it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the member keeps polishing up the handle, he is going to get over there beside the member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. McIlveen: The Lieutenant Governor mentioned a rapid growth in the Ontario economy with a lower unemployment rate—from 5.2 per cent in 1971 to 4.8 per cent in 1972—and with a record growth of 140,000 new jobs created in Ontario. These figures tally with the unemployment figures in Oshawa. Unemployment in Oshawa in February, 1972, was 4,162 males, 2,872 females. As of February, 1973, the male unemployed were down to 2,749 and the females to 2,290.

General Motors, by far the single largest employer in my community, had 9,712 hourly employees and 4,000 on salary in March, 1972. In March, 1973, the hourly employees had increased to 11,500, with no increase in the salaried employees. Their number remained steady at 4,000. This is the largest total employment in the automotive industry in Oshawa since the introduction of the auto trade pact in 1965.

Because automotive employment is so vital to my community, I would like to review the importance of car manufacturing to the Ontario economy in terms of volume of production of motor vehicles. Motor vehicle manufacturing is the single most important industry in this province. With the addition of motor vehicle parts and accessories, it supplies 70,000 jobs—which represents nine per cent of the total manufacturing employment in this province.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Who is that speaking?

Mr. McIlveen: Pardon?

Mr. Shulman: I can't remember the member's name right now.

Mr. McIlveen: Yes, Charlie what's-his-name.

An hon. member: Don't ever forget it.

Mr. McIlveen: The importance of this industry is truly exemplified by the fact that one in every eight jobs is directly or indirectly related to the automotive industry. The automotive agreement between Canada and the United States, despite recent US complaints, has been beneficial to the manufacturing of both countries. Sales of our vehicles in the two countries have reached record levels, averaging 1.9 million units annually between 1965 and 1969. This was an increase of 26 per cent over the average sales in the preceding five years.

Two-way trade between the two countries increased total employment in the automobile, vehicle and parts industry. The

wholesale price differential in the two countries for comparable models decreased from nine per cent of the US price in 1964 to approximately four per cent in 1969. I personally will be satisfied only when the price is price parity with the U.S.A.

Mr. Young: It is up to 10 per cent now.

Mr. McIlveen: No, it isn't.

Mr. Young: Oh yes.

Mr. McIlveen: Not according to last week. Are the member's figures better than GM's?

Mr. Young: They always are.

Mr. Shulman: Is it GM that writes the member's speeches?

Mr. McIlveen: No they don't, as a matter of fact. I wrote this one myself, as the member can tell.

Mr. Shulman: The member is reading it quite badly.

Mr. McIlveen: Well, I always read badly.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, isn't there a ruling about reading speeches?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): The member for High Park would have nothing to say if there were.

Mr. McIlveen: I wouldn't mind, if there were such a rule. I would be pleased to speak according to that rule, if it was also for everyone else. I would like to see a rule covering reading of editorials, because I think last year I listened to the member for High Park read editorials for about six hours.

Mr. Shulman: I gave attribution to my speech; I was hoping the member would do the same for his.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. McIlveen: Well, I'll tell you that next year with the price decrease the member has on Xaviera and The Happy Hooker, he might be able to read that aloud into the record.

Mr. Shulman: I wanted to do that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It would make as much sense as what he usually reads.

Mr. McIlveen: At the same time motor vehicle manufacturing production rose by 92 per cent and parts manufacturing production by 130 per cent. The only point of dissatisfaction with the auto pact on the part of the United States is the turnaround on the balance of trade of motor vehicles and parts from a total of $37 million in favour of the United States in 1965, to a minus of $162 million in 1970. However, it is a fact that the balance is still in favour of the United States by over $2 billion since the signing of the pact in 1965.

While Canada has benefited from the automotive pact as a whole, such cannot be said for all municipalities concerned with automotive manufacturing. Take Oshawa, for instance.

The UAW is an amalgamated union of nine units in Oshawa for General Motors and its suppliers. In 1965, this amalgamated union had 18,300 workers. In 1972 they had 12,000 workers, for a total loss of 6,000 automotive jobs. General Motors employed 15,700 in 1965 compared with 10,100 in 1972, for a total loss of 5,600 employees. Updating to 1973, with an increase General Motors has gone up to 11,500 hourly employees, which will bring the loss to 4,000 jobs since the automotive pact was brought in. At the same time, many of the small parts manufacturing plants, such as Coulters, have been lost to Oshawa and Canada over the past year.

Regarding the safeguards of the automotive pact, to continue the strength of the Canadian and Ontario economy specifically, I would like to suggest the following:

1. That regardless of other changes which may take place in the automotive trade pact between Canada and the United States, existing safeguards which assure that certain levels of production in terms of dollar value must take place in Canada, have to be maintained.

2. The level of production requirements be raised to ensure that, as a minimum, Canadians will have a right to produce in dollar value the amount actually consumed in North American automotive production.

If this had been in effect last year we would have had more jobs in the automotive industry. According to the president of the UAW in Oshawa we built six per cent of North American built cars but we consumed 7.5 per cent. If we were to build the same dollar value as we consumed, we would supply a further 30,000 automotive jobs.

It is my opinion that the Ontario government should make very strong representation to Ottawa in regard to increasing these safeguards. Second, they should request the the Canadian government institute a task force to study the importation of foreign-

built cars into our country. It is time that we as a province, and we as a country, found out how big a percentage of imports we can afford and still keep our own automotive industry healthy. So much for the car manufacturers.

The Lieutenant Governor made it clear that the most urgent requirements facing all governments today is the preservation of our physical resources, and the most important of these resources is land. To me, this was one of the highlights of his speech. Legislation for the preservation of the Niagara Escarpment and the control over the one million acres that are involved is important. But of more direct importance to my riding is the parkway belt from Dundas in the West to Oshawa in the east that the government has promised.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) aptly described this vast parkway system as urban separators to contain the sprawling growth around Metropolitan Toronto. This imaginative approach will ensure that our children and our children's children do not have the miles of concrete jungle to contend with that are prevalent in large American metropolitan areas today and which are quickly becoming evident in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, may I continue for a moment on the parkway belt? One of the ideal provincial land purchase schemes could be through bigger and better conservation areas. However, I would like to put forth some of the concerns of my municipality regarding the manner in which the conservation authorities are organized.

We recognize the validity of conservation and the necessity of spending substantial funds for conservation. However, those substantial sums should not be levied on it by a body of persons who are not elected, who are not answerable to anyone except the minister for the amount of money they spend, and who, for the most part, have no knowledge of or interest in the effect of their levy on the municipal taxpayer.

For instance, the city of Oshawa has 95,000 people, has 64 per cent of the population of the area covered by our conservation authority, provides 66 per cent of the municipal share of the expenses of the authority, and yet has only three representatives on a 15-man conservation authority.

A small portion of the township of Clark, comprising 210 people, has a member on the authority. A portion of the township of Reach, comprising 211 people, has a member on the authority, and a portion of the township of Pickering, comprising 1,225 people, has a member on the authority. The net result is that the representation from these small areas—containing less than 1.5 per cent of the population of our conservation authority and contributing less than 1.5 per cent of the municipal share of the budget—is exactly the same as the city of Oshawa, with 64 per cent of the population contributing 66 per cent of the municipal share of the authority's budget.

I feel that if the cause of conservation is to receive the support of the urban municipalities, these glaring discrepancies must be remedied, and the Act rewritten accordingly. It is my opinion that a much larger share for conservation land purchases must come from the provincial purse rather than the already overburdened property tax base.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that placed in the parkway belt there will be a special area called the transportation corridor. This will have a limited access, multilane highway, a medium density rapid commuter system, rail beds for CNR and CPR trains, hydro and telephone rights of way, plus space for communications networks that are not yet in the minds of the eventual inventors.

Mr. Speaker, all these plans are magnificent for the future. However, of greater urgency to my rapidly growing municipality is the extension of GO Transit to Oshawa by rail. Our transportation should have the same consideration as that of Metropolitan Toronto, and presently we are not getting it.

Mr. Shulman: Change the government.

Mr. McIlveen: No, I won't go that far.

Mr. Shulman: You will have to if you want better transportation.

Mr. McIlveen: The Lieutenant Governor stated that a strong and reformed local government is in the best position to determine its own priorities and proposes to strengthen local government by transferring more authority and responsibility for the many decisions that relates to local matters. Mr. Speaker, in our area that reform has been going on since 1967.

My municipality, accompanied by its neighbouring municipality, petitioned the Ontario government to join with them in seeking to find the best possible alternatives to the social, physical, economic, governmental, and financial elements. With this in mind, the OPAD study was born, and OPAD stands for the Oshawa area planning and development study.

Specifically, this study included the following closely interrelated components: 1. Economic base; 2. Land use; 3. Transportation; 4. Municipal services, such as water and sewer; 5. Financial capability; 6. Regional government structure and implementation. Consultant teams were hired and each consultant team took one phase of the study and reported their findings to the consultant principal, Mr. Don Patterson.

After two years, the study broke down, due to many factors. But the main factor, however, was the inability of the local elected officials to agree on the various alternatives for our region.

Following the study's termination, the study results were given to the province. The study was continued by the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, and a proposal has been brought forward for the area east of Metro, which was released by the hon. Charles MacNaughton and the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Irvine) Dec. 18, 1972, at Eastdale Collegiate in Oshawa. Municipalities are now in the throes of reacting to that Dec. 18 proposal.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): They sure are.

Mr. McIlveen: Hopefully, the province will have enough common ground to come forward with a compromise solution satisfactory to all.

I know that in a recent local newspaper survey, the majority of citizens in the area east of Metro decided that they were in favour of regionalization by a large percentage. I personally would like to see the legislation written this session in favour of implementation for Jan. 1, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset that I was going to mention matters from the Throne Speech as they affect Oshawa. The Lieutenant Governor mentioned that it is the Ontario government's proposal to conserve and maintain Ontario's heritage and history, and that the government would propose legislation to make funds available for the restoration and maintenance of selected buildings and structures of a historic significance. There is a structure in Oshawa in need of this new legislation right now.

The late Col. R. S. McLaughlin's family estate, called Parkwood, is in dire need of funds. If we are going to preserve it for posterity it must be preserved now.

Parkwood is unique. It is a part of our Canadian heritage that cannot be replaced, nor will its like ever be seen again. Parkwood is a magnificent structure that would equal or better in tourist attraction most of the medieval castles that are strewn throughout Europe and Britain and which most Canadians travelling through see every summer and on every holiday.

The late Col. R. S. McLaughlin left Parkwood to the Oshawa General Hospital situated directly across the road. The estate now is funded through a McLaughlin Foundation grant, a city of Oshawa grant, and fees charged from sightseeing. At the moment, the northwest corner of the estate is in jeopardy, as the Oshawa General Hospital has received approval from the Ontario Municipal Board to rezone it for the erection of a parking garage, in spite of many, many citizens' protests. The hospital is land-poor and badly needs a parking garage, but if Parkwood is to be preserved, no part of its land should be severed. I hope the legislation mentioned is decisive and quick because this province can ill afford to lose a part of its heritage as valuable as Parkwood.

His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor stated that his government will provide increased assistance and encouragement to our amateur athletes through a special community-wide athletics and recreational programme that will be giving full support to the first Ontario Summer Games, which will be held this year in Oshawa commencing July 1. I would like to take just a few moments to express my delight at Oshawa's being chosen as the city for these games.

Believe me, the government could not have chosen better. I would like to state categorically that we intend to make it a tough act to follow for the city that will be chosen for the 1974 games.

The games committee is under the chairmanship of Mr. T. V. Kelly. Terry is a dynamic, energetic young man who will have every Ontario citizen involved in making our games a success. He suggested to me a torch be carried from Queen's Park to Oshawa, following the ancient Olympic custom.

With this in mind, I wrote to the Premier, suggesting that the legislative members carry the torch in relays to start the games. As Oshawa is approximately 40 miles away, it would mean less than a half a mile for each member. The Premier replied to my request in an off-the-record letter. While I am not accustomed to reading the Premier's off-the-record letters into Hansard, this I thought I would. He said off the record:

> Charles, I am highly amused at the prospect of a suggested relay. Before we get

fully committed to such an undertaking, I would like to be sure that the games would not be over and forgotten before the flame arrived.

It is quite obvious to me that the Premier does not think too highly of the physical condition of the members of the House.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): He doesn't think too much of the mental condition of some of them either.

Mr. Deacon: He is thinking about his backbenchers.

Mr. Shulman: He is more familiar with the Conservatives than he is with the opposition, so he should know.

Mr. McIlveen: Well, I said that if I could find a really long-burning flame I would like to put the members to the test.

Mr. Shulman: We accept for the NDP.

Mr. McIlveen: The NDP accept?

Mr. Shulman: We accept.

Mr. McIlveen: Well, by George, we are in.

Mr. Shulman: Look at this slim group of members.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): You don't notice anybody chubby over here, Mr. Speaker. They all look chubby over there.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Don't look at me.

Mr. McIlveen: I want to say the fat cats here can outrun those guys, too.

Mr. Martel: We will put them to the test if they want.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The first time they ever admitted they were fat.

Mr. McIlveen: For the week preceding the games, Terry Kelly has devised a plan which will be known as "Fanfare for Oshawa Week." This will be a build-up for the games starting last week in June. The games themselves will start July 1.

The whole week will be devoted to arts and crafts and cultural exhibits by various organizations throughout the city. We certainly welcome all of the members as visitors to our city at any time, but especially during "Fanfare for Oshawa Week."

On July 1, the Ontario games start and they will speak for themselves. The best athletes from across the province will be competing. Come and see the records fall. Maybe someone from the members' own communities will be in the winners' circle.

Mr. Speaker, in closing let me say that this was an imaginative and a far-reaching Speech from the Throne. Its main theme was improving the quality of life for the citizens of Ontario. I am sure this government will continue to do just that. I have put forward some suggestions that I hope can be adopted by by the province.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I wish to thank you for allowing me to participate in this debate.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, before I get into my remarks I would like to add to the sentiments expressed by many other members in this chamber in thanking you for your co-operation in our proceedings and to congratulate you on the way that you have handled the affairs of the House. I have no doubt at all that this kind of relationship will continue.

I would also like to join with others who have spoken in this Throne Speech debate and add my congratulations to the two new members who have joined us as a result of the recent by-elections.

I would like to congratulate anybody on the other side who has been elevated to a ministerial position, particularly the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), since I'll be watching him very closely over the next few months. I want to say at the outset I wish him well and hope that he will take into consideration some of the suggestions that we from northern Ontario will be making concerning industry and tourism as they affect that part of the province.

I would also like to congratulate those who have been elevated to the status of parliamentary assistant and hope they too will do well and contribute in a significant fashion to the affairs of the province.

Before I get into the main topics I wish to discuss, Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have had the company of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) who spoke in this debate last night. I wonder what prompted him to be so volatile and so critical of a government that he happens to be a part of. Since he is parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), I wonder whether he is going to be with them much longer, because in my short tenure in this Legislature I don't think I have heard any government member get up and be so

critical of present programmes and of the indifference with which this government has treated all segments of northern Ontario.

He said the road structure was a disgrace. He said there just wasn't anything meaningful being done by this government in northern Ontario—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): But he'll still vote for them.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): He wants to keep his seat. It's the only way he can keep it.

Mr. Stokes: He said there's nothing that bears repeating or that would lead the people in northern Ontario to believe that this government is taking the problems of northern Ontario seriously.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): They just don't understand.

Mr. Stokes: I am really amazed, Mr. Speaker, to witness a parliamentary assistant stand up and be so critical of a government that he is a part of. I wonder if he avails himself of the opportunity to say those things during caucus meetings, if they have any; and if they do have any, whether there are any cabinet ministers around to listen.

If the hon. Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province, who made a great to-do about the future of this province of opportunity being for people, can't convince a parliamentary assistant that he is serious about making the future for people, how is he going to convince the rest of the people in Ontario, particularly those who come from northern Ontario?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He can't convince the hon. member and me.

Mr. Stokes: He certainly hasn't convinced anybody on this side of this House. I am really amazed, Mr. Speaker, to hear a parliamentary assistant stand up and be so critical of a form of government that he is a part of; it seems to me that he has to justify that to his own constituents. It is simply unbelievable and inconceivable that a parliamentary assistant would stand up and be so critical of a system that he is a part of.

Mr. Young: And he should resign.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): It may be strange but we allow free speech. We don't throw people out for having an idea.

Mr. Stokes: I would subscribe to that but I think anybody who stands up in this Legislature and continues to be a part of an organization with which he seems to be so disenchanted, should re-examine his position.

Mr. Drea: Let the member wait until he hears my next speech.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, a few members in this house have discussed the geography of this province. I've discussed it with you privately, and with my colleague, the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds), who was talking about redistribution as it affects federal ridings and the intimation in the Throne Speech that this government was going to look at redistribution as it affects provincial constituencies. To add some emphasis to the geography and the nature of the problem associated with redistribution, I would like to relate a personal experience that I had as recently as last weekend.

I got a letter from one of the Indian reserves in my constituency. I think it is fair to say that my constituency in a geographic way is the largest in the Province of Ontario. The estimates of its total area are anywhere from 103,000 to 110,000 miles depending on whom one listens to.

Mr. Deacon: That's 100,000 square miles. They may think that is acres.

Mr. Stokes: No, it is 110,000 square miles.

Mr. Deacon: Right. They always used to use acres.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. No, it is 110,000 square miles.

I got an invitation to attend a winter carnival at Big Trout Lake which is one of the most northerly Indian communities in Ontario. They asked me if I wouldn't attend last Friday and Saturday; it would be an opportunity for me to meet with my constituents and enjoy myself with a little bit of northern fun.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sounds great.

Mr. Stokes: I was sitting in the Ontario Legislature here as we all are. It is 747 railway miles from here to my home in Schreiber. It's a further 135 miles to the city of Thunder Bay. It is another 347 miles from Thunder Bay to the most northerly part of the province you can drive to, by automobile, at Pickle Lake. It would have meant that I had to charter an aircraft from Pickle Lake to Big Trout Lake, that's about 170 air miles. I don't know what the cost of the

charter would have been. It could have ranged anywhere from $200 to $300 depending on the kind of aircraft that was available.

Mr. Renwick: What about going over land?

Mr. Stokes: Needless to say I had to turn it down. It would have meant that I would have had to absent myself from this Legislature for about four days and I didn't think I could do that at this point in time. I got a map of Canada.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What did the member for Riverdale say?

Mr. Stokes: Using the centre of the circle that has been prescribed as Toronto, I prescribed the circle up to Fort Severn, which is the most northerly part of the province where anybody lives. If you continue with that circle it takes you to the outskirts of Winnipeg on the west; it takes you to Cape Breton Island on the east. This map doesn't go far enough down into the United States but it would be somewhere around Kentucky I think it is.

Mr. Deacon: Right down into Florida?

Mr. Stokes: Maybe even down into Florida if you continued with the circle. When members hear some other members of this Legislature complaining about the logistics of getting around their ridings and saying that they adequately serve their constituents while sitting down in the Ontario Legislature, at some time in the future if the members see me absent myself for a few days from the proceedings down here, I hope they'll appreciate that I, for one, think that the people in the northern part of this province have as much right to equal representation as anyone in one of the Metropolitan Toronto ridings.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that if the Premier, or anyone who is in a decision-making position in this Legislature, starts talking about the problems of individual members—of the logistics of getting around the riding and the need to see that remote members in the province have an opportunity to expose themselves to their constituents—he will take advantage of the opportunity to put in a word for northern members and the constituents whom they represent.

It seems to me that if the future of this province is to be for people, we should be mindful of the needs, the problems and the aspirations of everyone in the Province of Ontario, regardless of where they may live.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the setting up of a new native organization in the Province of Ontario. For the benefit of any member of this House who is unfamiliar with the way that native people have come into their own in an organizational way in the last few years, under the aegis of the Union of Ontario Indians, my colleague, the member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid), is well aware of Grand Council Treaty No. 3 that takes in all of the Indian bands in his constituency and several in the constituency of Kenora.

All the other Indian reserves and Indian bands have seen the wisdom in structuring themselves in this way. Last month they convened a conference at North Bay, where all the Indian bands decided to join together and speak with a united voice for some 15,000 native people living on northern reserves. These stretch all the way from James Bay on the east to the Manitoba border on the west, north of a line just north of the French River.

Since they have thought about this in a very sophisticated way and in a very responsible way, I think that it's incumbent upon me to remind this Legislature that this new structure is in existence and that they mean business. They are not coming cap in hand to either the Provincial government or the federal government asking for handouts or paternalism, as has been the case all too often in the past.

I would like to read into the record, the aims and objectives of this new organization and hope that if any member from any quarter of this House has an opportunity to speak with them that he or she will treat them with utmost seriousness and courtesy. Listen to them; they have something to say. They have a message. I think that we can expect great things from the new organization that is to be called Grand Council Treaty No. 9 under the presidency of Andrew Rickard, who is the former executive director of the Union of Ontario Indians and chief of the Moose band.

I would like to quote, just to let members know exactly what they are about. I quote Mr. Rickard's letter:

> I have been elected to represent my people in northern Ontario known as Treaty No. 9. I am honoured by this gesture of confidence. My colleagues and I will utilize every means possible to ensure that our people will some day enjoy a standard of living at par with the rest of Canada.

I do not claim to be God's answer to the so-called native problem of today; however, I do know that it will only be through a collective effort on the part of the Indian leaders that we will begin to resolve the actual problems, rather than working on the symptoms, as has been the practice in the past.

As the president of this new organization, I have promised our chiefs to work constructively with all levels of government. I intend to do this. I also expect the same co-operation from all the government agencies. I must stress, however, that I will not use any form of rotarian communication with any official just for the sake of pleasing some people. I expect all my inquiries to be answered in a constructive and positive manner. Perhaps this expectation is not in line with the normal civil servant's approach. However, this is the line of approach I intend to use.

I have informed my chiefs that this will be my last effort to work within the existing policies of the various levels of government. I will make every effort to work within the framework of these policies. My colleagues and I intend to resist any policies that are not attuned to the needs of our people. In turn, we intend to constructively propose changes and/or alternatives.

I realize that we in Treaty No. 9 represent only a small fraction of the Canadian population. [In fact, it's about 15,000 people.] I see our voices as being a tiny spark in the darkness. But do not forget that a tiny spark can create an explosion that can rock any power structure. I pray to our Great Spirit that no one will ever resort to this alternative. The incident at Wounded Knee is not a laughing matter. The same situation can easily develop in Canada if the federal government will not respond to our legitimate requests. If we come to an impasse, we will be prepared to seek aid from other sources, be it domestic or foreign.

If all these avenues prove fruitless, what means will we resort to? Will we have to resort to civil disobedience before our needs are met? Will we have to take government offices by force if our legitimate requests are not met? I hope we will never be forced to contemplate such measures. In any event, willingness to work with us will be the determining factor.

In order to ensure that Grand Council Treaty No. 9 does work effectively on behalf of our people in Treaty No. 9 area, we ask that the following procedures be adhered to:

(a) We do not want any group to be funded with respect to any study or project within Treaty No. 9 that will affect our communities, without the full knowledge and consultation of the executive council of Treaty No. 9.

(b) We do not want any studies in our native communities that will solely benefit non-native interests.

(c) Before any anthropologists or other similar groups contemplate visiting one or more of our communities for the purpose of studying our people, we ask that the executive council of Treaty No. 9 be consulted prior to the visits.

(d) We do not want the federal nor the provincial government to introduce any new programmes or projects in any native community located within Treaty No. 9, including meetings, without prior consultation with Grand Council Treaty No. 9.

(e) We do not want any group to spearhead any issue that might develop in Treaty No. 9; that is the function of Grand Council Treaty No. 9.

(f) The executive council of Treaty No. 9 will be the sole agent for the presentation of major issues and programmes dealing with Treaty No. 9 and its native people.

(g) All avenues are open to the chiefs of the Treaty No. 9. The chiefs and band councils will be making individual proposals pertaining to their respective communities from time to time. These individual proposals will not be limited to one level of government.

We leave it to each government to ensure that the foregoing will be adhered to by its civil servants. We request the fullest co-operation from all non-governmental bodies, i.e., both public and private institutions. We further request the co-operation of our sister organizations.

The people of Treaty No. 9 are very desirous in achieving some form of socio-economic parity with the rest of this country. In pursuing this objective, human and financial resources will be required. However, we will tell how, when and where individual services will be required.

We must do our own thing, at our own pace of development and under our own terms.

Yours in co-operation,
Andrew Rickard,
President,
Grand Council Treaty No. 9

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have made all members of this Legislature aware of this new organization. I hope that members from all sides of the House will co-operate fully with them and listen to them. I think that if we do listen and hear properly, this new organization will be the vehicle for bringing all native people in the far reaches of this province into the mainstream of the cultural, economic and social life of this province. I implore each and every member of this Legislature to co-operate fully with them.

Mr. Speaker, I do have several other topics that I would like to get into, and I was wondering if you would permit me to adjourn the debate at this time before I get into another topic?

If so, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I have been asked by the House leader, who is unfortunately unable to be here today—he is attending a funeral—to announce that the order of business for Monday will be the Throne Speech debate.

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 6, 1973

Tour of livestock marketing facilities, statement by Mr. Stewart 633

Regional government, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon 633

Use of Indian programme funds for Wounded Knee expedition, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. R. F. Nixon 634

Philco-Ford layoffs, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Timbrell, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Bounsall 635

Toronto downtown housing, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 635

Composition of advisory committee on geriatrics, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis 636

Composition of labour relations board, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 636

Composition of research foundation board, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Lewis 636

Composition of Niagara Parks Commission, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 637

Use of government aircraft, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. W. Newman 637

Ayr-Blenheim land purchase, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon 638

Complaint about OMB, questions of Mr. Bales: Mrs. Campbell 639

Great Lakes flood damage, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Burr, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Ruston 640

Public assistance application, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis 641

North Pickering development, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Deacon 641

Invitation of members to meeting, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Deans 642

Food and fuel costs in northern Ontario, questions of Mr. Lawrence and Mr. White: Mr. Reid 642

Ministerial responsibility for energy policy, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Givens 643

OMB membership, question of Mr. White: Mr. Laughren 643

Use of government aircraft, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Sargent 644

Presenting report, legal aid plan, Mr. Bales 645

Presenting report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Ewen 645

Town of Oakville Act, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading 645

City of London Act No. 1, bill respecting, Mr. Timbrell, first reading 645

City of Ottawa Act, bill respecting, Mr. Morrow, first reading 645

City of London Act, No. 2, bill respecting, Mr. Walker, first reading 645

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Spence, Mr. McIlveen, Mr. Stokes 646

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Stokes, agreed to 668

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Stewart, agreed to 668

No. 17



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 9, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the west gallery are students from Burlington Central High School of Burlington. In both galleries are students from Danforth Gardens Public School of Scarborough.

Statements by the ministry.

ESTIMATES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I have here a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by his own hand. Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ended March 31, 1974, and recommends them to the legislative assembly. Toronto, April 9, 1973.

ESTIMATES PROCEDURE

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I believe the members will find it helpful to have a brief statement from the government on the procedure which it is proposed to follow this year in connection with the tabling and presentation of estimates. It may also be of interest to you, sir, and to the members to have a short recapitulation of the decision-making process which has preceded the formal tabling of one volume.

It will be evident from copies of the book now being distributed—which is volume 2 and which covers the 1973-1974 estimates for ministries in the Justice policy field—that the government is reinforcing, in a highly visible fashion, the successful reorganization which emerged last year following acceptance of the recommendations of the Cronyn committee, that is the Committee on Government Productivity or COGP.

You will find, Mr. Speaker, that the first vote in this volume pertains to the cabinet's committee on justice policy of which my hon. colleague, the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Kerr), is the chairman. When the House resolves itself into committee of supply on the basis of the resolution to be passed later today, the Provincial Secretary will, in introducing his own vote, have an opportunity to elaborate on various aspects in the broad field of justice policy.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That will be pleasant.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The opposition parties in turn may wish to comment on general policy issues at that point. This procedure, we believe, will facilitate the progress of debate when we get to the estimates of the individual operating ministries in the Justice field. Some of these estimates, in accordance with the wishes of this House, will be referred to a standing committee, while others will be debated by the committee of supply.

If we can cover the general policy issues in the context of the cabinet committee's vote, it will avoid duplication in various other debates. These later debates, whether in committee of supply or in one of the standing committees, can be more profitably directed to specific matters pertaining to the ministry concerned.

In a week to 10 days the estimates for the ministries in the Social Development policy field and the Resources Development policy field will each be presented in a separate volume similar to the one tabled today. Again, the vote pertaining to the respective cabinet committee secretariat will be the first vote in the book.

The appropriations for non-policy field ministries, as well as for His Honour's office, the office of the Premier (Mr. Davis) and so on, will be contained in a general government volume which will also be tabled next week. That volume will also reflect another departure from former practices, in that certain appropriations pertaining to your office, Mr. Speaker, and to the operation of this assembly, have been separated and are no longer shown as part of a ministry.

In all this it will be apparent that we are departing from the process which was traditional or more appropriate in the days before

the government reorganization. The estimates are now being tabled separately and not as a part of the budget presentation. No doubt hon. members are aware that this is the practice in Westminster as well as in Ottawa and probably in other jurisdictions elsewhere.

The government considers it appropriate this year to have the tabling of estimates straddle the presentation of the budget. The timing of the latter was largely dictated by other events, including the timing of the federal budget. Another year may see the complete estimates tabled ahead of the provincial budget, although this sequence may also be reversed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That certainly leaves all their options open.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Certainly, as I said the other day, we expect in future to table the estimates before the beginning of the fiscal year. And this, I think, is the point that matters.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why not be like Mr. Diefenbaker and not have a budget at all?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The tabling of the estimates, now in four volumes, is only the final product of a long and careful sequence or process of decisions.

In presenting these facts to you today, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will allow me to digress for just a moment to acknowledge, on behalf of the Management Board and on behalf of the government, the efforts of all the officials in all the ministries and in all the secretariats. Much has had to be done by deputy ministers and their staffs to allow individual ministers and the various committees of ministers to establish the order of priority, to evaluate the alternatives and to make the decisions which are reflected in these estimates.

The process to which I am referring started more than one year ago. It is now in progress for the estimates to be tabled a year from now. It is a co-operative effort involving the ministries, the policy field committees, the Policy and Priorities Board, the Management Board and, of course, cabinet itself.

It used to be said that up to four or five years ago the Management Board, or the Treasury Board as it was then known, decided the estimates during a couple of months in the winter, with a few final decisions being deferred until just about budget time. This is no longer the case.

All last summer the ministers, the ministries and the policy field committees developed and reworked their proposals in the framework of a long-range forecast. These proposals were discussed by the Policy and Priorities Board at several series of meetings during the summer and fall. The cabinet then approved certain policies and established an upper limit for each ministry's expenditures.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Like cutting Medicare by $50 million.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It was within this framework that the Management Board reviewed and recommended the detailed allocations of funds, as tabled in the estimates.

The task of making the limited provincial resources stretch to cover the ever-expanding needs of the province, is difficult and demanding. The demands placed on the competence and ingenuity of government departments are very great. The Management Board, in reviewing the estimates submissions from the various ministries, ensures that they reflect the policy decisions of the cabinet and that the resources allocated are appropriate in terms of efficiency and sound administrative practice.

Mr. Speaker, the estimates which were sent to this House by His Honour today, and those which he will send here next week are the culmination of a co-operative effort; they are the result of many difficult decisions made by the government, and they reflect the determination of ministers and officials alike to maximize the benefits from the resources we have and to provide this province with efficient public administration.

I have intentionally refrained from comment on specific amounts or specific programmes. The Treasurer will deal with the finances of the province on Thursday and each of my colleagues will, at the appropriate time, elaborate on the programmes for which he has primary responsibility as a member of the government.

However, I do want to assure the members and, through them, the people of Ontario, that this new procedure, this new management process which the government has adopted for the review and presentation of its expenditure programme, is designed to maximize the results obtained for every tax dollar. Thank you.

TORONTO DOWNTOWN HOUSING

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to report to the Legislature on the discussions held with Mayor David Crombie, Toronto

city and Ontario Housing Corp. officials and myself in regard to a development proposed for Sherbourne and Dundas Sts. Although I was absent from the city since Thursday, I was in almost constant contact by telephone with those involved.

On April 3, I met with Mayor Crombie after which the following joint statement was issued and I quote:

1. The minister stated that acceptance of this development as a public housing project will only be in accordance with the resolution of the city council which said in part, "And whereas in January, 1973, council authorized the engagement of Messrs. Diamond and Meyer to prepare a feasibility study of the economics of developing the site at permitted densities; and whereas such a study was completed on Feb. 15, 1973, and it indicates that an infill lowrise project can be built on the site, retaining the existing buildings, at the same density and at no greater cost than the developer's highrise proposal; . . . now therefore be it resolved that the Ontario Housing Corp. be advised that council considers that negotiations should also be directed toward having a lowrise infill housing development on the site . . ."

2. The minister and the mayor indicated their mutual desire for a meeting with the builder to resolve the matter within a week.

3. The minister and the mayor will be pleased to accept the assurance of the builder that no further demolition will take place on the site pending such meeting.

4. The minister expressed strong interest in having this project go ahead along the lines of the city's wishes as outlined in his recent letter to the mayor, where he sought a practical way in which the project could provide an innovative approach in the field of public housing.

Sir, that's the end of the joint statement issued or agreed to by the mayor and myself at the time.

On April 5, officials of OHC, acting on my behalf, met with the mayor and his city officials and made an alternative proposal which would have provided accommodation for 250 elderly persons on this site as well as accommodation for families, with the prospects of preserving and retaining those houses of historical worth.

I believe this was an attractive alternative solution which would have mixed old with new architecture and families with senior citizens in the downtown core where such accommodation is needed.

What we were doing throughout these negotiations was stepping in to help the city in a situation it found unpalatable.

Our alternate proposal was as follows:

We were prepared to scale down the 29-storey building to 15 storeys and put it at the south end of the site behind the commercial development proposed for Dundas St. This residence would have been exclusively for elderly persons. OHC was prepared to preserve as many as possible of the existing homes, particularly those of historical worth, even though it might be necessary to move them elsewhere on the site.

It was estimated that all those of historical worth would be saved. These homes would have been renovated to house large families and some additional family residences would have been built to infill behind the existing housing.

It was our belief that this alternative solution could have been proceeded with quickly and would have produced upwards of 400 needed dwellings for Metropolitan Toronto.

I would like to emphasize here that, although this site had been offered to OHC by the owner, approved for public housing purposes by the Metropolitan Toronto housing advisory council and the federal government, final provincial approval for the project had not then, and still has not, been given. We had no written contract with the developer and, therefore, no control over his actions.

On the evening of April 5, this alternative was rejected by the city through Mayor Crombie. The mayor offered alternatives which, hopefully, will provide satisfactory development of this block.

After reviewing these alternatives, I offered, based on our agreement of April 3, that housing be developed at the same density and at no greater cost, and to provide the funds for this project on a partnership basis. The city of Toronto had shown its desire to become involved as an active partner in this development by expending $10,000 of its own funds for a planning study on the site.

It is normal for the two parties in a partnership to make financial contributions, and under the partnership arrangement which we are offering, one which is quite innovative, the city of Toronto will provide 7.5 per cent of the capital cost. If both parties agree to the proposal, the province will look to the

municipality to undertake the immediate purchase of the land, and carry out the planning and the construction of the development in collaboration with its partner, Ontario Housing Corp.

The province is prepared to accept all the units developed as public housing, or depending upon the final plan lease a major proportion of them under OHC's integrated community housing programme.

I would underscore the importance of proceeding with this project as quickly as possible. In light of the mayor's undertaking to me, there would be no greater costs involved. Each delay is adding about $5,000 a week to the cost of whatever is done on the site, and this of course will be borne by the taxpayers.

The partnership suggestion was agreed to by the mayor and his staff, and he has called a special meeting of city council for 8 p.m. tonight to discuss it. Throughout the negotiations Mayor Crombie has been most co-operative and indicated his desire to facilitate quick approval of the agreement and land purchase, and to be flexible in respect to municipal approval during the planning and construction stage.

As soon as a letter of understanding has been completed by our respective officials and signed by both parties, I will take it to my cabinet colleagues for a decision; and to OHC board of directors, a special meeting of which will be held tomorrow, Tuesday April 10, to discuss the Sherbourne-Dundas proposal.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ESTIMATES PROCEDURE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the Chairman of the Management Board in response to the statement he made, which purports to establish a procedure designed, in his words, "to maximize the results obtained for every tax dollar." Would he not agree that the procedure he described was precisely the one used and designed to cut $50 million off the cost of Medicare, which was approved by the board he heads and never implemented? What is the difference between the procedure that was used in that case and the one which he announced today?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman Management Board of Cabinet): I'm not prepared to respond to that. I will allow the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) to reply in due course.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Wouldn't the Chairman of the Management Board agree that, given the failure of the Minister of Health to respond adequately to previous questions, it is his responsibility to explain this procedure to the House, which is not new at all since it was used in the case of the attempt to constrain the payments from the Medicare fund, which attempt has been shown to be a failure?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't think that is the case at all, Mr. Speaker, but I think that this more properly, at this point in time, falls within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Health. I'm sure that the leader of the Liberal Party will not be dissatisfied when he has the final reply.

Interjections by hon. members.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier. In order that any misapprehensions may be dispelled, can he now announce that the government does not intend to introduce regional government proposals, or a bill covering regional government, for the Hamilton-Wentworth area during this session?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I can't make that announcement. Certainly when I was in an area fairly close to the home of the Leader of the Opposition last Thursday I did indicate, so there is no misunderstanding, that the government was not pressing with respect to the Brant county study.

There has been some discussions there, Mr. Speaker, as I understood it, with respect to the commission that is presently working, and I think presentations made to that commission by some of the municipalities asking for an extension of time. Mr. Speaker, I wasn't sure as to what the timing had been or what had been established, but I made it very clear that, from the government's standpoint, if it took longer to finalize the study in Brant county this would not affect whatever ultimate decisions we would be making in Hamilton-Wentworth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can't give the hon. Leader of the Opposition that position, but I just want to restate what I did say in Brantford, that we are not pressing with respect to the Brant county study and that there would be ample time for that to be completed, as requested, I believe, by some of the municipalities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Is the Premier not aware that the Treasurer (Mr. White), in a statement made last Friday following his meeting with Mayor Copps, was reported to have indicated that there might very well be a postponement of the Hamilton-Wentworth situation but that he was adamant that Burlington would still stick with the Halton regional government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I read a press report but I haven't had an opportunity to talk to the Treasurer about exactly what was said. If the Treasurer indicated that the government was flexible—which we always are —related to all of the proposals we presently have before the municipalities—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): As Streetsville.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —of course he would be reflecting government policy. I really can't assure—because this is what the Leader of the Opposition has asked me to do, Mr. Speaker—that there will not be a bill with respect to Hamilton-Wentworth, but if I could restate what I believe the Treasurer said, that is that the proposals are there, the submissions are returning, we are assessing them, and, of course, we will be as flexible as possible—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): And listen, of course.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we assume the responsibility, as we must as a government, to resolve some of the issues facing the general public in this province.

I have to remind the leaders of the opposition that really this is the responsibility of government and we can't postponed indefinitely those things that are difficult just because they are difficult.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary on the same matter: Since it was reliably reported that the government had decided not to go ahead with the Cobourg-Port Hope inclusion with Oshawa-Whitby, can he confirm or deny that a decision along those lines has been part of this rethinking of the regional government position of the government following the by-election setbacks?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Actually, Mr. Speaker, the process started before those two events took place—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier didn't make it public; if he had the Conservatives mightn't have lost so badly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder just what impact any alteration in policy east of Metro might have had in Metro or in Huron; I think that is a very debatable point.

Mrs. Campbell: He might have come and stayed with us.

Mr. Singer: He is universally listened to.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no decision east or west of Metro. The ministry is in the process of assembling this information; there has been no consideration at cabinet, and I think it would be premature, and I say this very objectively, to suggest to the Leader of the Opposition what might occur at this point.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Is the Premier not aware that the Treasurer left the distinct impression with the delegation from Hamilton that they were not going to proceed? Those weren't his words, but the impression was clearly there—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He's such a flexible chap too.

Mr. Deans: —that they were not going to proceed. Surely a statement at this time from the Premier along that line would clear the matter up once and for all and allow the people to settle down to trying to find some other solution?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I find this a trait of human nature, and a very understandable trait, that people will read into what people say or what they read in the press, that which they want to from time to time; it's a very human reaction.

Mr. Deans: Oh, no, no.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What do we read at the moment? Is the government flexible or inflexible?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for York South asked by way of an interjected supplementary whether we are flexible or inflexible, and the answer to that is we are always flexible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just like a reed in the wind.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are always flexible.

An hon. member: A correct answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At the same time—

Mr. MacDonald: Except the bill is coming in—that's what I read into the Premier's comments.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At the same time, we do the job that we have been elected to do.

However, to get back to the member for Wentworth and his question as it related to what impression the Treasurer may have left. Not being at the meeting, I can't really give the same sort of reaction. I'll be delighted to speak to the Treasurer about it. I would only say this—

Mr. Deans: I was there.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): This is what's killing the government politically. It is forever playing games.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member for Scarborough West, this government doesn't play games. We are trying to find—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are trying to find—

Mr. Lewis: The Premier knows they have reached a decision to suspend Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are trying to find some answers to some pretty difficult situations, and there has been no determination by the government exactly what will result east of Metro or west of Metro at this point.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier knows that is not so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it is so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition?

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENERGY POLICY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, a further question of the Premier for clarification:

To whom are we expected to look for statements of energy policy in the House? Are we to assume that since the Premier now has an assistant to advise him on energy policy (Mr. McKeough), he is taking back this whole area from the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence). Or in fact are we supposed to wait until his special assistant for energy matters is elevated to a position where he can actually speak in the question period and answer questions from his side of the House?

Mr. Lewis: Actually, it is nice the way it is now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear that one member opposite finds things pleasant as they are now.

I would say to the Leader of the Opposition, as they relate to those matters that are traditionally in the energy field, the questions should be directed to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

As they relate to the present development of the policy of this province with respect to the energy situation vis-à-vis our sister province of Alberta, the discussions that have been going on with the federal government, and that aspect of energy, I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the questions would be appropriately directed to myself or, in my absence, to the parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Singer: We can't do that, according to the rules.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I'm not sure about the interpretation of the rules—

Mr. Singer: Well, the Speaker has made himself quite clear on that point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well then, I will be delighted to answer the members opposite if they have some questions dealing basically with that area that they wish to pose to me. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that in order to help the House, I might find it worthwhile to consult with my very able parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier doesn't have to tell us his assistant is able.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I am delighted to hear that as well. But I would say that if I could divide it in those areas, those would be the appropriate routes for asking the questions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary, with your permission: Is the Premier saying then that if the question pertains to Hydro, we should not ask the vice-chairman of Hydro who sits behind him, but the policy minister who comes from Ottawa; and that if it has to do with a relationship with the government of Canada, we might ask the Speaker if we could direct our question to his parliamentary assistant—

Mr. Singer: Which he won't let us do.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —which is out of order? Is that the answer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if you have indicated that the parliamentary assistant is not to answer questions—and I am not sure we shouldn't review this, with respect, Mr. Speaker—then I would suggest the questions should be directed to myself.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we will permit one further supplementary.

Mr. Reid: In view of the Premier's statement, can he indicate if his counterpart in Alberta was as flexible as the Premier wishes he himself was in reviewing the energy policy regarding the export of gas to the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows the answer to the question, but in case he doesn't I shall try to indicate to him what I think he already knows; that is, the Premier of Alberta has made it reasonably clear, I think—

Mr. MacDonald: Abundantly clear!

Mr. Reid: Abundantly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, if it is so abundantly clear, why ask the question?

Mr. MacDonald: I did not ask the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the Premier of Alberta has made it reasonably clear that that province wants an increase in gas revenues, and I think that position has not altered over the past two or three weeks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Not on a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: I think there were no more questions from this side. Does the hon. member for Scarborough West want a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is in a related field, but I will ask it as a new question. I will ask it in the absence of the assistant in the energy field.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is not absent.

Mr. Lewis: Well, he can't speak for the first time in his political career, which is extremely difficult and is reflected by the look of anguish on his face.

Mr. Singer: He can only interject.

DEVELOPMENT OF LIGNITE DEPOSITS

Mr. Lewis: I will put it to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Would the Provincial Secretary consider, as part of the discussion of the lignite fields in northeastern Ontario, paying adequate compensation to the Manatta Coal Co. by way of their exploratory rights and developing that deposit as a Crown corporation?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that all of these things are capable of being considered. Different ways in which the government might or might not deal with Manalta have not come before us.

Mr. MacDonald: There is that flexibility again!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: There is no contract, I might point out to the hon. member, other than that related to the feasibility study. We have no continuing attachment to them in any legal way; therefore our options are all open.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does it make sense to the minister involved, given the emphasis on resource development and energy resources now, that a private company based in another province should take out something in excess of $100 million profit over 30 years from a natural resource in northeastern Ontario, which part of the province can obviously use the benefits of such profit? Does it make sense to him that the government enter into that kind of contract?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I can't establish, nor can the hon. member establish, the accuracy of those figures—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I can.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: —which are entirely speculative at the moment.

Mr. Lewis: No, not at all.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that it's a question of costing it out and seeing what capacities are there. As I said in response to the earlier question, all of our options are open at this time and will remain so until the question of feasibility is assessed.

HOSPITAL APPEAL BOARD MEETINGS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: How is it that the hospital appeal board meets only 2½ days a month? Is that a matter of policy, a matter of choice, or will the minister direct it to alter that procedure?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the hospital appeal board was to meet whenever necessary. I'll check it and find out for the member. There certainly is no policy that it meet every two or 2½ days a month.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Actually I don't know whether this is a supplementary to the question from the leader of the NDP or not. Having to do with the hospital appeal board, is the minister considering an amendment to the statute that inaugurated that appeal board so that, in fact, it can hear appeals from doctors who have never gained a hospital admitting staff status?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would be glad to see that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Will it be that that amendment may very well be introduced in the near future, so that the status could be improved, or at least the doubt on the status of that appeal board can be removed?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, that was the intention of the appeal board in the first place. It's been brought to our attention that perhaps it didn't cover enough. If that's the case, we will bring in an amendment and have it done as soon as possible.

SCARBOROUGH GENERAL HOSPITAL FUND-RAISING APPEAL

Mr. Lewis: A question, again of the Minister of Health: Did the Scarborough General Hospital, I guess it was, appeal to the minister for financial support to build the additional chronic convalescent care unit, which it is now going to public subscription to build?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, they didn't, Mr. Speaker. They asked for permission to proceed. They said they had the funds and were able to raise the necessary funds. They didn't ask for any financial support from the ministry at all. They wanted to go ahead on their own.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

McMICHAEL CANADIAN COLLECTION

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier, if I could just briefly: When the Premier announced on Friday his appointment of seven trustees to administer the McMichael Canadian Collection, how is it that he was able to appoint only one woman of the seven to administer that collection?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I realize the leader of the New Democratic Party is very interested in this general subject area, not just the McMichael. I would just state to him what is the growing direction as far as the government is concerned, and that is to seek ways and means of having more women on government boards and agencies. In fact, I mentioned this to certain members of the press on Friday.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, it does not reflect a lack of of desire. I would hope that in future appointments we would progressively have more women on government boards and commissions. I would say this applies to the government service generally and at the senior levels. But it is one thing to say this and another thing—not for boards and commissions as such, but within the government service, because of experience and because of what has been a policy not just confined to government—to have women move into these positions.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned personally I'm very much in favour of it. I think you will find that appointments progressively will show the direction that we're attempting to go.

Mr. MacDonald: We can take it for now.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary then, does the Premier see, in giving his assertive statement today, a certain inconsistency with his announcement on Friday, that it might have been deemed possible in the appointment of trustees in the McMichael Collection not to load it so disproportionately?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't see an inconsistency as much as I see a desire to have more women on such boards, including the McMichael Collection. As I say, Mr. Speaker, this is the direction we're going.

ONTARIO COUNCIL OF REGENTS

Mr. Lewis: I see. By way of a question then of the Minister of Education, along the same lines, and I will then have asked my last question for the day, is the minister prepared to alter the situation where there are 15 members of the Ontario Council of Regents governing the entire community college system, only one of whom is a woman; the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, 13 members, only one of whom is a woman; the board of governors of OISE, 34 members, only three of whom are women; the board of governors of Ryerson, 11 members, only one of whom is a woman. In the educational system, where surely it would not be too much to ask for parity, when will the minister alter his policy in the appointments to commissions and boards?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Of course, Mr. Speaker, it's always been my feeling, and I have practised it since I have came into this ministry, to assure that women are appointed where they are available and where they are qualified. Indeed, I would like to point out that at the first opportunity, when we had a vacancy on the Teachers' Superannuation Commission, I suggested and, in fact, made sure that a woman was appointed to fill that vacancy, Miss Sylvia McPhee.

I might also point out to my hon. friend that I have responsibility for only one of the groups of commissions that he pointed out. As far as the OISE board is concerned, certainly it is our policy to appoint women to that board, and indeed the hon. member has indicated there are three there already. I should point out to him, however, that we have—

Mr. Lewis: That's out of 34.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Wait a minute now. I should point out—

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean, "already"?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I should point out to him that we have responsibility over the appointment of very few members of that board; they are appointed by various groups and bodies. So therefore the member would probably find that the ones who are there are appointments; if they aren't, we'll certainly give very good consideration to this.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

ALBERTA NATURAL GAS

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Premier. Could the Premier advise us if, in all his consultations with the Premier of Alberta, the subject of the constitutionality of the two-price system for natural gas has ever been discussed? And has the Premier received advice from the law officers of the Crown of Ontario as to whether the proposed actions by the Premier of Alberta come within the constitution and particularly are not ultra vires of section 127, I think it is, of the British North America Act?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to state that in my conversations with the Premier of Alberta we have not dwelt on the constitutional position. I would hope that it was fairly clear in the remarks that I made in Calgary last Tuesday evening that I was endeavouring to see if some solution could be found to the problem without resorting to the question of legal interpretation or constitutional provisions, and quite frankly, if possible, without having it resolved in front of the National Energy Board.

It is my hope—and I express it as a hope, Mr. Speaker, because I can't go any further than that—that we can find some way of resolving this without it getting down to a discussion in front of the NEB, although of course, Mr. Speaker, that option is perhaps one of those that might be open to us. But to be very frank about it, Mr. Speaker, to the member for Downsview, the Premier of Alberta's discussions and mine have not really related to what Ontario might be able to do by way of legal recourse if the problem isn't

resolved, or partially resolved, in some other fashion.

I think it's also fair to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I gather—and I haven't seen these reports as yet—there are certain views with respect to the constitutional position. Of course, if it becomes necessary to move in that direction, we will be more than pleased to inform the hon. member for Downsview.

I would just like to add this, that it would be unfortunate, in my view, if we had to resort to a constitutional legal definition. to solve this problem. But I am quite prepared to say to the member for Downsview that certain legal opinions related to that particular subject are in the process of being obtained, or have been obtained.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, wouldn't the Premier believe it would be in the best interests of the people of Ontario, who are going to suffer if there is this new price structure created, that the Ontario government at least be armed with foreknowledge of its proper constitutional position as it can be advised by its own law officers? Wouldn't that be preferable to the pseudo-declaration of war enunciated by the speechless parliamentary assistant from Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough).

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will not interpret the speech from the member for Chatham-Kent in Sarnia, which was a very well-documented presentation, I might observe, and which I didn't interpret—and I don't think the people in Alberta interpreted it so—as a declaration of war.

Mr. Singer: That's the way the paper reported it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only give you—Mr. Speaker, through you—my own impression of the speech which I didn't sense as being a declaration of war.

Mr. Singer: We were waiting for the mobilization order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The reaction from the government of Alberta didn't appear to be toward a declaration of war. But the member for Downsview is quite right—we will be, if necessary, armed with whatever legal recourses we may have at the appropriate time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Did the member read the speech?

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for York South a supplementary?

Mr. MacDonald: Would it be accurate to interpret from the Prime Minister's comments that among those legal actions that could be taken would be court action for breach of existing contracts, action taken with the inspiration of the government of Ontario by TransCanada Pipe Lines or eastern Canadian utilities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what legal remedies TransCanada may or may not have. This is something on which I think that, once again, if we are faced with a situation where some form of legal definition will have to be found, it will be found.

I would point out also, in a further reply to the member for Downsview—and the member for York South is very interested in this—one of the areas which gives us some difficulty in really questioning the constitutionality of what Alberta is proposing is that at this moment in time we don't know what form the suggested rebate will take. I think the member for York South and perhaps the member for Downsview have some interest in this. Until we know just what form the rebate will take, it will affect the legal opinions we might get.

Mr. Singer: Even if they do it by way of subterfuge, surely the constitutional remedy would still lie?

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the final supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Can the Premier tell us the timetable involved here? Is he aware of when the new price system will take effect? Obviously it will take effect before there can be a provincial-federal conference on rationalization of energy needs in Canada. If so, when does he, as Premier, launch any legal proceedings? What timetable has he worked out with his assistant since I know he submitted something by April 1?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the timetable really is not completely in our hands. I think it is fair to state that the Premier of Alberta has made it clear that he would like some solution to—I don't want to be misunderstood on this; I was going to use the term "the short-term problem." Shall I say, he would like to see some resolution to the present stated position of the Province of Alberta; that is that they would like to see an increase in gas prices.

In spite of some of the reactions I have read with respect to the Premier of Alberta's

reactions to the proposal I made in Calgary as to the desirability of a federal-provincial conference related to energy needs totally—which I think is a much broader subject than this—I think it is fair to state that the Premier of Alberta indicated his support of that. In the interim, he would still like to see this other matter brought to some form of conclusion.

I can only say, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member that there are still discussions to be held. I will inform the House when we reach the point when either some determination is made or Ontario will have to seek whatever remedies it may have. As I say, Mr. Speaker, we have been dealing with it—and I will be very frank about it—on the basis of seeing if there isn't some solution, acknowledging that there is some justification for the Province of Alberta to increase its price somewhat.

I want to make it very clear, that our debate is partially on the timing, partially the extent of it and, of course, includes the concern we have not just for the householder who utilizes this source of energy but the sector of our industrial community which is dependent for a good portion of its production costs related to the use of this energy. Mr. Speaker, as soon as we have some further information as to timing or other developments, we shall inform the House as rapidly as we can.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

SALE OF LAND IN NOTTAWASAGA

Mr. F. Young: (Yorkview): A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is European Garden Enterprises, which seems to be a part of Pellegrini Enterprises of 3019A Dufferin St. in North York, still selling lots in the township of Nottawasaga to unsuspecting buyers, lots which are not part of a registered plan and which cannot now and may never be granted building permits?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that there are no salesmen registered under the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act selling property in the part of North York described by my hon. friend. I am advised that any attempts to sell property there are being completed by employees of the owner. Under the present legislation, it is not necessary for a person to be registered under the Act to sell his own real estate either directly or through an employee.

Mr. Young: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. First of all a correction that Nottawasaga township is near Collingwood and Stayner, not North York, although the company mentioned is situated in North York.

Is the minister aware that, prior to the recent legislation, this land was checkerboarded and that while the company itself may not be selling lots, certainly—as I think he may have indicated—employees and people connected with the corporation are selling lots to unsuspecting buyers.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes, I was aware of it because during the last session, Mr. Speaker, my friend was kind enough to draw the matter to my attention. I am sorry—it was in Nottawasaga and the company is located in North York, but the situation is still the same. I am sure that this House is aware of the decision rendered by the Ontario Court of Appeal some weeks ago with reference to the checkerboarding technique which, unfortunately, was employed in different parts of this province over the past year or two.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Would the minister consider declaring the Province of Ontario a major disaster area because of the recent flooding so that the federal government would join in any national formula for aid? In fact, just today we have word that the flooding is the worst that it ever has been.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is another storm in progress on the lakes and that there is further damage accruing to lakeshores and properties along the lakeshores. I can't answer this immediately. I hope that within a matter of days the Canadian Centre for Inland Waters will be able to come up with its first general estimate of damage, and against that estimate we will have to apply our judgment.

As I say, except for the amounts and the limitations in the federal formula, the answer of course is yes—any co-operative disaster programme that we can develop with the federal government we will. At the moment, without hard figures in front of us, I can't respond.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question, please.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth has a supplementary.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. Would the minister consider making available to the hardest-hit areas the people who are presently employed within the Ministry of Transportation and Communications on highways in order that sandbags, gravel, whatever is necessary, be put along those areas that are hardest hit today and are going to be hit again tomorrow, so they can get some protection—particularly, I might say, in the area of my own riding where the township has refused to act?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, one of the prime purposes in setting up a task force was to co-ordinate this kind of activity. Rather than deal directly with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, people are requested to deal through Mr. Walter Giles, of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

I have encouraged anyone who has called me or written to deal through him. To the extent of our capacities we are using whatever we have to help people affected in that way, limited only, of course, by the statement of policy which I made some 10 days ago, in relation to the spheres in which provincial participation will take place.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville was up for a supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)**:** I have no questions.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry; then the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside)**:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the provincial secretary: In view of the reports of the evacuations taking place at this moment in what appear to be unprecedented winds, would the minister get in touch with the militia in Windsor, at least with the officials in the Windsor area, to see whether they need the militia who were standing by last time with their high-wheeled vehicles and were not called?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I understand that when a situation as serious as the one that may be occurring this afternoon and tomorrow arises, it does bring into play the role of the local officer of the Emergency Measures Organization. What I will do after the question period is check with the Emergency Measures Organization and see if the level of activity provided under the law of Canada has been reached, or the level of concern or disaster has been reached, that would trigger his powers.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think in order to clarify it, I'll explain that the original question was asked by the hon. member for Essex-Kent. I've allowed two supplementaries. I think there have been sufficient supplementaries. It is now the turn of the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park)**:** Mr. Speaker, I have a brief question in four parts of the Minister of Government Services.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

There has been dissatisfaction expressed by certain members of the Liberal Party. I must point out to them, with respect, the hon. member for Essex-Kent asked the original question; it was their turn. Now we've allowed some supplementaries. There are certain members of the Liberal Party who would like to ask original questions and I'll come to them.

Mr. Reid: All to the NDPs.

Mrs. Campbell: All to the NDPs.

Mr. Speaker: It is now the turn in proper order of the member for High Park.

BRAMPTON COURT HOUSE

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker: 1. Can the minister explain why no tenders were called for the construction of the new court house in Brampton? 2. In view of the fact that $1.8 million is being paid for a 20-year leasehold on this building, a building worth somewhat less than $500,000, can the minister explain that discrepancy? 3. Why did the Rice Construction Co., which is building the building, make no charge for supplying headquarters for the Progressive Conservatives in the last election? 4. How much did the Rice Construction Co. donate to the Conservative Party in return for this contract?

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West)**:** Put that on the order paper.

An hon. member: Order paper.

Mr. Reid: That's of public concern?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, first of all, as I recall this is not a contract, it is a lease arrangement.

Mr. Shulman: Exactly. I know.

Hon. Mr. Snow: There were no tenders called for someone to construct a building; it is a building which I believe has been owned by the Rice Construction Co. for a number of years. The officials of my ministry, in reviewing accommodation that was available in the town of Brampton, felt that this building when converted as proposed by the owners would supply satisfactory accommodation for the courts and this was verified by the Attorney General (Mr. Bales).

Now to the third and fourth questions, I do not know the answers.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that there were at least 12 other vacant buildings in which 12 other owners were prepared to supply equivalent space, why did the minister not ask for tenders?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I do not have that detail, Mr. Speaker, but although it is our policy now to advertise for tenders for the leasing of space if at all possible, that was not carried out at that time.

Mr. Shulman: At that time—last month?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill is next.

COMMUTER TRAIN SERVICE

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications indicate what measure of success, if any, he had in his approach to the federal government last Friday with regard to the running of a commuter train from Richmond Hill to Union Station in order to avoid the terrible congestion on the Yonge St. subway?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I had a very encouraging meeting with the federal Minister of Transport, but he advised me it would be some time before he could give me his answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

SUNDAY OPENING OF RETAIL STORES

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. When does the minister intend to bring in legislation to the House regarding Sunday retail selling, as based upon the recommendations of the Ontario Law Reform Commission?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this matter is under consideration and a statement will be made when the policy is determined and finalized.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Could the Attorney General tell the House what action he is going to take for those retailers who are at present breaking the law by being open for business on Sunday? Does he intend to ignore those breaches of the present statute until the new policy is formulated?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, when a notice comes to me in reference to prosecution it is dealt with and in most instances it is signed and consent is granted for prosecution. There have been a very substantial number that have been consented to for Sunday prosecution in reference to stores being opened and also in reference to trucks being on the highway.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Does the Attorney General not feel that he has a responsibility where chains of large stores in certain communities appear to be staying open, not so much to tempt somebody to lay a charge against them, but simply to test the law to see if, in fact, they cannot spread the Sunday opening procedures uniformly?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in most instances where the police have laid a charge and it has been proceeded with, a conviction has been obtained. There is a real question as to whether the fines are satisfactory—

Mr. MacDonald: What else is new?

Hon. Mr. Bales: —but the prosecutions have been proceeded with and convictions have been obtained.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

WINDSOR INQUIRY CENTRE

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet. In light of the fact that there are numerous requests by citizens for information from various governmental agencies in the city of Windsor— and a lot

of these requests are from American citizens —will the minister set up a central inquiry agency in the city to expedite these requests and alleviate the pressure on other governmental agencies?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Will the hon. member tell me what type of requests he is referring to?

Mr. B. Newman: Every type of request the minister could possibly think of. They ask questions concerning the Ministry of Community and Social Services; of the local master of the Supreme Court. They ask every agency in the city every type of request that one could possibly think of; and the number of requests is so great that one of these agencies has asked for a central inquiry centre in the community.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question, I might say the government is carefully reviewing the matter of dealing with requests from Ontario citizens. They will come first, and we will deal with them first. After that we will concern ourselves with other requests.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman: Am I correct in my assumption that the minister's department intends to introduce legislation, or intends to open such agencies in all the major cities in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. First, it will not be under the administration of my department; it will be under the administration of another department. Nevertheless, I simply stated we were reviewing the policy and, in due course when it is available, it will be announced to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT OF INDIAN LANDS

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Has the minister investigated the legality of municipalities that have Indian reserves within their boundaries, or on the edge of their boundaries, of assessing business that are wholly on Indian lands? If the minister hasn't assessed the legality of such action by municipalities, will he look into it to assure the native people that they do, indeed, control those lands and possibly have the power to assess? If it is legal for municipalities to assess Indian lands, will he look into the possibility that they be forced to provide services commensurate with their ability to assess?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that matter, and all of the associated matters which the hon. member has mentioned, are under active consideration at the present time and there will probably be a policy statement forthcoming shortly.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary: Is the minister aware that some municipalities have been taxing in this way; and is it legal or isn't it legal for them to do so?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am aware that this has been going on and the question of the legality will be dealt with when the policy decision is announced.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

HOUSE CONSTRUCTION WARRANTY

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Revenue, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister insist on an adequate construction warranty on all housing built under the HOME programme so that buyers can be assured of full repair of faulty construction, including leaking basements?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, of course anyone who tenders for the building of homes on these lots is expected to carry out the requirements of the standards set out by the Ontario Housing Corp. and by the local building bylaws. If there is any evidence that this is not being done, they're taken to task for it. Indeed, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville raised the question along these lines, I think, a week or so ago. We pointed out that in one of those instances we were withholding an advance—I think it was about $345,000 or $350,000—until the corporation was satisfied that everything was in order.

Mr. Deacon: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that tomorrow this House will resolve itself into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

NOISE RESEARCH BUREAU ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Noise Research Bureau.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish a bureau which will co-ordinate studies and research on noise measurement and control.

VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, 1971, by specifically granting the board discretion to refuse to make a compensation award, where it is satisfied the applicant has refused reasonable co-operation with the law enforcement agency or has not reported the offence to that agency with reasonable promptness.

This is based on the policy, that in general before compensation is paid out of public funds to an individual in these circumstances, it rests upon that individual to satisfy his public responsibilities to co-operate with the law enforcement authorities.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the public nature of the payment, the bill provides an amendment to insulate the payment, at least until it reaches the applicant, from attachment, garnishment or assignment. This provision is similar in principle to those in other jurisdictions and is designed to ensure the public funds paid out in compensation indeed benefit the intended recipient.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill brings this statute in to line with Acts such as the Workmen's Compensation Act, by providing that compensation awards in favour of infants or persons of unsound mind may be paid to and administered to by the Public Trustee or other responsible person. In this way, we are assured that those funds, as soon and as directly as possible, are paid over to those responsible, so that they may be applied to the benefit of the individual concerned.

ARBOUR DAY ACT

Mr. Wardle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to proclaim Arbour Day.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, the bill creates Arbour Day and sets out the objects of its observation. The objects are: The last Friday in April of each year shall be observed under the name of Arbour Day for the purpose of encouraging, (a) the beautification of Ontario by the use of trees, (b) the landscaping, painting and cleaning of industrial plants, public institutions and private homes, (c) the appreciation of the beauty and use of trees, (d) the stimulation of interest in knowledge of trees, and (e) the planting, preservation and conservation of trees.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH ACT

Mr. Wiseman, in the absence of Mr. Turner, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HOGAN HOMES LTD. ACT

Mr. Handleman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Hogan Homes Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned on Friday, I had occasion to call the attention of the House to the fact that a new native organization had been set up to deal with native problems north of the French River.

Another matter, Mr. Speaker, that is of wide concern and a general interest in northern Ontario resulted from the high water levels on the lower Great Lakes, which prompted the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson), who is the chairman of the land drainage committee, to make a statement—or to think out loud I think would be more accurate—that maybe one of the ways of relieving the high water levels on the lower Great Lakes was to build a huge reservoir some place in northern Ontario; and he chose some place in the vicinity of Lake Nipigon, which is in the heart of the riding of Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It is the only way they will be able to defeat the hon. member.

Mr. Stokes: Now there was a good many people in northwestern Ontario, particularly in the riding of Thunder Bay, who reacted most vehemently to such a suggestion that this would be a reasonable alternative. I took the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to write a somewhat detailed letter to the Premier (Mr. Davis) as a result of this suggestion by the member for Lambton, and I sent a copy of it to the member. I haven't had the benefit of his reply. The Premier did reply stating that he would pass the letter along to those ministries that were responsible.

I think it would be useful, Mr. Speaker, just to put things in their proper perspective, if I quoted from the letter to indicate the devastation that has already taken place as a result of water diversions dating back over the past 30 years, as well as the ecological imbalance and resulting problems that have been created.

It is as a result of an exchange of letters that I have had with the Premier that this letter came about, Mr. Speaker. I would like to quote from my letter to the Premier:

> You state that concern over the environmental and ecological impact due to the siltation and bank erosion is of recent vintage and that there is no evidence that the Ogoki diversion or the manipulation of water levels has had any adverse effect on Lake Nipigon.
>
> During a recent meeting on strategic land-use planning in Sioux Lookout, considerable time was spent on planning for use of recreational land in the Lac Seul-Ear Falls area. It was brought to our attention that water levels vary as much as nine ft per year on Lac Seul, which makes it virtually impossible for effective planning to be carried out in a meaningful way on recreational land.
>
> I am advised that Ontario Hydro uses Lake St. Joseph as a reservoir. This means that they can manipulate the water levels on Lac Seul by effecting a southwest flow of water from Lake St. Joseph, Lac Seul, the English River and the Winnipeg River, thus providing ample supplies of water at Ear Falls, Manitou Falls and Whitedog Falls generating stations.
>
> There is no control of water levels by a local authority; control is vested in the Lake of the Woods Control Board, whose chairman resides in Ottawa, with representation from the United States through the International Joint Commission.
>
> Because of critical fluctuations and manipulation of water levels, a freeze has been placed on hundreds of miles of shoreline and no land disposition is permitted. Areas such as Lac Seul have been declared deferred development zones because of the adverse effect of manipulation of water levels. When water levels are at their maximum on the Lac Seul-English River system, water is diverted eastward from the Lake St. Joseph watershed into the Albany River. A flying trip over Lac Seul, Lake St. Joseph and the Ogoki Reservoir is all the evidence one needs to be convinced that manipulation of water levels has a profound effect on ecology and the environment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): One can see the stumps in the water.

Mr. Stokes: That's right—thousands of acres of nothing but utter desolation and devastation. My letter continues:

> Thousands of acres of productive forest land were flooded without even harvesting the timber. Extreme fluctuations have removed the possibility of this shoreline ever being restored to its original aesthetic beauty. This land will never be used for cottage or commercial development as long as it is subject to the ravages of extreme high and low water levels.

In spite of a difference of opinion among marine biologists, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that manipulation of water levels does indeed have a deleterious effect on aquatic life. Fish spawn has been found high and dry by commercial fishermen and hundreds of acres of spawning beds have been covered by siltation from diversions of muddy rivers. Entire bays that were once clear now resemble a bowl of pea soup.

Tourist operators and sportsmen complain of poor catches of prime species such as pickerel, lake trout and speckled trout, and some have had difficulty in launching their boats during periods of low water.

Indian bands who depended on commercial fishing for a good portion of their income have had to look elsewhere for employment. Those who have been unsuccessful have had to rely on welfare benefits to sustain their families. Indian guiding is almost a lost art since the decline of the sport fishery in many northern lakes.

MPP Lorne Henderson, chairman of the select committee on drainage, has suggested a 14,000 square mile reservoir in the Lake Nipigon area of northwestern Ontario to control high water levels in the lower Great Lakes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That was to drain Lake Superior, was it?

Mr. Stokes: Yes! My letter continues:

He has intimated that this is only one of the recommendations or alternatives that will be presented to the Legislature for consideration.

Believe me, Mr. Premier, if you want to precipitate mass insurrection among residents of this area, just mention reservoir. In fact, if Mr. Henderson and his committee ever journey to this area to have a look I fear for their safety. A solution to the cyclical water problems of the lower Great Lakes will not be found in inundating thousands of square miles of resource-rich and scenically beautiful northwestern Ontario.

Many years ago Ontario Hydro was given the right to use the water forces of northern Ontario to generate electric energy. Hundreds of thousands of Ontario residents have enjoyed the benefits of this activity at rates that compare favourably with any in the world. In addition to these benefits to the people of Ontario, Hydro has paid hundreds of millions of dollars into the provincial Treasury by way of water rentals.

The following is a summary of water rentals paid to the Province of Ontario by Ontario Hydro in 1971 for various generating stations: Ear Falls, $40,000; Manitou Falls, $143,000; Whitedog Falls, $115,000; Caribou Falls, $172,000; Silver Falls, $85,000; Lac Seul storage, $20,000; Cameron Falls, $180,000; Alexander station, $149,000; Pine Portage, $292,000; and Aguasabon, $94,000.

This amounts to a total of $1.3 million in annual water rentals for northwestern Ontario. The water rentals on the Lake Nipigon watershed alone amount to $622,000 annually. The value of energy generated on the Nipigon River in 1971 alone amounted to $17 million. Can you imagine the reaction of the provincial Treasury if this source of revenue was cut off by Mr. Henderson's reservoir?

The total value of energy generated by hydro power in northwestern Ontario is in the $40 million range. The cost of building a thermal plant to replace this lost energy could be as high as $75 million. Can you imagine Ontario Hydro's reaction to the loss of $17 million in energy revenue? Can you imagine the thousands of miles of untapped timber and mineral wealth that would be unavailable for harvesting? A good portion of the water rental revenue is earmarked to sustain the Niagara Parks Commission, while not one penny is directed back to the northern Ontario from whence it came to rehabilitate areas that have felt the adverse effect of water diversions.

Rather than look for ways to wreak further havoc on the northwestern Ontario environment and compounding our problems of slow growth and out-migration of our job-seeking youth, the province should be making substantial amounts of these funds available for the construction of fish hatcheries in the Lake Nipigon area to replenish the dwindling population of prime species as a result of past water diversions.

The removal of tens of thousands of cords of sunken pulp wood and bark from the lake bottom and mouths of rivers would help to rehabilitate spawning beds and restore the world-famous Lake Nipigon fishery to its once viable condition.

The province should also direct some of these funds to be spent on the extension of transmission lines to communities such as Armstrong, the Upsala area and along

Highway 11 where people are still seeking a reliable source of electric energy at reasonable rates.

Some of these funds should be directed in the form of assistance to tourist operators and Indian bands to upgrade facilities, which will enable them to provide services to an ever-increasing flow of tourists into the Lake Nipigon area. Breakwaters should be constructed at Gull Bay and Macdiarmid to protect againct bank erosion and damage to boats and dock facilities.

There is much that can be done to enhance and ensure the future growth of northwestern Ontario. It will not be accomplished by constructing huge reservoirs, or by compounding the problem in one area to satisfy the short-term needs of another.

Remember, Mr. Premier, the entire economy of the north depends on our ability to manage and to husband our resources wisely and well. Those same resources contribute well in excess of $2 billion annually in new wealth for the benefit of all residents in this province of opportunity.

We have been entrusted with the responsibility of stewardship over one of the greatest treasure houses ever bestowed by benevolent providence. Let us use, but not abuse. Let us manage our resources in such a way that our children, or our children's children will thank us for a job well done.

So I think that, basically, Mr. Speaker, is the true reflection of the sentiments of the people of northwestern Ontario to any idea that we should be impounding water in the north to look after the shortrange problems of people down in the south.

I am still awaiting a reply from the Premier and the various ministers responsible for this. I thought it would be useful to put that on the record just to give you some idea how strongly we feel about building huge reservoirs in the north and inundating literally thousands of sq miles of productive forest land and scenically beautiful areas that people down in the south will want to journey to from time to time, just to get away from the asphalt jungle.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex-South): They want to get away from the water up there!

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They are sending their water down to us.

Mr. Stokes: Well, I can remember not too long ago when there were low lake levels down here. The people in the south were crying for water, and we were quite happy to give it to you.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): They are never happy down here.

Mr. Stokes: They can't have it both ways.

Mr. Ruston: Not like the people in the north can.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Like the US Army Corps of Engineers! Remember that?

Mr. Stokes: Yes. The US Army Corps of Engineers was in here taking a look and making an assessment of our water quantities and water qualities. It was a good many months before this government even knew they were up there.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I guess they decided they didn't want it.

Mr. Foulds: It shows how much in touch they are.

Mr. Stokes: As a matter of fact, until I produced a series of letters from the US Army Corps of Engineers addressed to a constituent of mine, the ministry over there wouldn't even believe they were there. I had equal difficulty convincing their counterparts down in Ottawa that we in fact, did have residents of northwestern Ontario who were on the payroll of the US Army Corps of Engineers.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They were chasing butterflies or something.

Mr. Stokes: They weren't chasing butterflies. They were looking quite avariciously at our water; and I am not convinced yet that they aren't doing just that.

Mr. Foulds: It is that frivolous attitude on the government's part that is going to bring it down.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Bring down what? The high lake levels? I hope the member is right.

Mr. Stokes: When you start talking about continental energy policies, and this has been a popular topic of discussion across the border for a good many years, don't think for one minute they're turning their backs on the huge supplies of fresh and clean water that we do have in northern Ontario. We hope this government will take advantage of every opportunity to tell the Americans that our water just isn't for sale.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get into another area, as a result of the lead editorial in The Northern Miner on April 5, 1973. I want to quote from it to show just how ludicrous some of the editorial comment is today, particularly from a paper like this. I don't know whether they consider themselves to be a mouthpiece for the present government, or whether they consider themselves to be a mouthpiece for the mining industry.

Mr. Foulds: Or the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier).

Mr. Stokes: I just want to show you how ridiculous they can be. To quote from the editorial,

CONSERVATION AS APPLIED TO ONTARIO IRON

We suppose the announcement that Caland Ore Co., a subsidiary of Inland Steel of Chicago [in my friend's riding of Rainy River] is going to terminate its mining operations at Steep Rock Lake in the next few years, will be greeted with jubilation by the NDP benches in the Ontario Legislature—

Mr. Foulds: What nonsense!

Mr. Stokes: To continue:

—since that party professes to be greatly disturbed by the sale of our resources to foreign corporations. Caland, which leased the C zone of Steep Rock Iron Mines and which is currently Inland's largest source of ore, says that the reserves which can be extracted economically will be exhausted by 1978. Steep Rock expects to have the mine handed back to it by 1976, and perhaps will be able to extract some additional ore from it. But no new jobs will be created since this will only replace Steep Rock's own present production and 200 or 300 Caland workers will have to look elsewhere for their livelihood.

It is significant that Inland Steel has decided to rely on a domestic ore source rather than to participate in other Ontario iron developments. This is the second US steel company that has washed itself of Ontario iron ore since the Ontario government prohibited the export of ore except by special approval of the minister.

Mr. Foulds: They grant them all anyway.

Mr. Stokes: Now here is a paper that is suggesting members of this Legislature would be pleased to hear that jobs were being lost to any workers in the Province of Ontario; they suggest that we, as a party, would be happy to hear that Inland Steel had decided to close down.

To be fair, this government had nothing at all to do with the decision made by Inland Steel to cease operating in the Steep Rock Lake area. The ore body will cease to be viable and economically feasible sometime in 1976, and the company will be relinquishing its option to Steep Rock. But for a paper like this to suggest that any group in this Legislature would be happy to hear that jobs were being lost is just nothing short of irresponsibility. I think that it shouldn't go unrecorded that The Northern Miner is using this kind of tactic to smear members of this Legislature.

If there is any responsibility for the dilemma in which the mining fraternity finds itself at the present time, the present government must accept that responsibility because it has, as the article says, "since the Ontario government prohibited the export of ore except by special approval of the minister."

Now, we happen to have agreed with that. In fact, we would have hoped that the government would have gone a little bit farther; but to suggest that either the Ontario government or anybody in this Legislature was responsible for the decision made by Inland Steel to cease operations at the Steep Rock site is nothing short of being absolutely ludicrous. I think that this paper and its editorial should be shown for what it really is.

I think that any member of this House is continually looking for ways and means to provide additional job opportunities for the labour force in every section of this province. For a supposedly reputable paper to be suggesting that anyone in this Legislature would try to eliminate jobs at the expense of the work force of this province, I think should be shown up for what it really is.

Mr. Speaker, another area I wanted to discuss is the announcement in the Throne Speech that the Ministry of Transportation and Communications was going to involve itself with providing more airstrips for remote communities in the north accessible only by air. We did get an indication that three new airstrips would be developed: one at Fort Hope, one at Round Lake and one at Pikangikum.

For a government that spends between $5 billion and $6 billion dollars a year and has allocated somewhat less than $1 million a year—and as low as $500,000 a year—for an airstrip development programme in remote

areas, it seems to me to fall much short of the mark.

One of the air carriers in the province sent me a copy of the Canadian Aircraft Operator, which is the publication for all aircraft carriers. There is an article datelined Winnipeg and it outlines what the Province of Manitoba has done concerning airstrip development over the past five years. It says:

> By the end of last year, expenditures by the Manitoba government had reached $5 million on a major air transportation development plan involving regional airports, airstrips and landing strips in the north.
>
> Reporting recently on the progress of the provincial government's policy to provide landing facilities, usable the year around in all isolated northern communities of 100 people or more, [They don't have any road access.] Premier Edward Schreyer made these points: Twenty six airports and landing strips have been built or are currently being completed under the programme.
>
> Freezeups and breakups no longer shut off isolated communities that were served by float and ski-equipped planes and tractor trains.
>
> The programme will greatly enhance the recently announced ambulance programme for the north by enabling fast wheel-equipped aircraft to be used.
>
> Considerable local labour and local equipment has been used and has given a number of local residents on-the-job training in rock drilling and blasting at airstrip sites, enabling them to move on to permanent jobs in mines nearby.
>
> Indian bands and councils may operate and maintain the buildings and runways giving added local employment.
>
> Air transportation costs in many instances will be reduced by making it feasible for airlines to establish several scheduled services.

There is an indication, Mr. Speaker, that a province which is much less affluent than ours has, in a meaningful way, come to grips with the problems of isolation in many northern communities.

While we have made a start in establishing airstrips at Sandy Lake, Big Trout Lake and at Fort Albany, and with the announcement that we are getting three more at Pikangikum, Round Lake and Fort Hope, I would urge the Ministry of Transportation and Communications to step up this programme so that many native communities will be brought into the mainstream of things, by providing airstrips that will enable cargo planes as big as a DC-3 to get in and bring in provisions on a regular basis, thus lowering the cost of essential supplies and services to them so that they indeed will share in the good things that the members and I take for granted down here. I do hope the Ministry of Transportation and Communications will look elsewhere to see what is being accomplished and try to accelerate its programme to make it more meaningful and more readily available to people in the north.

Mr. Paterson: How about the remote areas in the south—the islands?

Mr. Stokes: I don't know of any remote area of southern Ontario which aren't accessible either by road or—

Mr. Paterson: Sure they are.

Mr. Stokes: I don't know. The member will have to speak to that. I don't know about the physical characteristic of Pelee Island.

Mr. Foulds: The member for Thunder Bay looks after his end of the province. Let the member for Essex South look after his.

Mr. Stokes: I am sure he can do that quite adequately.

Mr. Paterson: Right!

Mr. Stokes: Another area I want to get into very briefly, Mr. Speaker, is the recent ceilings that have been imposed by the Ministry of Education and how those ceiling impositions have affected many northern boards.

We discussed last year in the Legislature how, due to the weighting factors, a good many boards had to curtail their expenses in essential services such as special education and tutoring for children; such as library technicians; and a good many vital areas where they found it necessary to curtail expenses to get under the ceilings imposed by the Ministry of Education.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House and in particular to the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) the fact that, as a result of the ceilings and because of the unrealistic weighting factors, we are having to close schools in northern Ontario at the present time. It means we will have to bus

children who are going to kindergarten and grades 1 and 2. One hearkens back to some time in March, 1968, when the former Premier, the hon. John Robarts, made a statement in southwestern Ontario that the government was going to consolidate school boards across the Province of Ontario and that the reorganization and consolidation would mean there was going to be greater equality of educational opportunity.

A week ago on Monday, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the hon. member for Port Arthur and I attended a meeting at the little hamlet of Hurkett which is about 45 miles east of the city of Thunder Bay. We were invited to a meeting at which the Nipigon-Red Rock board of education was trying to answer questions from about 100 people in the audience. They were congregated there to find out why it was necessary to close a school in northern Ontario, when indeed the former Premier had indicated there was going to be an improvement in educational opportunity rather than a curtailment or a greater dislocation.

We have found out, Mr. Speaker, that because of the unrealistic ceilings imposed by the present Ministry of Education we are having to close down schools. We are forced to bus children at tender ages in greater numbers for even greater distances than was ever conceived before the consolidation of school areas.

My colleague, the member for Port Arthur, did seek to find the solution in discussing this matter with the audience and the representatives of the local board. We found that the board has been placed in such an unreasonable position, because of the unrealistic ceilings, that they find it necessary to curtail services in essential areas—even, as I say, to the extent of closing a school.

Mr. Foulds: They don't want to close it; the parents don't want to close it.

Mr. Stokes: That's quite right. The board can sympathize with the parents and say: "We wish there was an alternative, and if you know of any alternative please don't hesitate to tell us about it." I assured them, Mr. Speaker, that I thought the only alternative was to raise it in the Ontario Legislature.

Unfortunately, the Minister of Education isn't here, but I hope that he does hear my words; and I hope that before the Nipigon-Red Rock board finds it necessary to get under the ceilings by the closing of schools, that the Minister of Education and his ministry will intervene and sit down in a realistic way with the local board and say: "All right, maybe the weighting factors aren't sufficient to allow you to operate in an effective and efficient manner"; and readjust those ceilings and the weighting factors to allow them to keep operating this school and to satisfy all concerned.

I am going to discuss it personally with the minister whenever he is available to speak to me, Mr. Speaker, but I do hope by bringing it up in this debate, that perhaps he will be more sympathetic to it, and hopefully we will we able to resolve it in a way that will be acceptable to all concerned.

Mr. Foulds: He has been too busy in Florida.

Mr. Stokes: Another area I would like to get into, Mr. Speaker, is services to unorganized communities.

As a result of representations that have been made to me over the past year and a half, I have raised with the Premier and various ministers of government how vitally important it is for all ministries of this government that have responsibilities in special areas to be aware of and to respond to the needs of people in unorganized communities for essential services.

It's well known that we have conditional and unconditional grants to assist organized municipalities in education, in providing water and sewage, in assisting them with their police force; in all of the services that people have come to expect today we have in large measure set up programmes that deal specifically with those needs for people living in organized communities.

Unfortunately, we have never devised any programme that will allow people in unorganized communities—and we have literally hundreds across the north—to avail themselves of any governmental assistance.

This is felt particularly in the north, where on many occasions they do pay taxes at a higher rate than you and me, particularly in the sales tax field, where the sales tax is based on the retail price of a given commodity.

Mr. Foulds: Right!

Mr. Stokes: If an article is selling for 30 cents down here in Toronto, it's quite conceivable that it would be selling for twice that up in Armstrong. So, at a rate of five per cent for sales tax, one can readily understand they are actually paying twice and getting nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I'm dealing specifically with the community of Armstrong, where there is a danger of an epidemic if some ministry of this government doesn't involve itself in coming to grips with the water problem.

Most of the wells in that community are contaminated—you might have heard me ask a question of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) a few days ago. The threat is still there and yet I received a letter from the Premier today that he was going to try and effect some kind of co-ordination in order to see if something can't be done to assist these unorganized communities.

Another area where they need assistance in these communities is in providing fire protection. In organized municipalities where you have a taxing structure they can budget for fire prevention, and of course there is a vehicle whereby you can assess the people on a residential basis for the essential services. Unfortunately, in unorganized communities you have no taxing authority and you have no overall vehicle for provision of these services.

We have brought the matter up with the fire marshal—I see the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) in the House and I've got a letter in the works for him now about how important it is that somebody, whether it be the Solicitor General himself or his fire marshal's office, look into the possibility of entering into some kind of an arrangement where the government could pick up a portion of the cost of providing fire protection and fire prevention facilities to people living in unorganized communities.

Mr. Foulds: Good point!

Mr. Stokes: There is a particular need in Armstrong, Mr. Speaker, where we have a community of some 700 people and it's impossible for them, because they are unorganized, to tax people on the basis of ability to pay, to provide a core of seed money to even get started.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, Armstrong's fire fighting facility today is an old truck. They have an old herbicide sprayer mounted on the back of the truck and they've got an old handmade trailer behind it which they use to haul their hoses and axes and things like that. This is their fire protection at the present time.

I'm sure the minister isn't aware of just what the need is in these communities. But if he pays heed to the letter which should be on his desk sometime this afternoon I hope he will be sympathetic to it, discuss it with his officials, and hopefully we can come up with some kind of an answer to the problem. It's a particular problem in Armstrong, but it's a problem that also applies to most northern communities which are unorganized and find it impossible, without some form of outside assistance, to provide these essential services.

I see I have had the ear of the Solicitor General and hopefully he will be sympathetic and co-operative in trying to provide for that need.

Mr. Foulds: He's a good fellow.

Mr. Stokes: Another problem, Mr. Speaker, is the problem of subdivision control where a good many people, in order to find it possible to purchase accommodation, have found it necessary to resort to mobile homes. Many communities don't want to get into mobile home parks because of all of the constraints that have been put on by various ministries of this government—whether it be the Ministry of the Environment or the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs—in the kind of official plan that organized communities must develop before they can get the co-operation of those ministries.

And of course the bureaucracy one has to wade through in order to establish a mobile home park just boggles the imagination. We have a good many entrepreneurs who are willing to set up mobile home parks in unorganized territory, and the bureaucracy that they had to wade through just boggles the mind.

It's just insurmountable for any one person to try and wade through it. I have had people in two specific areas who have done everything possible to try to persuade the Ontario government that a mobile home park is a viable alternative to the expensive housing that most people are confronted with in organized communities. This seems to be a very viable alternative, and yet we don't seem to be able to convince the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs that it is indeed an alternative and one that should be encouraged and to which assistance should be provided in order to make it possible for this kind of accommodation.

So that I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in light of the few remarks I have made on those problems facing people—along with the establishment of health clinics in areas that either have no services at all or are underserviced—that possibly some action can be taken.

One final topic I would like to discuss has to do with pricing. Last year I had the

opportunity to introduce a private member's bill that called for a tribunal to review the high cost of living in northern Ontario, not only of consumer goods but the high cost of housing, the high cost of education and the high cost of transportation.

That private member's bill got complete endorsation from everybody on all sides of the House. The Premier said he was aware of it, he would take it under advisement and perhaps something meaningful would develop. Since that time I got signatures from about 3,000 people who endorsed the concept of such a review procedure in order to come to grips with the high cost of living and the stabilization of the price of essential services in the north.

Nothing has happened. There has been no indication since, either by way of the Throne Speech or any other pronouncements by this government, that it was even serious about coming to grips with it. They did embark on a transportation study in Kenora and the Rainy River area, where they have supposedly established some priorities, but nothing has happened with regard to making representations to Ottawa for amendments to the freight rate schedules or anything that would give a little bit of relief for the excessively high cost of living and transportation costs in the north.

Mr. Foulds: They didn't even send anyone to the prairie conference on transportation costs.

Mr. Stokes: That's right.

Mr. Foulds: They have the same problem.

Mr. Stokes: As a result of the hearings and the activities of a committee that was set up over in Ottawa to deal with the high cost of food, I thought it would be useful, Mr. Speaker, just to quote from some information that was provided to me by one of our retail outlets in northern Ontario.

Quite often the farmer is called the culprit in this whole piece; quite often the person from whom you are purchasing, the retailer, is made the culprit. In the view of many, many people who represent rural Ontario the farmer is not the culprit; and I'm inclined to agree with them. But when I talk to small businessmen, particularly in my riding, and when they give me the information as they get it right on their invoices, I'm going to agree with them too.

So if there is any responsibility, it's somewhere in between the farmer and the retailer, and not necessarily either one of them.

Mr. Foulds: You'd better believe it.

Mr. Stokes: These are actual invoices that were sent from Burns meats to one of the retailers in our riding. I want to quote the price of pork loins.

On Oct. 31, 1972, pork loins were selling wholesale—that is, the price to the retailer—at 78.5 cents a pound. That was on Oct. 31, 1972.

Mr. Paterson: Was that delivered?

Mr. Stokes: No, that's not delivered. There are freight charges on top of that. On Dec. 27, 1972, pork loins were 83 cents a pound; on Jan. 2, 1973, pork loins were 87 cents a pound; on Jan. 8, 1973, they had gone up to 92 cents a pound; on Jan. 31 they were 99 cents a pound; and on Feb. 26 they had jumped to $1.06 a pound. That's a jump from 78 cents on Oct. 31 to $1.06 on Feb. 26.

Mr. Speaker, the retailer is being scolded and admonished every time a housewife comes in to buy meat and finds that he has tacked on another three or four cents a pound. I just wanted to put those figures on the record to indicate that those are the prices that are being charged to him; so if anybody thinks the average small retailer across the province is gouging the customer, I would just like to put in a word for the retailer, come to his defence and say that if there is a culprit in the whole piece, let's look somewhere between the farmer and the retailer. Let's get down to the nitty-gritty and place the responsibility exactly and squarely where it should be.

I realize we are pressed for time, since this Throne Speech debate has to be wound up by tomorrow evening, and lest I cut anybody out of the Throne Speech debate—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Who's getting that?

Mr. Foulds: Don't let that inconvenience you!

Mr. Stokes: —by unduly stretching the time, I am going to refrain from expanding on anything I have already said and I am not going to introduce any new topics; I'll take advantage of another opportunity to do so, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is certainly nice to stand up and deliver a speech to a packed House. I think we should let the record show that there is actually one cabinet minister in the House but very few others of that party.

Mr. Speaker, I want to dwell on that very fact for a moment, because I feel personally that in the last two or three weeks the House has degenerated into what I can only describe as a zoo. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the result of two matters. One—I say this most respectfully sir, and I trust you will pass it on to the Speaker, if he is not listening—is that I feel you are not handling the House in the proper manner. I know it's the custom to stand in one's place and tell the Speaker what a great chap he is, and so on. But personally I have become very frustrated since this session began in trying to catch the Speaker's eye, in trying to follow the Speaker's ruling and in trying to figure out how the Speaker is trying to run this House, particularly during the question period.

You have been inconsistent, sir. It's hard to follow your rulings—particularly, if I may say so, in regard to supplementary questions. We had a matter here which was of urgent public importance, to my mind, sir, in regard to the flooding and the strong winds on the Great Lakes, which are affecting many ridings of members of this House. For some reason, known only to yourself—and your rulings are not debatable—you chose to cut off the supplementaries on what I consider the most important matter we had before us this afternoon.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Quit crying.

Mr. Reid: However, sir, I stood in my place—and, believe me, I stood. I felt like a kangaroo for one week solidly trying to catch your eye; you saw it, but you ignored me. You have done that to other members; and I think it is grossly unfair.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It's easier with the hon. member, though!

Mr. Reid: Obviously the House has degenerated because of your particular rulings; and I would suggest, sir, that you call a meeting of the three party whips and yourself to see if, between you, you can arrive at some kind of rational approach to the question period and to the matter of supplementary questions.

The other reason, sir, why I think the House has degenerated is because of the attitude of the government and the Premier (Mr. Davis) in particular. We have tried since we returned here to get answers out of the government on various questions and we have had relatively little success; again a result of two things:

(1) Very seldom do the cabinet ministers or the Premier bother showing up in the House at all. I would draw to your attention, sir, that last Friday there were nine ministers in the House—nine. Under the gallery on the government side, sprawling and spilling—and spilling is a good word to use—were the executive assistants and other assorted flunkies of the government. Sixteen of them on Friday—nine cabinet ministers; 16 civil servants. There was more of the province's money sitting under the press gallery than there was on the government benches.

If we are charitable and look at them as $15,000 apiece—and you could break that down into dollars per hour I am sure—let us say charitably that is $25 an hour—there was something like $240,000 of the taxpayers' money sitting under the gallery. That is roughly $400 an hour of the taxpayers' money to my mind being wasted while their ministers are God knows where; somewhere one would think, but where one doesn't know.

Today, sir, we had another example. In the House today there were 12 ministers; no more than 12 ministers at one time. Today, Monday, all the flunkies were back from their long weekend obviously; there were 28 under the press gallery. Again, if you figure that out on a per hour basis there seems to me to be an inordinate amount of the public's money going to waste.

But surely there is no reason why the cabinet ministers cannot find time to come in here for an hour for the question period, which should be—and if it was run properly—the most important hour perhaps in the day's business; at least when the only other business we are doing is Throne speeches.

To my mind there is no reason why only nine ministers could show up on Friday and only 12 showed up today. Surely their first responsibility is to this Legisalutre? But they all have that attitude toward the House—the Premier has it himself—and it has led to the

complete degeneration and the downgrading of this Legislature.

Now I want to say a few words about that, Mr. Speaker; particularly in regard to the question period. I have asked a number of questions and got no answers at all. When I say no answers, I don't mean just the usual oral perambulations of the Premier and some of his ministers. There have been no answers to questions that have been asked; answers the people of Ontario are entitled to have.

I don't want to dwell unduly, Mr. Speaker, on the questions arising from the Provincial Auditor's report, but let's just discuss one topic and then move on to something else. That particular topic has to do with cabinet ministers, their families and others using government aircraft of the Province of Ontario in and outside of the Province of Ontario.

The member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), myself and others have tried to elicit information from the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence), from the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), and from the Premier himself—and we have got no answers either (a) as to the policy of the government in regard to the use of these aircraft; and (b) as to why these aircraft were used and who was using them and for what purpose.

These are public funds we are spending and the public is entitled to these answers. We have asked for the log books of the various aircraft of the Ministry of Natural Resources. The Minister of Natural Resources has replied that they have some 40 some aircraft and they can't table all those logbooks.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no reason why the log books of the aircraft that are based at Centre Island in Toronto cannot be tabled in this Legislature. That would only involve two or three or four aircraft at the most, and would not be a great burden on the government. I'm sure there are enough executive assistants running around here that they could go down and get them themselves.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They can make copies and table them.

Mr. Reid: Surely we and the public are entitled to that kind of information? From the denial of that information to us in this Legislature, one can only conclude that the government has something to hide—that the cabinet ministers have been misusing their privilege to use those government aircraft—that they have been taking their friends and relatives and in-laws on trips completely unrelated to any kind of government business.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there's no other reason why the minister would refuse to provide that information to the Legislature. How the government and the Premier expect us to do our job when we're not given the information that's required, is beyond me. But this is part of the Premier's approach to the Legislature, to downgrade it and to ignore it if possible.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the Provincial Auditor's report. I was going to dwell at length on and quote at length from the auditor's report, and I think maybe I should, because it's obvious from my questions to the Minister of Natural Resources, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development and the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow), that they haven't even read the report.

Mr. Speaker, we've spent an inordinate amount of time, in view of its importance, on the book called The Happy Hooker, which supposedly the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr) considers obscene. I would say that this Provincial Auditor's report, Mr. Speaker, is obscene. If one reads it carefully, as we have on this side—but apparently the government side hasn't seen fit to do so—it reeks of corruption, of misfeasance, of malfeasance in the government service, to say nothing of incompetence.

Mr. Speaker, because I'm sure you yourself have read it I don't want to go into all the details because I trust that most of them will be coming up during the estimates or during the public accounts committee. But one can only dwell on the fact that, for instance, we've lost $55 million through incompetency in the Ministry of Health.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): Come here now.

Mr. Reid: One can only wonder about that statement which says that overtime bonuses have been paid to employees of the Ministry of Education without any checking or approval or anything but their word taken, without any kind of timesheet being kept.

What kind of an approach is it to a public trust of these public funds for these kind of things to go on? The auditor's report itself speaks of misfeasance in the use of public money.

What happened to the $45,000 that went uncollected from the sale of fishing and hunting licences? Why was a cheque for $1 million approved by Ontario Hydro for a con-

struction project that hadn't been completed? Why were goods and services signed for as received when they weren't received for months after the receipt was signed? Either that's incompetence or somebody's being paid off for something.

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Shame. Shame.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Shame. Shame.

Mr. Reid: Well, there's somebody over there—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Are there any answers? Why don't the members opposite give them?

Mr. Reid: The Tory bullfrog chorus is still alive and well.

Mr. Miller: The member doesn't believe that? We have a lot of faith.

Mr. Reid: Well, I do believe that. The auditor's report probably indicates the corruption of the government, Mr. Speaker, more than anything else.

Now, for those of my hon. friends across the way who don't understand what the word corruption means, perhaps I should read the definition into the record.

> *Corruption*: Impairment of integrity, virtue or moral principle . . . decay or decomposition . . . inducement to wrong by bribery or other unlawful or improper means . . . a departure from what is pure or correct—

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the auditor's report indicates these things on a broad scale, and we will continue to ask questions of the ministers, although we continue to get no answers from them, in these regards.

You know, Mr. Speaker, last week I attended a meeting in one of the rooms adjacent to the cabinet concerning liquor agency stores in northern Ontario. As usual I was the first one there. I was sitting in the office outside the Premier's office and I happened to look down and there was a piece of paper on the floor. I picked it up and it said, "Premier Davis, confidential memorandum to himself." The subtitle was "rating of the cabinet—0-10." I gathered from that that the Premier in his wisdom had decided he would rate his own cabinet ministers; he started from 0, being an absolute loss, to 10, being the highest rating, the best cabinet minister. One couldn't get any higher than 10.

Well, seeing as how it seems to be the thing to do to read confidential documents—we've all learned that from the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman)—I thought it wouldn't hurt at least to have a glance at it before I returned it to the Premier.

I'd like to inform the House how the ratings really went of the various cabinet ministers. I'm sorry that the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) is the only one present for two reasons, because we'll start with him and work our way up. As I told you, Mr. Speaker, the ratings ran from 0 to 10, 10 being the best. The Solicitor General had a minus-10 rating.

Mr. Cassidy: That's far too generous.

Mr. Reid: The Attorney General (Mr. Bales) had a rating of five, not competent or incompetent, just average. The Provincial Secretary for Justice had a rating of two. There are little comments with each one of these on the Premier's statement. He had a rating of two and it said "good-looking." I guess that's what the two points were for. The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) had a rating of six. The Premier would agree with us, I suppose, that he is one of the more competent members. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) had a rating of five because although he doesn't know anything about his ministry he doesn't get into too much trouble. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) had a rating of six because he's been able to keep the agricultural people, the farmers, happy even though the agricultural economy of the province is going down.

The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development had a rating of minus two, and there's a little notice saying, "Send him back to Cuba." I don't know what that means. The Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. Winkler) had a rating of four. The Premier even rated himself; for some reason he has 10 plus plus beside his name. The Treasurer (Mr. White) had a rating of six.

If only the Premier could have seen the Treasurer's performance in this House last Friday and heard the inane, asinine remarks he made in regard to the questions about women on different advisory boards! It was beyond belief, Mr. Speaker, it really was. If one takes 2x and 4x and divides it by four, one will find a formula for having the right

number of women on these boards. It was an incredible performance.

The Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) had a rating of two. He used to be one of the bright young men of the cabinet at one time but he lost a very important election, unfortunately, and all his competence and intelligence seems to have gone when he lost that. The Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) had a rating of two also.

Then we come to the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter); the rating beside his name was a funny thing. He was rated eight and then that number was crossed out and he was rated six. Then that number was crossed out; he was rated four. That number was crossed out. I won't go through it all but now he has a rating of minus nine. He's almost catching up to the Solicitor General.

Of course, the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow) had a rating of one out of 10; that's not very good.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Lot of confidence!

Mr. Reid: The others, Mr. Speaker, fall into that same general category, but I can tell you that out of a possible 230 points this cabinet scored something like 48, which is perhaps a measure of the competence that we have sitting on the Treasury benches at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be parochial, if I may, for a little while. I would like first of all to mention something that I hope will be passed on to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development—something that I trust will perhaps stave off another crisis we are facing in the province today because of the problems on the Great Lakes and the related land that they are eroding, and the houses and cottages that are being ruined.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the government has done nothing to alleviate this problem. They were aware of what was going to happen with the high water levels and the high winds and yet they did nothing.

When the government doesn't act and private industry won't, Mr. Speaker, obviously the individual is left with no recourse, when matters such as this are beyond his control. The people who own property along the beaches or waterfront that are now being hard pressed by these winds and waters are going to be complete losers, mainly because neither the government nor the private insurance companies will give them any kind of protection in regard to their property.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government sets up an insurance fund to provide insurance for those people owning property along the waterfront that can be affected by these waters. What I would suggest very simply is this, that the government arranges an insurance plan in which the individual cottage owner or waterfront property owner would pay into an insurance plan based on a 20-year cycle.

As we know, the water levels usually go in a 20-year cycle. The government could set up an insurance fund and ask each cottage owner or waterfront property owner to contribute to that fund based on that cottage owner's assessment of what his property, both land and buildings, was worth. He would then pay into that fund on a basis of at least 20 years and would be recompensed out of that insurance fund in regard to the amount that he had his property assessed at.

I think this would provide some kind of return to those people who now cannot get private insurance to protect their property. It would also provide the government with some initiative to set up such a fund to protect this kind of property. Obviously this would require the land owner to take all due consideration and care in the protection of his property from the waters and winds, but at least it would provide some kind of monetary protection from the loss that he is going to suffer because of these high winds and high waters.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about three or four matters that primarily affect my riding and northern Ontario. The first thing I want to bring to your attention is something the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) touched on, the high prices that we suffer in northwestern Ontario — although I wouldn't completely agree with my hon. friend that the retailers are always innocent of not taking advantage of the people that they are serving.

Mr. Speaker, on Feb. 19, 1973, the northern affairs branch of the Ministry of Natural Resources delivered to the Minister of Natural Resources a compendium of prices of different articles, food and gasoline, in northwestern Ontario. It is entitled, as a matter of fact: "Costs Survey, Northern and Northwestern Ontario."

> As requested, the officers in northwestern region have conducted a survey of various commodity costs in selected communities. The results are attached for your information.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from this report of the Ministry of Natural Resources to

the minister. I also want to quote from some research I did personally on gasoline prices, and I want to quote from a report that some ladies in Atikokan drew up last fall in regard to prices in their community. I would just like to mention briefly that these ladies did a comparison between food prices in Atikokan and food prices in Thunder Bay. For hundreds of groceries there was a difference of some $35 between Atikokan and Thunder Bay.

I would like to read into the record if I might, Mr. Speaker, the difference in cost among Toronto, Thunder Bay and Atikokan in some selected commodities.

The cost of a quart of milk in Toronto was 35 cents; in Thunder Bay it was 37 cents, and in Atikokan 43 cents. For a quart of milk the price in Atikokan is eight cents above that in Toronto and six cents above that in Thunder Bay. Milk by the tin in Toronto was 19 cents; in Thunder Bay, 21 cents; and in Atikokan, 24 cents—a difference there of five cents between Toronto and Atikokan.

A 24-oz loaf of bread in Toronto was 28 cents; in Thunder Bay, 31 cents; and in Atikokan, 35 cents—a difference of seven cents between Toronto and Atikokan. Sugar was 14½ cents a pound in Toronto; 18 cents in Thunder Bay; and 23 cents in Atikokan—a difference of almost nine cents a pound for sugar between Toronto and Atikokan.

Coffee per pound was 83 cents in Toronto; 95 cents in Thunder Bay; and $1.19 in Atikokan. Just between Thunder Bay and Toronto there is a difference of some 24 cents a pound for coffee. Tea per pound in Toronto was $1.18; in Thunder Bay, $1.29; and in Atikokan, $1.59—again a difference there of 41 cents.

Fuel oil in Toronto is 21 cents a gallon; in Atikokan it's 26.3 cents a gallon—5.3 cents higher than in Toronto. Regular gasoline in Toronto is 49 cents; in Thunder Bay, 54 cents; and Atikokan 57.9 cents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why there should be that kind of differential among prices in Toronto, Thunder Bay and Atikokan. Other areas within my riding also differ. They are even higher in Ignace and in Rainy River than they are in Atikokan.

It particularly bothers me that the prices of gasoline are from four to five cents higher in my riding, and six and seven cents higher in Ignace than they are in the rest of my riding, when most of our gasoline and fuel oil comes from Winnipeg. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I am informed that most of the gasoline that we use in northwestern Ontario comes out of the same storage tanks in Winnipeg. It is all the same gasoline, but if it's pumped into a Husky truck, or an Esso truck, or a Shell truck, then it becomes that brand of gasoline for that particular company and the price varies one or two or three cents.

I raised this matter, particularly the gasoline, Mr. Speaker, with the provincial Treasurer, when he was the Minister of Industry and Tourism, I believe, at that time. I asked him to look into the prices of gasoline in northwestern Ontario because we are being exploited, we are being rooked and we are being overcharged. I find it somewhat ironic that people in the city should be complaining about the inflationary prices of goods and services they have been enjoying, while we in northern Ontario have been exploited by the transportation companies, by the gasoline companies and others, and have been paying ridiculously high prices for years.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government might see fit, under one of its many boards and commissions, to have a look at price differentials between northern and southern Ontario with a view to giving us in the north an even break on this matter. If we cannot bring the pressure of the Ontario government to bear on the gasoline companies and on the retailers, particularly of food items, then we are not going to be able to bring these costs down.

Already the costs of everything are higher in the north because of transportation costs and so on. But why we should be paying these inordinately high prices is beyond me. The people of my riding are concerned about this. They are being exploited; they are trying to keep prices down as much as possible. But it has got to the point where they cannot raise their families when they have to pay $20, $30, $40 and $50 more a month than they would pay for the same package of groceries in Toronto.

There are two or three other matters I'd like to refer to in regard to northwestern Ontario and my riding. One, very briefly, is the need for a road between Atikokan and Ignace; I won't go into great detail about this at this time, sir, except to say that I was most disappointed with the Kenora-Rainy River transportation study, which to my mind was dictated by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): My friend doesn't like Fort Frances to Dryden?

Mr. Reid: Fort Frances to Dryden is fine. I don't mind that road at all; it is an easily

built road. As a matter of fact, it is already half built. But what I didn't like about the report was the fact that there was a road given higher priority in an area where no people live at the moment and which would benefit no one. The report in itself says that. It says, "There is no development in this area at all—there may be some in the future—but we recommend this road."

But where we have people living in the communities of Atikokan and Ignace, where the road would be a great direct social benefit, the report says, "The road is not economically feasible." Well, I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, that if we are in the business of doing only what is economical in this province, the government would have very little work to do indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the officials of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications will thoroughly review the matters that are put before them in regard to the need for this road. It could mean the life of one community and would certainly add to the lifeblood of another one. The representatives of those two communities, Ignace and Atikokan, will be coming down to see the minister; and I trust he will not be as intractable as some of the other cabinet ministers when these people come to present their arguments to him.

I must say that I was most disappointed in the recommendations that came out of that report in regard to those two particular roads. One is a resource road that should come under the aegis of the Minister of Natural Resources, and should not have been recommended as a highway by that study at all. We must place our priorities on people in this province; and surely there is an obvious need for a road between Atikokan and Ignace.

I want to say one more word, if I may, Mr. Speaker, about the white paper—if that's what it is—of the Minister of Natural Resources in regard to the zoning of Crown land and the necessity of having a licence to use that Crown land for recreation purposes.

The Minister of Natural Resources himself long has been well aware of the problems of camper trailers, particularly foreign camper trailers, using Crown land in northern Ontario. We allow non-residents to come into this province to camp anywhere they please as long as there is a road there; they can camp up to three weeks with no charge at all. Usually they buy a fishing or hunting licence, but they're given the use of the land and the water for free.

Now the minister comes out with this white paper, which states that we have to do something about this situation because it causes a litter problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to argue immediately that the minister is heading in the right direction for the wrong reason. In this province we have allowed non-residents to come and use our land and water, and not charged them anything. There is nowhere in the United States that I know of where a person from Ontario can take his camper trailer, drive up to a lake, throw his boat in the water, fish, hunt or whatever, for no charge at all. If there are though, Mr. Speaker, there are very few isolated spots indeed left in the United States for those purposes.

Obviously, our hunting and our fishing is much better up here than in most places in the United States. But we have literally been giving our province away to these people who pay no taxes here and they have come up and enjoyed our bounty and we have sat mum and collected their garbage—and we can't blame just the Americans for the garbage problem.

Really, Mr. Speaker, what I'm getting at is that I applaud the first hesitant move of the minister, but I have to quarrel with his reason for doing so. The idea behind tourism is to part the tourist from as many dollars as possible. You don't bring a tourist to your country and give him everything free and say: "Thanks for coming. We enjoyed your company. We'll see you next year." I can tell you the Americans are great ones for—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Tourist traps!

Mr. Reid: Well, I don't call them tourist traps—but they're certainly great at parting a tourist in their country from as many dollars as possible.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They've got speed traps over there.

Mr. Reid: And for as long as I can remember in this province, we've been allowing these people to use our great outdoors with no charge at all. We've been literally giving away our resources; and Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford that any more, for two reasons: First, obviously our resources are not unlimited. We are running out of good fishing and hunting areas, even in northern Ontario.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we can't afford it from the point of view of economics.

All the studies that have been done on northern Ontario indicate that one of the primary industries for employment has to be the tourist industry. If we continue to allow people to come up to our area to camp gratis on Crown land, where they pay no fee and are under no regulation, well that is just abysmally stupid. That's like allowing somebody to walk into a supermarket, handing him a trolley, and saying: "Just help yourself. Thank you very much for coming. Help yourself to the meat, vegetables, whatever you have, and come back and see us again next year when you have that urge to fish and hunt again."

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I applaud the first hesitant step of the Minister of Natural Resources to grapple with this problem; but surely he's doing the right thing for the wrong reason. I think if he would change his thinking perhaps he could come up with a very concrete policy of forcing these camper trailers into provincial parks, or into licensed tourist camps, or licensed trailer parks. Make them pay a fee and part them from a few of those tourist dollars that we need in northern Ontario.

I say at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that if he would adopt that kind of attitude there would be no reason at all to charge the residents of the Province of Ontario a fee for using their own land, their own water and their own air.

Surely, we pay taxes in this province. We have to live with the tourists. We appreciate having the tourists here, but surely we should not be forced into the same category as tourists? We should be able to use what is ours because of our heritage and not have to pay for it. We are not tourists in our own province in those areas in which we live. We shouldn't be treated like tourists, nor should we have to pay like them.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few other matters that I would like to go into, but I know there are others who are anxious to speak. I would hope that my words—I can't say they've fallen on deaf ears; there aren't very many ears of any kind for them to fall on. But I would hope that the minister would take some cognizance of the fact that we, in northern Ontario, having been paying inflationary prices for some years for our groceries, for our gasoline, our heating fuel—that we're being exploited, particularly by the oil companies, for no reason at all.

I have a letter here from a constituent who used to be in the oil and gas business and he indicates the way in which the oil companies used him, or took advantage of him. I would hope that the government would take some cognizance of this and would set up some kind of machinery to look into these problems, so that we in northern Ontario can enjoy the same standard of living at the same cost as we do in southern Ontario.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure for me to take part in this Throne Speech debate today. The contents of the address read by the Lieutenant Governor on March 20 again forcefully demonstrates this government's willingness to meet head-on and overcome the large problems which face society today.

It is my intention to single out for special attention in the time allotted a subject of great concern to me and about which I have conducted considerable research in the past year—the problem of solid waste management. I was extremely gratified to note the reference in the Throne Speech to our government's intention to provide an early solution to this problem.

The problem is truly imposing in scale and there appears to be little doubt that it will become even more so. At the moment, we are coping with more than 20 million tons of solid waste annually and it is estimated that this may grow to 37 million tons annually by 1980.

As you know, garbage disposal has become a topic of public, and in most cases highly emotional, controversy. There are many reasons for this. It poses threats to health and public safety and the possibilities of increased air and water pollution. In addition, there are factors such as noise, unpleasant odours, increased traffic and possibly reductions of property values resulting from waste disposal operations.

In discussing the problem with you now, I want to outline for you the dimensions of these problems and give you some insight into what is being done about garbage disposal in Ontario. I also will review briefly some developments in other jurisdictions and then put forward my own ideas of what can be done to solve the problem both now and in the future.

In my view, there are two major reasons for the increased concern which is evident not only in Ontario, but throughout the urban

areas of North America. The first is the rapid growth of our cities and towns. In early days, the refuse from the city would be hauled out to the country and dumped and burned in sparsely populated areas.

Now, as we all know, urbanization extends well into the former rural areas and efficient land use planning has become an urgent priority in its own right. It is no longer possible or reasonable to dump and burn refuse in the countryside. Waste management legislation in Ontario does not permit this form of disposal except in small communities in remote areas and even this is subject to controls.

The second reason for the growing awareness of the need for better waste management is the increase in the disposable packaging for convenient merchandising which has been developed to meet our changing life styles. This was inevitable in an age in which women comprise a third of our labour force and use such convenient items to accommodate their dual role as worker and homemaker.

Solid waste disposal falls roughly into four problem areas. First, municipal and industrial waste, such as household refuse and scraps from a large variety of commercial and industrial operations. This type of waste is generally composed of about 50 per cent paper or paper products, 15 to 20 per cent organic material, such as vegetable scraps, and about 10 to 20 per cent almost equally divided between glass and metal. The remainder is ashes and miscellaneous materials which can be almost anything under the sun. Secondly, there is agricultural waste which consists largely of animal droppings, soiled straw or other bedding materials. Thirdly, there are abandoned automobiles and, finally, the litter we see on our streets, in our parks and other recreational areas.

All of these present some special disposal problems but the biggest problem is the enormous bulk entailed. At the moment in Ontario we are faced with a mountain of eight million tons of municipal and industrial waste, and it is estimated that this will increase to 12 million tons by 1980. In addition, we are presently challenged to dispose of 10 million tons of agricultural waste and sewage sludge each year. It is estimated that this amount will increase to 25 million tons a year by 1980.

There is not a great deal to be said about the litter; with the exception of broken glass, it generally does not create a health hazard, but aesthetically it is offensive. The antilitter campaign undertaken by the Ministry of the Environment has, I think, had a salutary effect. By and large, the people of Ontario are aware of the invitation, "Ontario, keep it beautiful," but even if picnickers, campers and motorists disposed of their waste in on-the-site trash cans, it would still have to be collected for final disposal.

To a certain extent, the same can be said of abandoned automobiles. They do not present a health or pollution hazard but they, too, are offensive to the eye. Again, the ministry's extensive thrust in this area is well known and going on.

Let me describe some of the problems posed by the disposal of solid waste. The overriding concerns, of course, are human health and safety, the preservation of reasonable standards of air and water purity and the quality of life. The basic approach to these goals is to collect the garbage and dispose of it in a safe and satisfactory manner.

However, as members are well aware, this is more easily said than done. The collection of disposable solid waste in our cities and towns has become a gigantic task employing thousands of workers and costing millions of dollars. At present, the cost of collection is three or four times the cost of disposal and this ratio is unlikely to change unless much better ways of collecting and disposing of waste are developed.

It is estimated that the average annual cost of collection and disposal of municipal and industrial waste in Ontario at the present is between $8 and $10 per capita, or $40 for a family of four. If no changes are introduced in the present methods of collection and disposal, it is estimated that by 1980, these costs would be at least $25 per capita and possibly could be even higher.

At the moment agricultural waste is in a class by itself because it does not come under the regulations of our Ministry of the Environment. Officials of the ministry and others are becoming increasingly concerned about the potential health and pollution problems resulting from the production of vast quantities of manure from feed lots, piggeries and poultry operations. These are not farming operations in the traditional sense.

We can cope with the manure of our family farms by returning it to the earth as fertilizer. As members know, this is the practice which has been followed for centuries, but the operations I have mentioned are not farms, they are factories for the mass production of food. There is no doubt that they perform a useful function in our society. In-

deed, we would not eat so well without them, but they are factories and as such, in my view, they should be treated like other industry and be made subject to pollution control laws and regulations of the province.

I want to give you now some information on what is being done about these various problems in Ontario. Waste management in the province is a shared responsibility of the province and the municipalities. At the moment, municipal and industrial solid wastes are collected and disposed of by municipal governments. The provincial government, through the Ministry of the Environment, has concentrated largely on air and water pollution to date and this, of course, has involved it extensively in sewage disposal, and to a lesser extent, in solid waste management.

Any such comprehensive solid waste management programme can't restrict itself to collection and disposal. One of the principal considerations must be the generation of waste, and the starting point might properly be here. We must reduce the quantity of waste by controls of unnecessary packaging and encourage re-use of materials to avoid entry into the disposal systems.

However, I think we can profitably spend a few more minutes on how we can actually handle municipal and industrial solid waste in Ontario. At the present, about 50 per cent, or 4.5 million tons, is disposed of by landfill. About another 3.5 million tons has been disposed of by dumping and about one million tons is incinerated. Little or none is reclaimed, with the exception of some newspaper recycling projects and, of course, scrap metal.

Generally speaking, each municipality owns and operates a disposal site or sites, and many of these until recently were located haphazardly wherever cheap land could be acquired. There was no collection in many rural areas, little if any co-operation existed be municipalities and there was a large number of small, unacceptable sites.

The dumps are the most primitive form of disposal and generally this method involves the open burning of refuse. Many of them have been located without thought to the possible pollution problems, and in some areas they constitute a hazard to wells if soluble organic materials, salts and alkalis leach into the water table.

All of the dumps, including those that involve burning, provide breeding grounds for rodents, flies and other disease carriers. They are invariably malodorous and in some areas they constitute a highway traffic hazard. A number of serious accidents have been recorded because of loss of visibility caused by smoke from dumps blowing across the highway. Of course, the picture is improving. As I indicated earlier, dumping is now banned by law in Ontario with the exception of very small communities in remote areas.

The landfill operations under way at the present are much better than dumping, but here too there are difficulties. Anyone who has followed the efforts of Metro Toronto and the Canadian Pacific Railway to find an acceptable site outside Metro for the disposal by rail haul of municipal and industrial waste, will be aware of some of the problems.

The government of Metro Toronto is not alone in facing these difficulties. Up until September of last year, despite the considerable research to prove its value, the transport of refuse by rail had not become operational anywhere in North America. If there have been some recent applications of this method they have not come to my attention. There are many reasons for the non-use of rail haul, ranging from legislation in some areas to prevent shipment of refuse across state lines; the opposition of environmentalists in some areas; and the undesirable reluctance of rural areas to accept the big city problem.

The major problem for Toronto has been difficulty in finding a suitable site and, of course, assessing this method of disposal against the merits of other systems which are in the process of development or in use in other municipalities. However, despite these difficulties, I believe that rail haul, combined with the compacting of refuse, is one of the most promising avenues of escape from our solid waste dilemma. I will return to this subject and discuss it in some detail later.

Before doing so, however, I want to discuss briefly some other systems of handling solid waste. Most of them are at a trial or development stage but there is sufficient activity and evidence to indicate that some major breakthroughs may be possible in the future. However, most of them are not practical now and, in addition, the social and economic problems involved in the application of some of the new systems are formidable.

For example, collection, which is the costliest phase of our present system of garbage collection, needs a major overhaul and the adoption of more sophisticated equipment such as automatic collection vehicles.

These one-man collectors are in use in some US municipalities but widespread adoption of this method, in my opinion, will be slow because of the initial capital cost and because the form of automation may mean loss of jobs.

In the future, we may use ducts and slurry pipelines. These already have been developed for use—the slurry pipeline is not exactly a new invention—but these, too, will be slow coming into use for handling garbage because of the social and economic factors I mentioned in connection with automatic vehicles. When they do come into use, ducts and pipelines will require that the garbage be fragmented and this process sometimes is known as comminution. It is used in some areas.

Fragmentation is also necessary for sorting operations and these, too, are being used in some localities in the United States and in Europe. The big problem at the moment is what to do with the fragments when one gets them. The most practical use is for landfill until better sorting and reclamation systems are developed.

We also have to consider incineration, but there are a number of drawbacks including the high cost of construction, addition of pollution controls and maintenance. So far, efforts to recover some or all of these costs by utilizing waste heat for energy production in central heating operations have not lived up to the expectations of the theorists. To my knowledge, although it is talked about by people—most of whom, I suspect, either sell or have just been sold incinerators—there is not a single economic installation in operation in the world selling steam to private industry.

Composting is another area that appears to be attractive until it is examined closely. It can be used as a soil conditioner but generally fertilizer must be added. In some cases, compost can be used to make wall board and other compressed products but so far most of the 20-odd composting plants started in the United States in recent years have had to shut down because of the lack of markets and technical difficulties.

There is little doubt that in the long run reclamation and recycling has to be the correct answer to our massive garbage disposal problem. And progress has been made in some areas of the industrial field, but the efforts to reclaim household and many industrial wastes have been stymied so far by the lack of economic sorting and cleaning processes.

Sorting appears to be feasible only for small operations, but if we are to achieve economies of scale in our garbage disposal, then the small operations are not of the right answer. Until such time as recycling becomes economically feasible in private industry, it simply won't happen. That day appears to be years in the future for most areas.

But we cannot settle for our present system because our garbage problem is becoming more serious with every passing year. Think back to the tonnage statistics I cited. I believe that we must act now to take advantage of three types of technology that are available and which will provide substantial relief in the years ahead, while other processes leading eventually to successful reclamation and recycling are completely developed. I am advocating a combination of sorting, compaction, rail or truck haulage and reclamation of abandoned quarries and strip mines.

Let me deal first with compaction. One of the most difficult problems associated with garbage, as we have noted, is its vast bulk and unpredictable content. This ranges from paper scraps and potato peelings to discarded stoves and refrigerators. This bulk is troublesome, even when we use the most practicable disposal method available at present, sanitary landfill.

This is particularly true of the area where the landfill is located. The dump trucks shed loose paper, dirt and dust as they travel to the site and, although the refuse is covered with clean earth at intervals, the landfills tend to be somewhat malodorous until they are completed. The rats and other pests also continue to find homes in the refuse until the fill is completed—and this is a process that can take years, if it is a large operation.

Moreover, even when a sanitary landfill project is completed that often is not the end of the trouble story. There may be danger of seeping methane gas and possible fire and explosion and also the problem of pollution of the water supply through leaching. Moreover, this use of available land is wasteful and inefficient. In my view, compaction combined with rail or truck haul and topographical engineering can overcome these problems and give us substantial relief from our garbage disposal problems for many years to come.

Compaction, after extracting any economically useful material, takes the garbage in giant hydraulic presses and squeezes it at great pressure into large high density blocks. Presses currently in commercial operation in some American cities such as Cambridge,

Mass., compress garbage into 4 ft cubes weighing approximately five tons. Under the tremendous force exerted by the presses, virtually all of the liquids are squeezed out of the garbage and the resulting bales are dry, neat and free from odours.

This means that the problems associated with sanitary landfill are eliminated. There will be no blowing paper and other debris to mar the landscape and no rats or other disease carriers. There will be no odours and the possibility of methane gas seepage and leaching also will be eliminated. But perhaps most important, the bulk of the garbage will have been reduced by a ratio of 25 to one and, in bales, it can be handled with relative ease by heavy duty machinery, better than the best results obtainable by a modern incinerator. In a landfill operation, the bales can be placed tightly together and covered with clean fill, which in turn can be compacted by heavy equipment.

You may be thinking at this point that the incineration also reduces the bulk of refuse. But in my view we must keep in mind that compaction operations now in use in the United States involve capital costs of about one-tenth of the cost of incineration, and operating costs that are between one-third and one-half lower. These are very important considerations when we think about the growing amount of garbage in the years ahead.

If this system was put into operation in any of our large urban areas or by any of our regional governments, it would be necessary to build a compaction and transfer facility in a central location. An area like Metro Toronto might require two or three. This facility would include a refuse receiving area, the compaction presses, and bale storage and loading area. Ideally, it also would be served by a railway spur line, because rail transportation offers significant advantages in moving the bales to the landfill site.

I can hear you asking: What landfill sites? Those are the hangups at the moment. The rural areas do not want big-city garbage. I agree, but there are other locations we must examine, some of them in more remote areas or those that are functioning as industrial mining sites at present.

In Ontario there are more than 5,000 abandoned quarries and a number of open-pit mining operations that can be numbered among the largest man-made excavations in the world. The scars which currently disgrace the Niagara Escarpment could be covered and rehabilitated. The essential advantage of this system is to reclaim land, our most irreplaceable commodity, and to turn ugly wasteland into good usable space.

What I am saying, in essence, is that there is no shortage of places to put our garbage if we can negotiate suitable purchases or leases and overcome some of the complications. Many of these would be eliminated by the compaction process. This would assist in overcoming neighbourhood objections to conventional landfill and at the same time reclaim useless land for the general public benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I started by outlining the massive problem of solid waste disposal that now confronts us: 20 million tons annually now, with a possibility that this may nearly double by 1980. I also outlined some of the ongoing research and development work that promises to help us solve the problem in the long run. It is clear that the best solutions are reclamation and recycling; this is imperative if we face a resources shortage, as the pessimists claim.

The achievement of these objectives on a large scale is a long way down the road, and in my view it is also clear that we have to move quickly with the best technology that is available now. I maintain this is a combination of compaction, rail and truck hauling, and disposal in open-pit mines or large quarries. I say action is needed quickly, because it will take time to organize this system and to build the facilities—and time is running out on us. With a possible increase of 17 million tons of solid waste a year confronting us in less than 10 years, there is no time to spare. We must act now. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we could have a motion to adjourn the debate by the next speaker.

Mr. Cassidy moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 3

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 3, by Mr. Givens.

Resolution: That the provincial government, in co-operation with the municipal and federal levels of government, should set up a permanent secretariat to discuss, study and explore matters of common interest with the purpose of assisting munic-

ipalities with their problems, in light of the fact that a tri-level conference was held in Toronto last year, at which time it was felt that representatives of the three levels of government should meet on a regular and continuing basis.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 3.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York-Forest Hill moves resolution No. 3.

Mr. Givens: I'd like to explain the purpose of the resolution. As every schoolboy knows, Mr. Speaker, which includes the vast majority of the hon. members of this House, under the British North America Act, which is our Canadian constitution, municipalities and urban areas of this province come under provincial jurisdiction under section 92 of the Act.

This constitution, as we know it, was drawn over 100 years ago when the responsibilities of the municipalities were limited. They were confined to services with respect to property and to services such as police and fire protection, garbage collection, the paving of kerbs and the filling of potholes, and so on. But this is no longer so. Since that time, municipalities have got into a myriad of very sophisticated services which are not attributable to property alone and which cannot adequately be paid for by property taxes alone. These include such sophisticated services as welfare, housing, transportation, pollution, post-secondary school education, unemployment and many other services which can in no way, by any stretch of the imagination, be attributed to taxation on the basis of the fixed asset of real estate taxes.

We haven't been solving the problems of our cities, Mr. Speaker, and there are many urban problems that we haven't been dealing with adequately; with respect to the urban poor, drug addiction, alienation, crime, housing and transportation. I was very much amused when listening to and watching television on Saturady night to hear the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) when he made this profound statement, which turned out to be the biggest laugh of the weekend. He said—I paraphrase him; I don't quote him because I don't remember the exact words: The day of the motor car for the transport of people is finished.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): That's right.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh yes, that certainly is right!

Mr. Givens: We have only got through selling over a million cars in the Province of Ontario alone last year. The Wall Street Journal and The Financial Post in Canada have indicated that last year was the biggest year in automobile sales on the North American continent. And my hon. friend from Scarborough Centre says "the day of the motor car is over." So we have solved that problem.

Mr. Drea: No, get it right.

Mr. Givens: Oh, all right!

Mr. Drea: The day of the automobile in mass transit is over.

Mr. Singer: He didn't say that.

Mr. Givens: He is equivocating. We haven't solved the problem of pollution, although the Dow Co. is in the courts. Members heard the answer from the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) today, that he went up to Ottawa last Friday to speak to the Minister of Transport, specifically for Richmond Hill and the Union Station, and that he came back with a big goose egg—with nothing! He said it would be some time until he heard from the Minister of Transport in Ottawa as to whether he will help.

The federal government, amidst its debates and its concerns with respect to wet wheat and fish and national unity up in Ottawa, refights the battle of the Plains of Abraham up there just about every week. They hardly have time for other things with which they should be concerned, such as urban matters. The politicians and the civil servants up there have been dragged, kicking and screaming, into the realization that they have to do something about the concept of urban planning and urban problems on a national basis right across this country.

I remember in 1968 when I first went there I was told unmistakenly by the Prime Minister, and by other people, that the federal government has no place in the urban affairs of the nation, that this was unconstitutional, that it couldn't have a ministry of housing and it couldn't have a ministry of urban affairs because it was unconstitutional and the government wasn't going to face up to it. Since that time, because of public pressure, it has decided to get into the field.

I would like to give members a few examples of federal involvement. The federal

government may say that it has no constitutional responsibility and we may say to it "thou shalt stay out," but the fact of the matter is that it is involved.

Let me give members some contemporary examples. This past Saturday, there was this banner headline in the Toronto Star: "Andras Says 190,000 Immigrants May Still Be Hiding." If there are 190,000 immigrants still hiding, I suggest to members they are hiding in the cities of this country and there are probably closer to a quarter of a million or 300,000 of them. They are not hiding on farms and they're not hiding in villages; they are hiding in the big centres of this country.

Who was responsible for that? Windsor? Toronto? Waterloo? Are any of the cities across the country responsible for something that the federal government has brought about?

With respect to transportation, we all know about the heroic action taken by our government here in abandoning the Spadina expressway and the Spadina subway. Hurrah.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): The member sounds like a broken record.

Mr. Singer: The member is going to hear it for many years until it is built.

Mr. Givens: The members are going to hear it for many years, Mr. Speaker, because there has been no alternative to what the government has abandoned.

Mr. Singer: That's right!

Mr. Givens: Now there will be, years from now, the Toonerville Trolley, like the Third Ave. "El" they used to have in Manhattan. It will come about in another 10 years; and it's going to be on concrete stanchions instead of the iron they used to have in New York.

We're going to have the dial-a-bus system in about three or four years. But in the meantime, all we've got is the extension of the Yonge St. subway, which we planned 10 years ago. Two lousy stations have been completed in 10 years. It was started in 1963 and that subway is overloaded now.

The point of the thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to have federal help now in order to twin the Yonge St. subway, to prevent it from becoming paralysed within the next few months. It would have been much easier to bring this about if there had been this kind of tri-level, permanent secretariat that would be working on this right now, instead of the minister going to see the Minister of Transport, who is from Montreal.

Probably when our minister walked in and said: "Let's have the commuter arrive from Richmond Hill," the federal minister said "Richmond who?" So now they're going to study it. It will probably take them about six months to study it but the pressure is on now because by the time the extension goes up to Finch, the Yonge St. subway will be totally paralysed.

It will be incapable of handling the traffic that it is going to attract. When the dial-a-bus system goes into effect three years from now it will disgorge an extra two million passengers into the Yonge St. subway.

The Yonge St. subway system was designed with this in mind—that it would be relieved in due course by the Spadina subway system. What has happened to the Spadina subway system? It is before the Ontario Municipal Board today; it will be there for the next three or four weeks. The board will reserve decision. It will take six months to make that decision.

It will then be appealed to the cabinet, so it will take another year before we can acquire the land and draw up the plans for the Spadina subway, which members are all in favour of and which the government ruined together with the expressway two years ago.

The government should have gone ahead with that. It had the opportunity to do it at that time. That is why I say if we had the secretariat we would have been in much better shape.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): No way!

Mr. Givens: With respect to the airports, we messed up the Malton airport — the Toronto International Airport — situation because of lack of co-ordination and co-operation among the three levels of government. This is why we now need a second airport, and the second airport has been messed up—

Mr. W. Newman: Who said we needed the second airport?

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): The government did.

Mr. Givens: The second airport has been messed up; the whole concept of it has been

messed up because there has not been tri-level—

An hon. member: The member sounds like a broken record.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): The member for York-Forest Hill was in Ottawa at the time.

Mr. Givens: What did the member say?

An hon. member: He didn't say anything.

Mr. Givens: If he has anything to contribute, let him say it.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): And if he hasn't got anything to say, don't let him say it.

Mr. Givens: The trouble there is we didn't have three-level co-operation and consultation with respect to the proposed airport at Pickering or the government wouldn't be in the mess it is in now.

An hon. member: Darn right!

Mr. Givens: There are other examples — in the education field; the welfare field; the field of crime and so on. Last year we had a tri-level conference which was hosted by the former minister, the one with the mailed fist in the mailed glove. He called it but when it was held a new minister had taken over. He was the man of the iron fist in the silken glove. He's gone now. So the first minister was so successful that now the government is backing away from his regional policy, as we heard from the new minister the other day.

The other minister has been such a great success that he was responsible for losing the safest Conservative seat in the Province of Ontario, a seat that's been Conservative for 40 years. And now the new minister — he's the one with the pudgy palm in the paper mitt — has indicated that he's going to retire and not run in the next election; presumably after he has enshrined the women in his ministry, as he stated so valiantly.

You girls should apply to the Ministry for Intergovernmental Affairs. You could become deputy ministers. It's in to be a woman now!

Mr. Singer: If you multiply 3x by 4x, yes!

Mrs. Campbell: If you can make the quota.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: Anyway, the only result —

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: I'm sure she's not going away mad. She's just going away.

An hon. member: To make an application.

Mr. Drea: She's scared.

Mr. Givens: The only result of last year's tri-level conference was that they merely decided they would meet again this year. They must have been scared out of their wits, because our Treasurer of that period, Mr. MacNaughton, was reported in the papers as having almost scuttled that tri-level conference. The news item that appeared in the newspaper said that it was practically a disaster until at the last minute there was some compromise made and they agreed to meet again this year, probably in November.

I think we can all agree in the light of what has happened over the past three or four years, that the British North America Act substantially, virtually, for all intents and purposes, is unamendable. I don't think anybody wants to challenge that opinion. It's unamendable because, with all the provinces across this country — even the have-not provinces — they don't even want to have to give up the right of not having anything and consequently they will not agree to an amendment of the Constitution, so that if there are any adjustments or adaptations to be made with respect to the Constitution it has to be done by consultation and co-operation and not by amendment.

I remember, when the Prime Minister used to say, "Well, amend the Constitution." You know, that's absurd and it's ridiculous. He knows it and we all know it here. Everything has to be done politically by negotiation and consultation, because somewhere the buck has got to stop.

When a city goes to Ottawa for help they say: "Well, we agree with you but it's the province that has the jurisdiction." When I used to come hat in hand like a mendicant and a beggar up here they used to say: "Well, why don't you go to see your friends up in Ottawa because we haven't got the money for it?"

Well, somewhere among these three levels of government the buck has to stop, because somewhere among these three levels of government all the total jurisdiction and power and money exist to solve the problems of the day. Surely, we can agree on that, somewhere among these three levels.

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): The member knows how hard it is to get along with Ottawa.

Mr. W. Newman: He's been to all three levels to try to find the money.

Mr. Givens: That is why we have to have—

Mr. Handleman: He cannot get along with them up there.

Mr. Givens: That is why, having served at the three levels, I realize and I understand that the three levels have to get together for consultation and co-operation, because otherwise there's no end to it.

Now, let me get on with why we need this permanent secretariat. First of all, I feel that it has to be a small full-time permanent secretariat responsible to the chairmen of the three levels of government. It would have an analytical role. It would work on research and planning.

Another function it would have would be to co-ordinate and communicate. It would have a communicative role, so that we don't have what we've had before, where the province comes in with provincial facts, and the federal government comes in with federal facts, and the municipal governments come in with municipal facts. A fact is a fact is a fact, as Gertrude Stein would say. We shouldn't need three different categories of facts, and if you had a communicative secretariat that could work these things out there would be one set of facts that we could all understand.

Furthermore, the function of the secretariat would be to set up and conduct trilevel committees and conferences on comprehensive problems in specific metropolitan areas, of which there are about 20 across this nation, that have national problems. When I talk about comprehensive problems I mean comprehensive as opposed to sectorial problems. You cannot deal with urban transportation, for instance, by itself. No way! Urban transportation is interdependent with housing, and with planning and with zoning and with pollution and with other matters of that kind. You cannot deal with these problems alone. There has to be cross-fertilization and cross-pollination between departments and between civil services and between the departments and the civil services of the three levels of government. So they have to be dealt with on a comprehensive basis.

Then there has to be the job that the secretariat can do with respect to planning and designing of policies on matters on which the three levels of government are involved. What's the point of saying, for instance, that education is strictly within the purview of the provincial government when over half a billion dollars is funnelled off from the federal government to the provincial government for post-secondary school education?

Now, the government is in education with the federal government—is in education with both feet and we might as well recognize that. There are other examples of that kind—with respect to housing. The federal government, whatever the party in power may be—I'm not talking partisan politics now—whatever the party in power, 90 per cent of the funds for housing will be coming from the federal government.

Then another function of the permanent secretariat will be to legitimize the concept of the federal role in urban affairs and the urban role, which will be plugged into the decision-making process.

What is the use of having these conferences, of inviting municipal representatives? You will have a municipal representative from Toronto who represents over two million people, and he will sit up in the 10th row of the gallery as an adviser. Whereas, the Premier of Prince Edward Island who represents 150,000 people on a budget of about the size of a suburb in Ottawa, or something, is a first minister who has a direct line of communication to the Prime Minister of Canada.

I suggest that it is wrong and I suggest that it is high time today that the urban areas of this country were plugged into the decision-making process which affects their daily lives.

And finally, I feel the secretariat would be able to give direction and evolve policies and administer the implementation thereof on a continuing basis.

Again, what is the use of having a conference every year when you don't have an ongoing secretariat of experts — a small ongoing secretariat of experts who take advantage of whatever decisions are made at these particular meetings and conferences and build for the future? It's a complete waste of time unless you do that.

Now I think such a secretariat has to have three substantial elements. First of all, it must be representative of the three levels of government as co-partners, if not equal

partners. There is no point in merely saying: "You federal people, you mind your own business and just send us the money and we will finish the job."

No federal government of any political stripe is simply going to send a cheque every time you send them a bill. That's absurd. Because urban business is the people's business and no one level of government has a monopoly on the people's business in this nation today.

And I think that this secretariat must deal with problems on a comprehensive basis rather than a sectorial basis, as I explained. And I think that such a secretariat must begin to distinguish between the large municipalities—like Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Winnipeg and the smaller municipalities, because their problems are essentially different. I don't believe that you can compare them.

I think one of the main difficulties of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities is that they try to lump all the municipalities — small and big; rural and urban— into the same basket; and you cannot do that.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that eventually all this will come to pass as cities grow in importance and as more people flock to them. I think the trend is irreversible. If we read the demographic figures it would indicate that in the next few years over 80 per cent of the population of Canada will be living in the large cities of this country.

I think this trend is totally irreversible. Furthermore, as more city politicians gravitate towards the cabinets of the provinces and of the federal government, they will begin to have an understanding they don't have now. The trouble I had in Ottawa was that there wasn't a member of the cabinet who had been a mayor of a city — of any city in Canada. Consequently, how could you expect anybody on the cabinet to have an understanding of what the urban problems are in any city in this country?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): But the member keeps on hoping; is that right?

Mr. Givens: I think there was one who had served as an alderman for a few years on the Montreal council, and I think there was one member of the cabinet who was an alderman in the city of Hamilton for one or two years. But as John Kenneth Galbraith said — and you must know, because I'm sure you fellows read that sort of thing. John Kenneth Galbraith said —

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Those members who can read.

Mr. Givens: —"No man can make a contribution to the life of the American republic without having served as the mayor of a large city." I think there is a lot of truth to what he says; particularly since I agree with what he said.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A lot of middle class elitist nonsense.

Mr. Givens: So Mr. Speaker, I say to you that I think there is a lot of truth to what he says, particularly since I agree with what he says.

Mr. Foulds: What a conceited comparison.

Mr. Givens: So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that—

Mr. Cassidy: That means the member for York-Forest Hill must be the Messiah.

Mr. Givens: —we must formulate this permanent secretariat. Certainly when my party comes into power, we will address ourselves to this matter right away, and we'll initiate such a permanent secretariat. I hope it won't be too late by the time we get around to it, because I think it is needed right now, and for the reasons that I have indicated to you. These are the reasons why I feel that we need a tri-level permanent secretariat now to deal with all the massive and complicated problems that I have indicated to you that the urban areas of this country are confronted with today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from York-Forest Hill could well have made the same speech in the House of Commons back in 1967.

Mr. Foulds: He probably did.

Mr. Singer: He did.

Mr. Wardle: I did not have the opportunity to read Hansard from Ottawa at that time, but the words that I recall reading in the newspapers then sound familiar.

The hon. member went to Ottawa as a former mayor of Canada's largest city — largest city today, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Stokes: Second largest.

Mrs. Campbell: Largest organized.

Mr. Givens: Largest, largest.

Mr. Wardle: —and he put forward the same ideas to the government of that day. But I think he was a voice crying in the wilderness because the government would not listen and the Prime Minister of that day would not listen. So I do give credit to the hon. member, that these ideas that he promoted some six years ago are bearing some fruit today, and for this he is to be commended.

The fact that he was not listened to in Ottawa, I know brought great frustration to him, but now he is in a place, Mr. Speaker, where he is probably a happier man and he speaks to a government that is willing to listen.

Mr. Cassidy: Only one applauded there.

Mr. Givens: We are all listening.

Mr. Wardle: When the hon. member has good ideas, and he has had a couple of good ideas the government has already accepted—

Mr. Timbrell: One was leaving the House of Commons.

Mr. Handleman: There is another good idea.

Mr. Wardle: —I would suggest to him that he keep up the good work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government has been well aware of this problem for some time. I recall on Nov. 27, 1967, during the Confederation of Tomorrow conference, the then Premier of Ontario, John P. Robarts, had this to say:—

Mr. Cassidy: Is the member sure he remembers it explicitly?

Mr. Wardle: Quoting:

> The core of any federal system lies in the distribution of powers between the levels of government. Let me emphasize that any redistribution of powers is a two-way process and that powers can be transferred both ways.
>
> In our discussion on this subject, we must aim for efficiency in the provision of services. We must maintain close communication between the government and the public in areas where this is essential. There must be respect for differing preferences among groups of people in various regions of the country.
>
> We must ensure that the central government has sufficient powers to mtaintain a single market within the country to promote effective economic growth and stability, to narrow disparities among the regions in the country, to defend us and to represent us adequately in international affairs. The distribution of powers must also be sufficiently flexible that we can adapt to change.

Mr. Cassidy: That is a remarkable memory the member has.

Mr. Wardle: Since that time there has been a number of federal-provincial conferences and meetings. The tri-level conference in Toronto last year was another step along the road to closer co-operation among the three levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, the mover of this motion ranged far afield today, but I am going to confine myself only to the motion that was presented by the hon. member. We, on this side of the House, would not favour this motion, Mr. Speaker, because it does not take into account the nature of tri-level consultation in Canada today and where this process should concentrate its efforts.

First of all, I would like to point out to the hon. member for York-Forest Hill that at the provincial-municipal conference in 1970 we established a provincial-municipal liaison committee. This committee meets on a monthly basis and is co-chaired by the Treasurer (Mr. White) and Mayor Des Newman of Whitby.

The group of municipal representatives headed by Mayor Newman is called the municipal liaison committee, and it is composed of the presidents and members of the executives of the three main municipal associations in Ontario—the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Association of Counties and Regions of Ontario, and the Ontario Association of Rural Municipalities.

The provincial-municipal liaison committee meets monthly to discuss provincial policies and programmes of concern to Ontario municipalities. At recent meetings such items as construction safety inspection, provincial-municipal finance and solid waste disposal have been discussed. In addition, the committee has pre-screened pending legislation which would directly affect municipalities, such as amendments to the Municipal Act and the Planning Act.

To ensure the continued development of the provincial-municipal liaison committee as a main forum for provincial-municipal

dialogue, the Treasurer announced on April 3 that the government would provide the municipal side of the committee with an annual grant over the next four years.

Thus, in Ontario there is a body which meets regularly, which has as its very purpose liaison and consultation, and which could well serve as the focus for the development of a tri-level structure for this province.

At the national level, the situation is less clear. During their constitutional review, the federal and provincial governments established a secretariat to the constitutional conference. It served both levels of government equally well and achieved a large degree of acceptance by all participants in the constitutional review process. In November 1971, at the first meeting of first ministers after the constitutional conference had reached a roadblock in June 1971—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Why doesn't the member give us his thoughts?

Mr. Wardle: —the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis) suggested that the secretariat to the constitutional conference should be retained as an intergovernmental secretariat to serve the meetings of first ministers. He suggested that gradually its role could be extended to serve meetings of the finance ministers and the other ministerial meetings which are a regular feature of Canadian federalism today.

Mr. Givens: What about municipal representatives on that?

Mr. Wardle: However, this suggestion was not accepted by the government of Canada—

Mr. Givens: Who prepared this for the hon. member? What are his own thoughts?

Mr. Wardle —and the constitutional conference secretariat was largely dismantled. At Ontario's institgation, however, it was revised to serve the tri-level conference last November, to which the hon. member refers in his resolution. The framework for an intergovernmental secretariat exists, but I question whether it should be considered solely in the context of national tri-level meetings or whether it might be more usefully seen in the context of intergovernmental ministerial meetings in general.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think that we would be remiss in not noting the important variations in provincial-municipal relationships across Canada. Regional differences in approaches to problems and in setting priorities are among the reasons that Canada is a federal state. Urban problems in Ontario and urban problems in Newfoundland or Saskatchewan are of a different order and magnitude. These differences probably make it next to impossible for those at the federal level to take anything but an extremely broad view. Such generalizations which will result might be comfortable; in some cases might even be informative. But will they accomplish a great deal?

The Ontario government has taken the position that there is a far greater opportunity to achieve concrete and useful results by concentrating tri-level efforts at the regional level. In November, this province invited the federal government to participate in an Ontario tri-level conference. This offer was accepted by the federal minister, the Hon. Ron Basford. I expect that this matter is now being pursued among the three levels of government.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the resolution by the hon. member for York-Forest Hill put the emphasis in the wrong place. National tri-level meetings, representing the federal government, the 10 provinces and the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities might prove to be interesting forums for discussion. However, if we are to achieve solutions to the problems facing Ontario municipalities, the focus must be on Ontario. A forum for provincial-municipal dialogue, the provincial-municipal liaison committee, has already been established, and an Ontario tri-level meeting is being explored. The basic elements for resolving our problems are already in existence and are being developed and strengthened by this government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: On my right in the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, I've had the hon. member for York-Forest Hill demonstrating his Messianic zeal for the tri-level formula. On my left, I have had the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine trying to express in a rather sourpuss or sour pickle manner his feeling that this wouldn't work, and that because it comes from the Liberal Party, therefore, on behalf of the government he ought to oppose it.

There is an attitude among the government which, as a member of the opposition, I've become rather familiar with. It is that some-

how it's been done for the best of all possible worlds here in the Province of Ontario. Nobody does it better. Nobody can do it better. The existing institutions are quite adequate, thank you very much, for God's sake, let's not try anything new or anything innovative.

Mr. Handleman: The member never spoke truer words.

Mr. Cassidy: Let me deal with the hon. member for York-Forest Hill first. He said, and I quote his words: "Somewhere the power has got to be." He said that if you get the three levels of government together, between one or the other of them, they've got to be able to solve it and somehow the answers will be found. While we support the concept of the tri-level consultation and feel that the Ontario government, in particular, has been very laggard in warming up to this approach and using it for the benefit of local autonomy and for the benefit of a better urban policy in this province, I think that it's also fair to recognize that there are some pretty substantial problems, and that the government of which the hon. member for York-Forest Hill used to be a member is one of the major reasons for those problems. If you will, he should have been taking his speech and peddling it elsewhere and not in this particular House alone.

The resolution says that this permanent secretariat should discuss, study and explore matters of common interest. It's a weak resolution in that sense, Mr. Speaker. It's very nice. We discuss, study and explore things of common interest in the private members' hour. People know just what concrete result that has. We never vote on them, and ultimately the government can simply ignore what happens in the private members' hour. A permanent secretariat that didn't do more than that would be pretty darn useless.

The problem is that it takes three to tango. The municipalities are perfectly willing to get involved in the kind of tri-level consultation that ought to be taking place nationally, provincially and on a regional basis—that is, the Toronto region, the Ottawa region and the other major urban regions of this or other provinces. They're very ready. As for the provinces, well, their attitude depends. If you go to Manitoba or if you go to the Maritime provinces, you find that those provincial governments are perfectly willing also to get involved and to treat the municipalities as partners. Here in Ontario, on the other hand, the attitude is a bit different. As the hon. member for York-Forest Hill noted, the former hon. member for Huron (Mr. MacNaughton) and the then Minister of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs was dragged kicking and screaming into the consensus that emerged from the tri-level conference held at the new hotel downtown last November. It was a very ticklish business to get Ontario to recognize that on any basis whatsoever the municipalities should have the right to sit down at a common table with the federal government as well as with the provincial government.

The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine, I think, put it rather well. He suggested that, as far as the government was concerned, the provincial-municipal liaison committee was a satisfactory means, and that the province already had a number of existing means by which it could talk with the federal government.

As far as this government is concerned, the compromise at the tri-level conference notwithstanding, its basic attitude is that the provincial government—the Treasury and Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs—will serve as the intermediary and never shall municipal governments talk directly with the federal government, even though they might want to and be willing to, and even though the federal government might want to, and even though there are some pretty positive constitutional and politcal reasons why that should be the case.

The province wants to keep the municipalities under its thumb. The province does not believe in local autonomy. It does not really believe in seeking every possible means to decentralize authority, to give the autonomy that the municipalities ought to have.

The province, and rightly in this case, keeps worrying about the fiscal squeeze at its level and at the municipal level, and about the fiscal powers that are held in Ottawa. It is unwilling to recognize the fact that we may have to wait a long time before fiscal powers are decentralized from Ottawa even though they ought to be. The federal government, for political reasons of its own, is going to try to keep some dollars flowing into the municipalities, into urban areas, if only because of the votes.

Therefore, it is shortsighted of the province to try to cut out the kind of direct consultations and discussions that ought to take place between the municipalities—

which are seeking and anxious for and need that aid—and the federal government, which is willing to dole it out but is unwilling to transfer income tax points or make other unconditional transfers which would allow the degree of autonomy that the municipalities ought to have.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, both the provincial government and the federal government are at fault in this. Perhaps if one turned to the provincial government one could see more explicitly just how meaningful its kind of consultation really is. In one of the documents which was presented before the tri-level conference, Mr. MacNaughton boasted of the two established means of consultation which existed. One was the provincial-municipal liaison committee.

Now, granted, that committee meets every month. Not every municipality, by a long shot, is represented on it, and not one breath of one word of what occurs in that committee comes out to the public, Mr. Speaker, because of the government's insistence that it will interpret what happens in that committee and that its proceedings will take place in camera, in private. It is consultative or advisory.

There is no means, however, by which the municipalities can engage public support for the case that they may bring before that liaison committee, in order to let the public know how the province is reacting; whether the province is being co-operative or obstructive in the things that are being discussed with the municipalities.

The other bodies cited by Mr. MacNaughton are the provincial-municipal-regional advisory committees for the five economic regions of Ontario. These were first announced last June. They were meant to be set up by the end of the year. They are not yet set up.

Once again, the province has shown that it is not willing to involve the municipalities in a very important aspect of their future growth and development — that is the regional planning that has gone on and will continue to go on. In fact, whether it's the Toronto-centred region plan or the Design for Development, Phase I, for eastern Ontario or for other regions of the province, the province has created plans in private. It has laid them on to the municipalities; it has them presented as faits accomplis.

There has never been the proper kind of debate, whether in this chamber or with the municipalities or with the public, about these plans. The province, in other words, is planning pretty much in isolation. It's clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of self-satisfied praise which the member for Beaches-Woodbine brings to the present system is simply not justified. The province, in creating out of the blue transit systems which substantially affect the future growth and development of municipalities, is acting just as arbitrarily as the federal government has acted, say, in creating waterfront parks here in Metro Toronto.

Both senior levels of government are responsible for the kind of breakdown that exists, and both of them need the will and, if one will, the discipline of proper tri-level consultations on a permanent, rather than a temporary basis. We would support that. I would caution the member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) on the other hand, not to expect the millenium overnight.

The senior governments, this one certainly included, are not particularly amenable to this process. They do not co-operate particularly well. They tend to make political decisions arbitrarily and in isolation. So far, they have shown no willingness to give to the municipalities the kind of partnership and the kind of autonomy that they ought to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

I have been interested in what has been said thus far. Perhaps my thrust is somewhat different. I have listened to government speakers tell us of their great flexibility and of their willingness to listen. Yet it has been my experience both as a municipal politician and as one not in politics over a period of time, that the reverse is true. I regret that the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine, who was himself involved at the municipal level, should be of the opinion that this resolution is not one which is relevant, apparently, at this time.

Several people in the course of debate since I have been here have wondered why such matters as regional government should have been in any part of the campaign, or the concern of voters in the riding of St. George. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if for no other reason, this government should welcome this sort of secretariat so that it could become less remote from people and understand a little better what the feelings are of people, particularly in the urban areas.

This government is talking about local autonomy. Let us examine such a matter as

the field of education. With great self-righteousness one of the ministers has spoken about the need for holding a ceiling, but he hasn't explained that as far as this government is concerned, it has imposed programmes on the boards of education – programmes which have cost money; programmes which have required staff. This is local autonomy, but are they prepared to permit to those local school boards the cutting back in these programmes as part of their cuts to accommodate the government? Surely this whole field of education is something which has to be discussed at all three levels because, of course, all three levels, as has been so properly stated, are involved in education.

Then this government has decided in its wisdom to cut back on the terms of office of municipal governments such as Metropolitan Toronto, and then it talks about their autonomy to plan. To plan what, and in what terms? If there were such a secretariat, Mr. Speaker, this government could more readily understand, if it wishes to, what the problems of planning are at an urban level such as that in which we are meeting today.

I mentioned in my speech earlier that the metropolitan government could not resolve the problem of garbage disposal in a two-year term. Yet this is a problem which should be engaging all levels of government because it is related to matters of rights of municipalities; it is related to matters of pollution; it is related to matters which cannot be solved by a municipality alone nor can it, with respect, be resolved by the provincial governments alone.

There are ongoing problems which require ongoing consideration, Mr. Speaker, and these one-shot, once-a-year sort of gatherings together are not going to resolve those problems. It strikes me, too, that rather than crying about what the federal government's role is, if the provincial government invites the federal government in, it has at least taken away one of its excuses for not being involved–that is, that they have to await the invitation of the province before they can intrude themselves in urban matters.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that we are in this province in an era of assessment planning. Yet no one has stopped to look at the effect on the planning of a municipality by the formula assessment policy of this government.

But when you see, the change in the assessment is the transfer from commerce and industry–including, my understanding is, the highrise developments–over to the residential home owner and the residential farmer, then there has to be some kind of co-operation so that people will be able to understand; either to stop this formula planning or to be able to sit down and understand what their future is.

We pass up this opportunity if we allow the provincial government to impose its Disneyland-kind of rail system on Toronto as a solution, or a possible solution to problems. Surely we have to recognize that we have to plan beyond even Metropolitan Toronto in the transportation system. It can only be done effectively when you have the co-operation and consultation of urban governments across the province.

This is one of the things that is causing so much dismay right across Ontario in the whole area of regional government.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge this government to show leadership in this area, to prove to people what they have been saying –and that is that they do believe in local autonomy–to give them an opportunity to be heard.

Because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, as I go across the province in the limited areas in which I have been able to be, people do not believe this government is concerned with local autonomy. They believe that government is imposing upon people that which they want to impose. And believe me, with what we have seen in the failures of policies I would think that you need all the wisdom you can get. And accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution as it stands. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, since I usually bring out the beast, let's get it over with in the first 30 seconds.

What I said on the Provincial Affairs programme the other night was simply this –and I defy anybody in what is left in the Liberal caucus over there to disagree with me.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): There are more Liberals than there are Tories.

Mr. Drea: And what I said, and it is an exact quote, is: "The age of the automobile in mass rapid transit is gone forever." Now, I defy anybody to argue with that.

Having got that one out of the way—because I use things like that on television for only one reason—I like to explode things in York-Forest Hill. But I will probably explode a few more things in York-Forest Hill this afternoon because I support—and without any qualification, and without any of this third reading nitpicking and fooling around—I support entirely the motion put forward by the hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Reid: We must be wrong.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: The members opposite are cutting into my time.

The reason that I support the motion—and again I say without any qualification—is the time has come to tell the truth; which I realize to an awful lot of people, although not necessarily in this chamber, is a rather painful experience.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): It's unparliamentary.

Mr. Drea: That's right. For almost 100 years we in Canada have relied upon this little textbook maxim — and I'm sure it goes back to the old common readers — that the municipalities, even when they were townships, cow paths, crossroad towns, were the creatures and the creation of a rather benevolent if somewhat remote province.

We carried on that charade until the provinces lost their fiscal authority, when in a moment of bewildered stratagem, I suppose it was, they turned over the collection of income tax to the federal government, and as such they wound up losing their treasuries. At that point the federal government again took great consolation and great relief in that maxim, that somehow the municipalities were the creatures of the province and somehow the federal government would arrange, either by keeping taxes down or leaving more to be raised by the provinces, or by raising taxes and funnelling them back in cost-shared programmes, that the municipalities would be taken care of.

The progress of government in this country for the last century, regardless that it was slow at the beginning, that little was done in the Depression or that it was temporarily interrupted by the wars, has meant more services to people year by year. The municipality was only set up to provide the solutions to certain material problems. The municipality was set up in the beginning as a method of determining, not land use, but land right. A person went into a township and fenced off his farm. He was part of the township. He paid for some very basic services — the policemen, some type of fire protection and so on.

When education became expensive — and here I disagree with the hon. member for St. George — I don't think education has any place in this particular kind of debate. Because long ago we segregated the local board of education from the operations of the municipal council. We did that very deliberately.

But the municipality today whether it is a township or a numbered township in northern Ontario, which is administered directly by the province since it is unorganized territory, or a borough the size of the one where I reside and part of which I have the honour to represent — neither one of those governments was ever intended to serve people.

Just today I got a very nice document from the Ministry of Community and Social Services. It told me how much money was going to recreation in Scarborough this year. I'm very grateful for it, but for the whole borough of Scarborough it is about $43,000. Now that sounds like a lot of money for kids playing baseball and so on, but, the recreation needs of the borough where I reside are estimated at $38 million over the next 10 years. And that's only to bring us, by 1983, to the point where we should have been in 1968.

Why are we in that predicament? We are neither any better run nor any worse run than any other municipality. We are in this recreation predicament because of the housing policies of the federal government. When other areas wouldn't take NHA housing and the small NHA lot, Scarborough was betwixt and between and eventually, because of our low tax base, through some grants and so on and so forth, we got it. We had a proliferation of single-family houses. There were no parks—nothing, just house after house after house. Then along came the provincial government after the federal government and its Ontario Housing Corp. policy forced us into untenable recreation programme.

Recreation is one of the new services for people. It wasn't here 100 years ago. You went in your backyard. Now there aren't any backyards. After the federal government was done, the provincial government came in, and through the proliferation of Ontario Housing again, there was a tremendous need for recreation of $38 million over 10 years. There is no possible way that this borough can provide that; it can't raise the taxes, it can't do anything else about it.

Certainly everything the member for York-Forest Hill has said about the federal government and its attitude towards urban affairs is remarkably correct. I suppose this is going to bring about some kind of an uproar in here, but I am a great admirer of the municipal capabilities of the hon. member for York-Forest Hill. When he went to Ottawa a great number of people in urban areas thought that finally, here is somebody who has enough prestige and personality, enough clout and personally enough brains and enough dedication, that we're going to ram it through some of these lunkhead civil servants in Ottawa that we do need a better break in urban areas. And what happened to him? He's lucky he got back to Toronto alive.

Now, we are back into the same problem here. Last year, with all the fanfare — and let's forget about the Confederation of Tomorrow, what was it, a conference on confederation or something, in 1967. Noble ideals gone again — we went into this. Again we dragoon the poor municipality in. We pull it in by the shirt and we say: "Now, look, we're going to sit down and look at your problems."

We in the Province of Ontario are not interested in urban problems. If we were we wouldn't have got the urban communities into these crazy cost-shared programmes. We sit here, this government — and so does every other provincial government in this country — we sit here and we say we don't want any more of these cost-shared programmes with the federal government because they dictate the terms. Along with the money that comes in, they dictate the terms.

What do we do when we have a chance? When we get the federal money — and we get it in social services and we get it under the table in universities, we get it all over the place — we then dictate to the poor municipalities. There's red tape between us and the feds? You should take a look at the red tape between us and the poor municipality, and it's even worse for the poor crossroads place.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The member should form his own political party.

Mr. Drea: I say to you that the time has come when we've got to be honest. Urban governments are now faced with the problems that were never foreseen by anyone who had anything to do with the British North America Act. Again, I agree with the member that the British North America Act will not be repatriated as the Constitution in our time. I wish it could be but it won't be. In the meantime, Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto and such little side adventures as Mississauga, Cambridge, north Pickering, are not going to wait for a repatriation of the Constitution.

Again, there are some simple solutions being put forward; a one or two per cent income tax; or, let the city levy its own sales tax. These things have been tried in the United States as last desperate measures to try and revive city life — well, they haven't even got an urban society any more. They failed there.

So what the motion is proposing is that instead of all these sham conferences, where they bring everybody in with his dicky suit and take his picture and everybody is supposed to be having a great time and nothing happens, there should be a permanent body. That, to me, makes eminent good sense. The people who work in municipalities and are faced with the terrible proposition of having programmes and not being able to find the money, know where the problems are.

Secondly, I say to you that that kind of a thing will do more for the type of urban Conservatism as represented by such people as the pride of the Eglinton Progressive Conservative Association, Dave Crombie, the Mayor of Toronto, and myself, a little bit further in the suburbs. This will do more to end this nonsense of building a 20-storey apartment house because it will get you taxes. It might get you taxes for two years but it will get you grief for the next 38.

The time has come where we've got to stop playing lip service and bringing the municipalities in as some kind of a juvenile delinquent who is on parole. There are people in the smaller areas, I say to you with a great deal of candour, who can spend money in a wiser fashion than some of the things that we in this area do and the federal government does. So, without qualification, without any type of nit-picking, I am very proud to support the motion of the member for York-Forest Hill. I think it exemplifies the type of thinking that he has always brought to the urban-municipal field. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes the private members' hour.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the estimates of the Attorney General be referred to the standing estimates committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder-Bay): Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, does this mean that it is possible that the standing committee on estimates may be dealing with those particular estimates tomorrow evening, concurrently with the House and during the windup of the debate on the Throne Speech?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Just after the budget speech.

An hon. member: Not until after the budget.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): It could be. I see nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Stokes: Is it or isn't it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It could be. It probably will be, but the move is being made so that the committee—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Well, the House leader has got to be more specific than that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —can constitute itself tomorrow. As to what the committee does, it is in its own hands. I'm not going to dictate to the members what they do.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The House Leader runs the business of the House and members on this side would like to hear the windup of the Throne Speech debate. I'm sure the NDP members do, also. Surely we can put off the estimates of the Attorney General until after that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That will be determined by the committee when it constitutes itself.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'm calling the order of the business of the House. I don't wish to dictate what different areas do. While we are at it, I would like to outline what will happen in the course of the week.

On Thursday, of course, we will have the budget; at the conclusion of the budget, I think it's been traditional that the House adjourn. On Friday morning, we will either proceed here with estimates which will be announced, or second readings. I will let that be known at the earliest possible opportunity.

I'm not prepared at this moment to call the exact order of business for next week but for the information of members I would hope that the House would sit next week on Monday, including Monday evening; Tuesday; Tuesday evening; and Wednesday; and that we would adjourn on Wednesday, April 18, at 6 o'clock until Tuesday, April 24.

That would give us the sitting hours of the week so that we can return to our homes and constituencies on Wednesday evening for the balance of the Easter weekend.

Mr. B. Newman: The House will close at 6 o'clock on Wednesday?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, that is correct. I will also endeavour to inform the House, certainly before the weekend, what the business of Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday will be.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 9, 1973

Estimates procedure, statement by Mr. Winkler 673

Toronto downtown housing, statement by Mr. Grossman 674

Estimates procedure, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. F. Nixon 676

Regional government, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans 676

Ministerial responsibility for energy policy, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Reid 678

Development of lignite deposits, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 679

Hospital appeal board meetings, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 680

Scarborough General Hospital fund-raising appeal, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon 680

McMichael Canadian collection, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 680

Ontario Council of Regents, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis 681

Alberta natural gas, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Singer, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Lewis 681

Sale of land in Nottawasaga, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Young 683

Great Lakes flood damage, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Ruston, Mr. Deans, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Burr 683

Brampton court house, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Shulman 684

Commuter train service, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Givens 685

Sunday opening of retail stores, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Bounsall, Mr. R. F. Nixon 685

Windsor inquiry centre, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. B. Newman 685

Municipal assessment of Indian lands, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Stokes 686

House construction warranty, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Deacon 686

Noise Research Bureau Act, bill to establish, Mrs. Scrivener 687

Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 687

Arbour Day Act, bill to proclaim, Mr. Wardle, first reading 687

City of Peterborough Act, bill respecting, Mr. Turner, first reading 687

Hogan Homes Ltd. Act, bill respecting, Mr. Handleman, first reading 687

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ewen 688

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cassidy, agreed to 706

Private Members' Hour 706

On notice of motion No. 3 re tri-level co-operation of government, Mr. Givens, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Drea 706

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 719

No. 18



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Apart from our very special guests, we have in the east gallery today students from Humbercrest Senior Public School of Toronto and from McLaughlin Collegiate Institute of Oshawa. In the west gallery there are students from Deer Park Senior Public School of Toronto and Sheridan College of Oakville.

At 3 o'clock we will be joined by students from Belle River High School of Belle River.

KINGSTON TERCENTENARY

Hon. C. J. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, may I beg your indulgence for a moment in order to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It certainly requires some justification.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —make a short announcement which, I'm sure, will be of interest to all members of the Legislature. As they may know, Kingston this year is celebrating its 300th anniversary.

Members will find on their desks a brochure which outlines the great number of ceremonies and events that are taking place in Kingston during this year. They will see that we will be honoured in having the Queen visit us on June 27. We have a homecoming week from July 9 to July 15. During that time, on July 13, we will have a new landing by Count Frontenac.

I would hope that all members of the Legislature would visit us during this coming year. I can assure them that they will receive a very warm welcome. In the words of our mayor, "Kingston is justifiably proud of its position in the history of Ontario and Canada. I urge all citizens and visitors to join with us as we make 1973 a truly enjoyable and memorable year."

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Can we stay at the minister's house?

Hon. Mr. Apps: A warm invitation is given to all members of the Legislature to come and visit us.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The minister looks better in the dress of the 19th century than that of the 20th.

Hon. Mr. Apps: As members will see, I am wearing a costume—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The 17th century actually.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —similar to that which was worn a great deal during those years.

It is my pleasure to introduce to the House at this time in the Speaker's gallery his worship the mayor of Kingston, George Speal and Mrs. Speal.

I would like to introduce to members as well, the chairman of the Kingston tercentenary committee, Mr. Wally Viner and Mrs. Viner, and the wife of the member for Kingston and the Islands, Mrs. Apps.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): She is better looking than the minister is.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Who isn't?

Hon. Mr. Apps: We would be delighted if after the question period the members would come in twos and threes—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Maybe ones or twos.

Hon. Mr. Apps: —so that we will always have a quorum in the House, to room 247 in order to say hello to our mayor and the delightful gentlemen and ladies who have come down from Kingston this afternoon in order to make sure that everyone in this Legislature knows about our tercentenary project. We will welcome the members very much and would appreciate it if they would just come in and say hello at that time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): I'd like that wig when the minister is finished with it.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): The minister is standing, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL MEETING OF INDUSTRY MINISTERS

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House about the federal-provincial meeting of industry ministers held yesterday in the city of Ottawa.

The discussion, hosted by the federal Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, covered a wide range of topics of interest to both levels of government, and were both useful and informative. Among the subjects we discussed were national industrial policies, Canada-US relations, the GATT trade negotiations, assistance to small businesses, and the federal government's Bill C-132, the Foreign Investment Review Act.

Ontario pressed during these discussions, Mr. Speaker, for full and complete prior consultation between the federal and provincial governments on any of these areas that are of direct concern to both the provinces and the federal government. May I say that in the case of the Foreign Investment Review Act, we succeeded in getting a commitment from the federal government that before any decision is made on a foreign takeover the provincial government will be able to see the full and complete file on the matter—I might inform the House here that there was an indication by the minister that the complete file would be available at the request of the province at any time during the review —and will be able to make recommendations concerning the decision by the government.

We also found, Mr. Speaker, that there is a wide-ranging consensus among the provinces for more consultation on matters of international interest such as the GATT negotiations, and the federal government was made aware of the need for provincial input before any decisions are made relating to subjects which are of prime concern to the provinces. The federal government also agreed to consult with the provinces on these matters and our officials will be meeting with officials in Ottawa to draw up further agendas which will produce results for provincial governments.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: In view of the fact that the damage from high lake levels seem to far surpass what was envisaged in the minister's previous statement, can he report to the Legislature any further assistance or programmes designed to assist the communities which have been so seriously damaged in the last 24 hours and which are still under a very serious threat of further damage?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Yes, Mr. Speaker, one programme that is being assessed by the government—I think I mentioned it the other day—relates to a system of guaranteed loans to be made available to those who suffered damage and need the ready cash to repair it. Whether or not we decide to go this route, of course, will depend on the government as a whole but it is being seriously assessed as to its Treasury and administrative implications.

Also, we are waiting upon the federal government to come to some—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The floods aren't waiting.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: —decision with regard to the availability and use of the armed forces.

Mr. Cassidy: The floods aren't waiting.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: As I understand it, the armed forces have available some 2,000 men in the Petawawa area and perhaps another 600 in the London area, with incidental supporting technical people and engineers.

My conversations with the hon. Jack Davis in Ottawa suggested the federal government is prepared to consider releasing armed forces to Ontario for work along the shorelines on some basis other than the existing one, which would require either the province or the municipalities involved to totally underwrite their cost.

It would be impossible under present circumstances, I think, to sign a blank cheque to the armed forces of Canada, not knowing what the cost of their operation in the province would be. But Mr. Davis has advised me that in the days ahead he and the government in Ottawa will be considering some kind of formula so that we in government can have some support, as it were, in the presence of the forces, some knowledge of what those

costs would involve, and we ourselves would be in a position to equate the impact of calling in the armed forces.

I may also say that the federal government has moved to place a number of troops, soldiers primarily, in positions in this province, so that when the decisions are made in Ottawa and in Toronto they can immediately be released for action.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Supplementary question: Why doesn't the minister proceed immediately to make whatever is necessary available to the people on the lakefront? The minister must surely know—or does he know—of the havoc that was wreaked last evening, as was predicted by me some three weeks ago?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Did the member see it in his crystal ball?

Mr. Speaker: Order:

Mr. Deans: The programme being offered by the government is useless.

Mr. J. M. Jessiman (Fort William): The member walked on water three weeks ago.

Mr. Deans: The government's programme is useless at the moment. It does no good at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the hon. minister have any response? No?

The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): I have a question of the provincial secretary. Does the minister have any experienced engineers in his department that he could make available to the municipalities in Kent county and Essex, such as Erieau and Erie Beach, that had a severe storm yesterday, so that they would be able to go down and advise the people in some way how they could protect their homes?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Through the Ministry of Natural Resources, and I believe other departments that are clustered together under the chairmanship of the task force headed by Walter Giles of the Ministry of Natural Resources, we can respond to that kind of request. Indeed, they are coming in from all parts of the province involved in the erosion and the flooding problems.

Walter Giles is the key co-ordinator there and he has resources available, not only from the technical and engineering point of view, but I would point out to the member for Wentworth, we are doing the best to make other equipment and other expertise available as we have it.

Mr. Deans: What has the minister made available in Saltfleet township?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: It's the—

Mr. Deans: What has he made available?

Mr. Speaker: It's the New Democratic Party's turn. The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I have a supplementary. How long will the minister and the cabinet engage in these endless considerations while the emergency accelerates? Why is it not possible for them to abandon their nonsensical 80-20 formula, their dollar for dollar, their endless studies about what can be done, and move in and provide the money that is required now for a really impossible crisis for thousands of homeowners along the lakes? How long will they consider it before they act?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: What are they taking so much time for?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: We are not taking any particular time. We have announced at least two programmes and—

Mr. Lewis: Programmes?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: —the money is there for the disaster fund—

Mr. Lewis: Sure—if the municipality starts to pay.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: —the money is there for the municipal 80-20 sharing, and I have a strong feeling that on individual loans we will be able to support the people in a very few days. We are ready to act on those two. Some municipalities are acting with us. The programmes, I think, are fair. We simply cannot—perhaps the leader of the NDP could, but we simply cannot—stop the waters, we cannot stop the storms, nor can we promise the owners of 900-odd miles of shoreline that we will protect them and compensate them from the Treasury of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: But don't take so long.

Mr. Jessiman: The member for Wentworth can walk on water.

Mr. Deans: I wish I could.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: Twenty years they have been waiting.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order please. The hon. member for Rainy River has a supplementary.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because private industry will not, will the minister consider initiating an insurance policy, based on a 20-year cycle, so that the homeowners and cottage owners can protect themselves?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is very much worth considering. After the last high water, of course, the interest in protection drops with the water, but I would say that's a concrete suggestion and I think the government would have to take it into consideration.

May I say in parenthesis that, let alone the private owners as such, the marina owners are experiencing devastating losses. I was talking to their president a few hours ago and their ballpark figures are running into $30 million to $40 million of damage, which can only increase throughout the rest of this year. So we certainly have a ready public if we should—and I think we must—consider presenting some kind of an insurance package.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, may I ask another question?

Mr. Speaker: I think four supplementaries are a reasonable number.

Mr. Deans: But just for clarification of a point made.

Mr. Speaker: I think it would necessarily have to be a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Well, this really is a matter of urgent importance.

Mr. Deans: You don't understand the problem—really you don't.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I think I do. The question was asked; the Speaker can provide for a reasonable number of supplementaries. This is what the members of the House asked for.

Mr. Deans: This is useless. This is a crisis, for heaven's sake!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ADOPTION OF FOREIGN CHILDREN

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question that I would like to put to the Provincial Secretary for Justice, in the absence of the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle).

What legal recourse exists for Dr. Robert K. Ferrie of Burlington who has been stopped by this government in his attempts to get the proper documents from the Minister of Community and Social Services to bring in his two young adopted sons from Vietnam?

Secondly, can the minister explain why the government policy should have changed in this connection, when in the past the acceptance of an adoption under the laws of another nation has always been automatic? Why is it not automatic in this connection?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not fully aware of the latest situation regarding Dr. Ferrie's plans for adoption of children from Vietnam—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are adopted legally. They have passports; they have got tickets. But they are being kept out by this government.

Mr. Lewis: By administrative procedure.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think the information I have, and what I have read, is to the effect that the Ministry of Community and Social Services requires assurance that in fact they have been legally approved as far as the Vietnamese government is concerned—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Try making a phone call.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Also, I believe, part of this consideration is whether or not the Ferrie family itself intends to keep those children. If Dr. Ferrie intends to adopt the children himself, then of course this particular point is settled. However, if the children are to go to another family in Ontario, then again the Ministry of Community and Social Services would be involved in some way.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister undertake to personally look into the problems which he says are in existence at present and satisfy himself one way or the other and report to the House without delay, since the facts that he presents seem to be completely at variance with those presented by Dr. Ferrie, who has stated publicly

that the adoption has been completed and is legally recognized. The immigration of these two young people simply awaits a statement from this government that the requirements have been satisfied.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, all I would say is that I wish Dr. Ferrie, who happens to be a constituent of mine, would write to me or talk with me. He lives about two blocks away.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I guess he must be Liberal.

Mr. Lewis: Why should he have to do that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Maybe the minister should contact him.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The constituent contacts the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, the constituent contacts the member! Well, I wouldn't want the minister to condescend to contact a constituent of his, no!

Interjections by hon. members.

GOVERNMENT INTENTIONS ON REGIONALIZATION

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker? Given the endless array of statements in apparent conflict over regional government emanating from the minister, the Premier (Mr. Davis) and yesterday from the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), can he provide for the House a statement of the overall intentions of government for that part of Ontario not now covered by regional government?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): If I may spend just a minute, Mr. Speaker, eliminating the "apparent contradictions," which I think are not contradictions at all, here is the situation.

We have certain proposals in front of the public dealing with east of Metro, Peel, Halton, and Hamilton-Wentworth. These proposals are simply that; no decisions have been made. Decisions will have to be made, of course, within the next few weeks. I am not willing to proceed with any one of these proposals until such time as we have evaluated the reaction from councillors and electors.

I think each of these areas can be treated somewhat differently. I don't think the solution for east of Metro is necessarily the solution that should be imposed, let us say, upon Hamilton-Wentworth. I think that in this matter, as in many other matters, we have to learn how to give heterogeneous treatment across the province to a complicated matter.

Applying that philosophy to the question asked by the leader of the NDP, I think there will be no particular model equally adaptable to northern Ontario and the county of Essex. My hope is that we can work with these counties and municipalities, whether it be Essex and Windsor or Sarnia and Lambton, to assist them to find a solution acceptable and adaptable to their region.

In this respect, I am taking a look at existing legislation to see what might be attempted by way of change to facilitate some kind of evolution toward a stronger county system, perhaps, in some instances.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: When that study has been completed internally, I would hope to be able to give a somewhat more precise explanation of our viewpoint.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A complete ripoff.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Cassidy: That applause is amazing!

Mr. Lewis: Well, that's relief, let me tell the minister. That's an expression of his colleagues' relief.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The minister knows almost as much as the NDP!

Mr. Lewis: I'm interested in what the Treasurer is saying; perhaps he can provide just a further step in the analysis. What he is saying is that the announced intention of his predecessor for regional government units across the Province of Ontario, announced or legislated by 1975, has, in fact, altered and beyond anything presently intended he has now decided to retreat to the county units or reinforced county units and that the whole programme has been jettisoned in his terms?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member has been listening to the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, there was never any such programme. In all my years here I have never—

Mr. Lewis: That's one of the most comic comments the Treasurer has made.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): By 1975, the former minister said.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, this cuts pretty deeply. Take my own home town; there has never been any mention at Queen's Park about regionalizing London-Middlesex.

Mr. Lewis: London was meant to be a separate fiefdom.

Hon. Mr. White: For the members of the opposition to go trooping through Huron county—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: —making a claim to the contrary is a complete and absolute falsehood.

Mr. Lewis: I didn't hear but I think the minister accused me of a falsehood. I would like him to withdraw that.

Hon. Mr. White: I used my own part of Ontario as an illustration. I have never, since 1959, heard any suggestion from the member for Kent or any other person in our caucus that we were going to regionalize London—

Mr. Lewis: Can the Treasurer forget him so quickly?

Hon. Mr. White: Just a minute. I am repeating this because the member didn't hear it the first time. I said those members of the opposition who trooped through Huron county during the by-election saying something to the contrary were telling a falsehood.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question of the minister.

In light of the minister's comments last week and then again today concerning Windsor and the Essex county area, and knowing that the minister would like to see that the input on the reorganization came from the local areas, is the minister willing to provide funds to the communities—to Windsor and Essex county—so that they can hire staff and go into an in-depth study of the reorganization of government so that they can come up with the answer themselves as to the type of government they would like to have?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, that is one possibility, Mr. Speaker, that I am investigating.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the Treasurer indicate, in an area where there might be some confusion from various statements emanating from himself and the Premier, what the disposition in the Hamilton-Wentworth area is at the present time?

Hon. Mr. White: There is no confusion here at all. There is only a variety of interpretations placed by people who want to make trouble.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is referring to the Premier, is he?

Mr. Lewis: The minister wouldn't say that if the Premier were sitting beside him.

Hon. Mr. White: I read the Premier's remarks in yesterday's Hansard and he has said exactly what I said—namely, that there has been no decision made with respect to Hamilton-Wentworth; that the proposals put before the people on January 23 are still under consideration;—

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: —that as part of this deliberation process we are conferring with the Hamilton and Wentworth councils, as I did at noon today; and I was interested to see that no Liberal or NDP members accepted my invitation to be there.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to you, sir, that the members of this caucus were not invited to the meeting; we have never been invited to the meeting—the government has attempted to keep us out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was invited to the meeting of Hamilton council on Friday and he came.

Mr. Deans: I was not invited, I asked.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! This is purely an argument.

Hon. Mr. White: He was invited to the meeting today and he didn't come.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Deans: That is a lie.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The hon. member for Wentworth will please withdraw the remark.

Mr. Deans: I can't withdraw it, because it is true.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has accused the minister of uttering a lie.

Mr. Deans: I will withdraw that statement if the minister will withdraw his.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will withdraw the statement.

Mr. Deans: I can't withdraw it.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He would be lying if he withdrew the statement.

Hon. Mr. White: I issued instructions to invite the MPPs from the area. If this gentleman was not available, then I suppose he didn't get the message.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member withdraw the statement then?

Mr. Deans: No! I will reword it that the minister misled the House.

Mr. Speaker: I regret that I can't accept that; I direct the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

I direct the hon. member for the last time to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Deans: I withdraw the statement. I have to; I have no choice—I want to speak today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The minister doesn't care. He sits there smiling like a Cheshire cat. He doesn't care about the havoc for his party. He is resigning. That will be his legacy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: I was not invited.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the—

Mr. MacDonald: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; I must intervene here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order. I must intervene.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: The hon. member for Wentworth was forced to withdraw his statement—and I draw to your attention not a single member of the Liberals or NDP were at the meeting because they didn't receive the information the minister allegedly conveyed to them. Now, under those circumstances, then I think the contention that they got an invitation and didn't attend was a lie or a misconception.

Mr. Deans: Damn right it was! And it wasn't a misconception.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: My hon. friend, I am perfectly sure, will accept my word when I say I instructed my staff to make it clear that the press were welcome to this meeting as were MPPs from the area.

Mr. MacDonald: How come nobody got their invitations?

Hon. Mr. White: Just a minute please. If this message failed to reach certain members of the press gallery or certain members of the Legislature—

Mr. MacDonald: They weren't invited. Nobody invited them.

Hon. Mr. White: —that was contrary to my instructions and a matter of imperfection in communications.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Just a minute. I have attempted to get an input from all possible sources, e.g., from the council, the city, the area—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Just a minute. —the city, the county, the MPPs and other interested persons; why should I exclude any of these people?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely we can have some order in the chamber. This is a question period.

Mr. Deans: Why should we come to order?

Mr. Speaker: Well, if the hon. members don't wish it, I assure you I am not going to waste my time trying to gain it.

Mr. Lewis: All right then, don't gain it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: How come nobody got an invitation?

Mr. Lewis: If the minister can't organize a luncheon, how is he going to reorganize Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber (Mr. Leluk).

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough West has further questions.

ONTARIO NORTHLAND RAILWAY

Mr. Lewis: A question of the docile, uncontroversial, lamb-like Minister of Transportation and Communications: What is it about the Ontario Northland Railway which makes the runs through so-called mid-Canada uneconomic; and why has his ministry supported the ONR in its wish to discontinue those runs through northeastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: I was surprised that the hon. member for Wentworth wasn't interested enough to come to the party.

Mr. Deans: I wasn't invited.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Deans: The Treasurer knows I wasn't invited. I was here at 9:30 this morning.

Mr. Stokes: What do you say about that interjection, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. White: We had a place for him.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Tell him we will pick him up on the train and take him.

An hon. member: Mrs. Calabash can go the next time.

Mr. Deans: Sure he did. I've got a place for him.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, firstly, I would point out that the Ontario Northland is, I understand, probably the only railroad on the continent that made a profit last year.

Mr. Lewis: Why does the minister discontinue passenger service?

Hon. Mr. Carton: We are not discontinuing passenger service.

Mr. Cassidy: But the minister applied to.

Mr. Lewis: I thought he applied to.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Ah, you put the member up to it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I would advise this Legislature with respect to the ONR—the ONTC, in fact, and not just the ONR, because there are other aspects of the ONTC—at present under my ministry and through the policy field we are having a complete look at the ONR and its role in northern Ontario. I, for one, might add that I think there can be a role for the ONR in northern Ontario, apart from the one presently being carried on. I must say that it is a very efficiently run operation. There are aspects, that I'm looking at, whereby the government of this province should take into consideration some social aspects of the ONR that perhaps we could in turn subsidize, leaving the railway free to look after the proper duties and responsibilities of a railroad in the north.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I understand the minister, he is not really happy then about the effort to discontinue passenger service that the ONR is providing in mid-Canada?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on! The government made a submission to the transportation commission to discontinue routes.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Jessiman: Where?

Mr. Lewis: The ONR through what they call mid-Canada.

Mr. Jessiman: What route?

Mr. Cassidy: The mid-Canada passenger route on the ONR.

Mr. Speaker: This is out of order.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry. I don't think the question is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: The comments, the speech, the interjections, and so on, that the hon.

member has been making, are not part of the question period.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask why did—

Mr. Jessiman: What destination?

Mr. Lewis: Well, that is very interesting.

Mr. Jessiman: Which one? Which destination? Let the member get his facts straight.

Mr. Lewis: I have two questions then. Why did the ONR appeal to the CTC for a discontinuance of its mid-Canada routes in northern Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Now just hold on a moment! Since the chairman of the Ontario Northland Railway doesn't know his railway made that submission to the CTC—

Mr. Jessiman: Oh, yes he does.

Mr. Lewis: —perhaps he should be removed from the chairmanship along with the vice-chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: That will be dethroning incompetence.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a supplementary question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, following from his statement that he is looking at the purpose of the ONR. Why doesn't he just return to its basic purpose, that it is a development road, a railroad which has this as its basic reason for existence, and simply build on that? We are glad, and everyone supports his statement that it's a good thing to make a profit, but would he not agree that it's far better to return to its primary purpose and that is for the development of northeastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, all I can answer to the hon. Leader of the Opposition is that he must have been listening in on my conversations during the last six months.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think we've had enough discussion on that topic.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Mr. Speaker, my question, referring to the extensive damage as a result of the high level of Lake Ontario in the Mimico area yesterday, has already been asked by the opposition.

Mr. Sargent: Somebody speak to him.

Mr. Speaker: Was the question directed to one of the ministers?

Mr. Cassidy: It was withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question previously asked.

ESPANOLA WATER CONDITION

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) asked me about correspondence which I had been sent from the town of Espanola. The letter was from the assistant clerk of the corporation of the town of Espanola and requested my ministry to undertake an investigation to locate the reasons for the pools of black water appearing on the surface of lakes in the Espanola area.

I may say that the letter came in when I was on my way to Sudbury and my own staff took it to our own water people rather than waiting until I returned, which I think is quite proper. My ministry was investigating this matter prior to receipt of a similar request from Espanola.

On March 16, inspectors from the water quality branch and the air management branch obtained samples from the black water puddles. These samples are undergoing detailed chemical analysis which, when completed, should allow staff to identify the material present and perhaps the source. I have today written to the town council to inform them that if the source of the pollution is determined to be industrial, suitable measures will be taken to prevent a similar reoccurrence, and for the information of the hon. member for Waterloo North, I will give him a copy of my reply.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. David has a question.

Mr. Foulds: That's two Conservatives in a row, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I don't think so. The previous one was an answer to a question.

RYERSON RADIO STATION

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Can the minister inform the House as to whether the Ryerson radio station CJRT will be permitted to continue its operation for the next year?

Mr. Deans: That was asked a week ago.

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, as of the moment, that's a matter for Ryerson to decide.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Could the minister indicate, further to his statement a week or 10 days ago, whether or not additional funds from other sources have been allocated by his ministry for the assistance of Ryerson in keeping that radio station on the air?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, the question as to how we might or might not help Ryerson with respect to this radio station is still to be determined.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If so, then it is really up to the ministry and not Ryerson at this stage?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I think that that's not an appropriate statement. I think that Ryerson still have it within their prerogatives to fund this radio station if they choose to. I was talking to the chairman of the board of governors as recently as today at noon, and they're looking at this whole question. This might well be regarded as a higher priority in their reassessment. That's up to them at this particular moment.

Mr. Lewis: General welfare recipients can eat at La Scala but they don't have the money!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. About a month ago today the Lands and Forests King Air plane crash-landed at Goderich and did about $100,000 damage. It could have been worse; the Premier could have been killed and we would have had the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) to look after now—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member ask the question?

Mr. Sargent: I've been looking through the records of the Treasury and I can't find where the Conservative Party paid rent for the plane that day. Is it the minister's practice to do his electioneering on government planes?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I'll take this question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwhich-Riverside.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secrtary for Resources Development regarding a legal aspect of the flooding problem along the shores of the lower Great Lakes: In a community of lakeshore residents, where nine out of 10 may be making great emergency efforts to protect their property with sandbags and other devices, has any government at any level any emergency powers to place, or have placed or allow to be placed, sandbags or other protective devices on the property of the owner who is not, for one reason or another, co-operating in the emergency and thereby jeopardizing the efforts of all the rest?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, it does raise a legal question. It is one I mentioned in the House the other day, that bedevils the whole question of what we do on what legal base. My understanding is that the Supreme Court of Canada is at the moment seized of a case involving lakeshore owners and the province in the perennial discussions that have gone on over the years as to who does own the shore along the lakes and to what extent that ownership is tied to the low or high water level. I would think that until this, and perhaps other cases in the Supreme Court of Canada, establish the title to the shores themselves there can be no satisfactory answer to the question.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Burr: No.

Mr. Speaker: All right; the hon. Minister of Revenue has the answer to a question previously asked.

ELIZABETH GARDENS PROJECT

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on March 30 I was asked by the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall) if I was aware, as he put it, that the same contractor that built Elizabeth Gardens in Windsor has approval to construct a set of similar units on Union Blvd. in that city. I am advised, sir, that OHC is not involved in any way with the Union Blvd. site.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

ONTARIO HYDRO LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Since it is now over six months since the Hydro arbitration committee was struck and no decision has yet been handed down, when can we expect action to relieve the plight of the strikers, the employees of Hydro?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I didn't hear the question from my hon. friend. Would he mind repeating it?

Mr. Deacon: Since it is over six months since the Hydro arbitration committee was struck and no decision has yet been handed down, when can we expect a decision to help the employees?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, this matter, of course, has been sent to an arbitration board. I am given to understand the chairman of the board, Dean R. S. Mackay, is working steadily on this matter. I would presume a decision should come down fairly soon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

AIR POLLUTION IN TORONTO

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister care to comment on the Touhey report, which was released yesterday in Los Angeles, which states that in Toronto our pollution problem will be as serious as that of Los Angeles within five years because of the over-building of service stations, car washes and highrises?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware of this report, and does he intend to take any action about it if he is or is not aware of it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am now aware of it, Mr. Speaker, and I will get a copy of it. Having had experience with my hon. friend about other reports, I would like to read it before I comment on it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

JAIL SENTENCE FOR KEEPING DOGS

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A question of the Attorney General: Has the Attorney General investigated claims made by officials of the Ontario Humane Society that one Matthew James Varey, aged 82, was serving a 40-day jail sentence because the township of Mono was out to get him in relation to keeping dogs in unauthorized locations?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, that was a case of a breach of a municipal bylaw in that particular township. The sentence has been handed down and it may be subject to appeal.

Mr. Good: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In the investigation that the Attorney General has done, is he aware of the claim that every time the gentleman concerned moved his kennel from one location to another on his property the township changed its bylaw to get him?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Speaker, but I checked into the matter generally. It is subject to appeal.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Deans: A question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: Has the provincial secretary reconsidered his programme for flood control, and will he please make available to individuals, on the 80-20 basis, the money that is at present available only to municipalities for flood control efforts which are at present underway in the area of Lake Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the guidelines spelling out in more detail the statement I made the week before last in the Legislature will be going out this afternoon.

With regard to the latter part of the question as to whether or not the 80-20 could be applied for individual protection, this has been raised but I do not know how we could plunge into the administration of such a formula on that basis. Our feeling was that it was a generous and responsible thing to offer to municipalities.

I think the hon. member's problem probably arises out of those municipalities which perhaps, in his opinion and mine, are not acting responsibly. All I can say is that we are very concerned with this. If we find that, in general, a large number of the municipalities are not responding to the 80-20 offer we will have to reassess it. At the moment I find it difficult to see how we can adequately and immediately administer such a thing on an individual basis.

Hon. Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

EARLY LEARNING PROGRAMME

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education: I wonder if he could advise this House who, on the task force studying the matter of the early programme, represents the board of education or the junior kindergarten aspect of this question?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the members of this task force are members of various government departments. If it can be said that they represent any particular interest, they represent their ministries. They don't represent particular segments, junior kindergarten teachers as opposed to community college graduates. There are people from various ministries on that task force but they all are government people, except for one who has been specially seconded.

Mrs. Campbell: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could I know who is the chairman of that task force, because my information was that the chairman was related to the co-operative nursery school portion of the community? Is that incorrect?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't say whether he is related to the co-operative daycare programme.

Mrs. Campbell: I thought, Mr. Speaker, it was one of those "shes" that we heard about.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He, incidentally, is responsible to and appointed by my—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Is it a he or a she?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is a he.

Mr. Lewis: It is good that the government is discussing early childhood education with a male chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He is directly responsible to my colleague, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. The committee was set up by the policy field and it is an interministry committee. I'll get that information for the member. I'll tell her who—

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, if I may: Is it the minister's understanding that at some point in time before the report is brought down, this committee or task force will, in fact, at least speak with those engaged in the field of educational programming, since it hasn't done so to date?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised to hear that it hasn't done so to date because it was my understanding that all those interested in this very important matter had made presentations either to the task force or to people concerned with the task force. If the member would like to give me the name of the group I'll see if they have, in fact, been in or why they haven't had a chance to present their brief.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How many people are on the task force on early childhood education and how many are women?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'll have to get that answer for the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: I would appreciate it, as it is an appropriate area for parity.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that's right, but I think that it is also appropriate the member know that the responsibility for raising children, whether they be young or old, rests jointly with women and men. So let us—

An hon. member: There should be women involved then!

Mr. Lewis: It is a dual responsibility. It would be nice to have some women involved then, wouldn't it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can assure the hon. member that women are involved in all stages of education.

Mr. Lewis: That's right, except where the decisions are made.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. On Friday, I am told, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources took a few shots at me.

Mr. Jessiman: That's what the paper said.

Mr. Sargent: He said I had said that I had seen him putting cases of booze and other ministers on the plane at the Island Airport. I said I had seen them loading cases of booze on the plane at the Island Airport. He further said, Mr. Speaker, that I must have been looking in a mirror.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Right!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I think this is the way they pass this off. These are very serious charges. They want to cover up the fact they are using these planes for illicit purposes; and I'd like the minister to apologize for that remark.

Mr. Roy: The minister ought to be ashamed of himself. He should apologize on his knees.

Mr. Sargent: Come on! See what happens here!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member does not, of course, have any point of privilege as nearly as I can determine.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, he has inferred I was loading booze on to my plane.

An hon. member: Does the member deny it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member does not have a point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: Are you going to allow him to do that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member does not have a point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: He can't back it up.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What was the member drinking?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I call the first order of business—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! We have other routine proceedings.

Mr. Martel: Don't jump the gun!

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill is simple justice, because it would make it an offence to alter the reading of an odometer installed in a motor vehicle. At the moment that offence only pertains to a car dealer. This would eliminate the bucket-shops and drive aways.

Mr. Shulman: I already brought that bill in.

Mr. Drea: Did he?

Mr. Martel: Late again!

Mr. Stokes: The members can debate it jointly.

WASTE DISPOSAL AND RECLAMATION ACT

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ontario Waste Disposal and Reclamation Committee.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide solid waste disposal and reclamation services throughout the province, including incineration and landfill; to develop procedures and establish plants for the reclamation and recycling of paper, metal, glass and other materials; to study the methods of marketing reclaimed materials; and to provide waste collection services in areas where it would be uneconomical for local authorities to do so.

ADJUDICATURE ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Adjudicature Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech of Feb. 29, 1972, the government promised that it intended to extend the bilingual services in court proceedings. At present, under section 127 of the Adjudicature Act, proceedings can take place only in English. This bill will allow the use of either language where all parties consent in an area where 10 per cent of the residents use French as a first language. With this amendment, as well, there will be an amendment coming in under section 9(4) of the Official Languages Act, allowing the use of French in the criminal courts.

With this amendment, Mr. Speaker, we will correct the ridiculous situation where, as in the national capital area, people have a choice of languages on one side of the river and only English on the other.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I call the first order of business for the House, I would like to say, in making reference to rule No. 25, in regard to the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, that to facilitate the flow of business, the first order of business today will be order No. 18, committee of supply. In this way the Provincial Secretary may make his statement, which I understand is relatively brief; then I would ask that the committee rise and report so we can proceed with the conclusion of the Throne Speech debate.

I would expect that the votes will be taken at 10:30 this evening and, in regard to the order of speakers, I will allow that to remain with the whips of the various parties and expect that the conclusion will take place this evening in accordance with that rule.

Mr. Martel: There's no way and the minister knows it.

Mr. Cassidy: No way.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now, so that the other parties will have an opportunity to reply to the Provincial Secretary for Justice, I am prepared to make arrangements that that item will be called first on Friday morning and that the other two parties will have the first two positions on Friday to reply to the Provincial Secretary. Following that, we would consider the estimates of the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

I think that's all I have to say in that regard. I call order No. 18.

Mr. Reid: Why do we have to go through this?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Surely the House leader must realize the position he is putting the opposition members in when he makes a statement like the one he has just completed.

He must surely recall that three weeks ago, when the House began, he undertook to tell all the members of the House on the Thursday or Friday of the preceding week what the business would be that would be under discussion. Yesterday, at the last minute, he moved that the estimates of the Ministry of the Attorney General be referred to the standing estimates committee. Now, all of a sudden, we're going to hear the policy minister make a brief statement when the House leader knows full well that it will be very late tonight by the time we complete the order of business which he has indicated he wants to complete before adjournment.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it would be good judgement on the House leader's part if he were to insist on this type of procedure—that on Friday we hear the policy minister for Justice, if there is something he wants to get off his chest. But to introduce him at this stage for a brief statement, or whatever it is, seems to be a complete nonsequitur, an irrational approach to the governance of the business of the House.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, that is not so, of course. I had felt that, before any ministry in the Justice policy field would be heard, the Provincial Secretary might be heard first. That was the reason—

Mr. Reid: Can't he be heard on Friday?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —that I suggested he would go on today. There is no wish in my mind to change the order or to become argumentative. If it's satisfactory to the Provincial Secretary, it is certainly agreeable to me that he make the statement on Friday morning. He has just agreed to that course.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Very sensible!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Sensible or not, I believe that in the new course of events it would be my desire that the Provincial Secretary could make his statement in advance of any of the other ministers being heard.

However, that being the case—and it's very satisfactory to me—we can move directly on to order of business No. 1 following the previous suggestion that I made.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, before that order is called, I rise on a point of order. I ask you, sir, if the motion of the minister yesterday was, in fact, in order? I draw your attention to standing orders section 87, subsection (b) and (d), in which it says—(d) particularly—

> There may be appointed at each session immediately following the presentation of the budget at least one standing committee which shall be charged with the responsibility of considering [etc.]

It seems to me, sir, that the motion as put yesterday by the House leader, in fact was out of order to begin with, because we haven't had the budget yet.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't think it was. I explained last week what the new course of events was. If it requires a change in the rules, I think we will have to consider that.

Mr. Reid: The minister can't change the rules unilaterally.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would hope that in future years, despite what day the budget comes down, the estimates will be before the House prior to the end of the fiscal year. That will be my responsibility and I'll endeavour to have it that way. I think that's correct.

Mr. Reid: But the minister can't change the rules unilaterally.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The motion was agreed to. Was the member here?

Mr. Reid: I didn't agree to it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could start by congratulating you on the way in which you have been holding onto the chair for the last few days and express the hope that you and I will not have the contretemps we had last year. Also, maybe I should express the hope that when you hold discussions with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), as was recommended the other day by the member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid), you might suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that essentially that is where the problem in question periods really begins.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The problem of the length of time occupied by the leaders of the opposition parties, Mr. Speaker, really relates to the Leader of the Opposition, who has insisted ever since I have been in this House on having three, four, five and six questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: This time has, therefore, been matched by the leader of our party in order to have equality between the two parties. I think an agreement by the Leader of the Opposition to confine himself to one or two questions would be the greatest single reform in assuring private members—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: —access to the question period here in the House.

I would hope the member for Rainy River and backbenchers in the Liberal Party who are concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, would talk to the leader of their own party rather than expressing pious hopes, either to the government or to you, for a reform of the question period. The problem begins right there to the right of me.

Now, that's enough about the Liberal Party.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Now the member has got off to a bad start.

Mr. Cassidy: Obviously I drew some sparks from the Liberal Party. I think they may protest a bit too much, Mr. Speaker. They may feel a certain guilt, knowing the truth of which I speak.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Compared with the problems of the question period and the Liberal leader, the problems of the government, I think, are far more overwhelming for the future of the province, particularly in view of the fact that this province will never, ever have a Liberal government. The last one left office in 1943.

Mr. Gaunt: Don't be too sure!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I find it really difficult to analyse the other side of the House. I wish I had the talents and the training of the member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) to define and discern precisely what is happening with the government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I think the member needs his services; I don't know about his talents.

Mr. Cassidy: There seems to be a mixture of paranoia and schizophrenia there. When one compares the statements of the member for York East (Mr. Meen), the provincial Treasurer (Mr. White) and the Premier (Mr. Davis) on the question of regional government, this is certainly a sign of schizophrenia. For that matter, when one sees what the provincial Treasurer himself has had to say, there is obviously a glaring case of schizophrenia urgently in need of treatment.

The paranoia is reflected in the way in which the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario and other ministers have been lashing out at people outside the government and trying to load their own guilt and their own uncertainties—uncertainties which should not prevail with a government of the majority that it enjoys—onto outsiders.

The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) lashes out at ratepayer groups. The Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) sulkily refuses to answer questions about appointments and lashes out through television commercials—published at great expense to the taxpayers—at the patients of Medicare rather than at the doctors and the other people who control the costs of the system.

The Treasurer gratuitously launches an attack on the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) for daring to raise the questions that people in the Hamilton area are raising about regional government and accuses him of meddling. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) lashes out at the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) and at me for trying to articulate the problems of the school situation in Cornwall, when it is his own government which has been laggard and which has created the problem on which it was at the time unwilling to take any action to solve.

The government writhes and wriggles in this way, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand we get statements by the Premier that it ought to make decisions; on the other hand a flexibility which absolutely defies belief, for one thing because we really do not know really what to expect next.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you'll recall that shortly before the provincial by-elections a grandiose plan was unveiled for government office buildings just east of Bay St. in Toronto. The by-election results came in and suddenly a plan which had cost the government money, for which definite firm proposals had been sought from architects, became a chimera, a mere idea that the government wanted to explore and which, in view of the evident lack of interest, it thought it would abandon.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that this kind of vacillating will continue as long as the government has not got its priorities right and as long as its policies are wrong. I would assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the way the government is acting right now its flexibility only extends to non-essentials; the essential kind of course that the government is bent on is still very dangerous for this province. For example, if the government didn't suffer from such a single-minded commitment to the growth of Metro Toronto and the Toronto-centred region, it would not have got into the mess it got into in planning for 9,000 additional civil servants in the area to the east of Queen's Park.

In another case, the Minister of Revenue came through at the last minute with some money in order to further a lowrise, medium-density solution for a redevelopment scheme in the city of Toronto at Dundas and Sherbourne Sts.

We welcomed the minister's conversion to the innovations being proposed by the city council in Toronto. However, the Ontario Housing Corp. and the minister would not have got into that mess, Mr. Speaker, had the OHC not been holding hands with the developer, giving the developer little pats on the back to indicate that it would be all right, that a highrise just like any other highrise built in the city could go up there, and that the process of blockbusting and massive highrise redevelopment would continue, not only with tacit government support but with government funds, government tenants and a guaranteed profit to the builder.

Had that cozy kind of relationship with the developer not existed, Mr. Speaker, it would have been much easier to come to a solution for redeveloping that particular piece of land along the lines the city of Toronto proposed. The last-minute confrontations, the pickets in front of the site, the beginnings of demoli-

tion, the wrecking crews coming in; all of that would not have been necessary had the government had its priorities straight as far as housing and the Ontario Housing Corp. are concerned.

In that particular case the city had indicated some months earlier that it wanted a lowrise alternative. In fact, it had put its money where its mouth was by investing $10,000 in a study to show that an alternative was available for the same price, with the same number of units and providing the same quality, in fact a rather better quality of accommodation. However, the province apparently didn't even know what the city was about.

That brings me to the area, Mr. Speaker, where the vacillation, the uncertainties, the lack of direction of the province are most evident, and that is in the question of regional government. I was taking some notes when the Treasurer was commenting in the House this afternoon, and frankly I really hardly know where to begin on the question of regional government.

In Design for Development phase three, in the statement by the Premier to the House, which was made on June 16, 1972, the Premier said that:

> It is our goal that by 1975 sufficient progress will have been made to enable the government to make proposals concerning the direction of local government reform in the rest of the province.

He said also:

> What we are setting out to do now is to develop a new provincial map of local government in Ontario that will allow us to answer many of the questions on who is responsible, where and for what.

But today we have the Treasurer, who one has to confess is new on the job, saying there has never been such a programme of extending regional government through the province. In one phrase, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer simply jettisoned seven years of policy on behalf of his party and his government; he simply left it in total limbo. The government is in complete disarray, and God knows what they are going to try next.

He says, after the determination with which the proposals for local government reform east and west of Metro were presented back in December, the minister now says he is not willing to proceed with the proposals until the reaction has been reviewed.

A plan which was definite at that time—speeches by the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Irvine) and the member for York East as they crossed the areas affected say: "Yes we will make minor changes but the basics of these reforms are not up for negotiation and are not up for discussion"—well now the minister says that they are. And he will go across the province with his new philosophy, with his heterogeneous treatment.

If I can quote his words: "We are going to have heterogeneous governments rather than regional government." Or rather, in fact, the kind of local government reform that the province actually needs.

The flexibility now being shown by the minister on this question, Mr. Speaker—and as I say it is very difficult to discern exactly what it is—but the flexibility and the willingness to abandon principle really took place before those by-elections; and members of this House who think that it is the by-elections alone that are responsible are wrong.

There is a certain sensitivity which has entered now; and which frankly is almost welcome, given the arrogance of the government in the past. However, the flexibility the government had betrayed or had shown in the past was a flexibility to Tory mandarins, to developers, to the kinds of interest which always have the ear of the Premier and of the Conservative Party.

Some time ago the government senior bureaucrat, Samuel Clasky, who was involved with the regional development programme, made out for the government a series of criteria which talked about what they could do with regional government. Regions should have a balance of interest, for example, regions should be large enough to be efficient; they should permit the optimum in co-operation with neighbouring regions; and they should have boundaries that were usable by other institutions.

Now, in the two proposals east and west of Metro Mr. Speaker, the government deliberately chose to contravene the principles on which the regional government programme for urban areas had been built. And in either case—I will talk about west of Metro first—the results were disastrous.

West of Metro, the government was damned and determined, at the time the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) was the minister, that there would be one strong region between here and Hamilton, between Metro Toronto and Hamilton; and also was almost as determined that Burlington should become a part of the Hamilton-Wentworth regional government. A union which, although it was reluctantly accepted by people in Burlington—and that's putting it mildly—was pointed to by any of the criteria of the regional government programme.

However, the government—under the influence of the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow), the super-Minister for Justice (Mr. Kerr) and the Premier himself as, members from that area—chose to listen to the view there should be separate county reorganization in Peel and Halton; that the natural reorganization in Hamilton-Wentworth should be abandoned and therefore the hodge-podge which we now have before us should be created.

Now that has several defects. One is that it won't work. Peel county in particular is being opened up as a developer's paradise. The Hamilton-Wentworth region is truncated and has been forced into an impossible kind of choice between a one- and two-tier system, under the limited framework presented by the province. There is no possible resolution of that problem. There was unanimity among most people in that region about a two-tier system, provided Burlington would be part of it.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me just cite another authority on that question of regional restructuring west of Metro. This is a speech which was delivered to the Bolton Rotary Club back in 1970. It's by a very eminent spokesman, in fact a very eminent expert on the question of regional government—regional reorganization. He says:

> From the outset, it was apparent that the proposal of the county of Peel to have a separate region on its own would not come to grips with the most immediate problems which were confronting councils in Peel. I was also concerned that Peel's proposal would not be consistent with the concept of stronger local government emerging from discussions of a broader provincial programme in the government's Design for Development. The Peel County proposal—

I may as well say who presented this. It was the member for Chatham-Kent who was then the minister, Mr. Speaker.

> The Peel County proposal did not recommend any substantial movement towards a system of representation by population.

So what do we have, Mr. Speaker, under the new provincial Treasurer and Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs? We have a proposal which buys—lock, stock and barrel—the Peel county suggestion. We have a proposal which does not honour representation by population, but gives citizens in the rural area of Peel county four-and-a-half to five times the voting power of people in the densely-populated southern municipalities.

The member for Chatham-Kent, who I think is an undeniable expert, having created the regional government programme, stated:

> If there is no broadly-based unit of local or regional administration to co-ordinate the planning and provision of services within a region, then this role will, by default, be absorbed by the centralized administration of the senior governments.

He also said that he thought it was fair to say that the preponderance of the town of Mississauga within Peel made it impossible for the thing to work in the necessary climate of trust and good will. And that this problem would be repeated in any region based on the county of Peel alone.

Now Mr. Speaker, if you ask anybody expert in municipal affairs about what the town of Mississauga is most noted for, they will reply that the town of Mississauga is most noted for its fast-buck developer mentality; and for the way in which it has been willing to absorb any kind of development, any kind of profiteering, any kind of speculation and always hold hands with the developers; the way in which it has been willing to open wide and accept development from Metro Toronto. In fact, the way in which it's been willing to simply ignore any grounds of rational planning or any sense of orderly development and growth.

The member for Chatham-Kent was convinced in 1970 that the union of major portions of Halton and Peel is essential if the centralization of responsibility at senior levels of government is to be reversed.

The question one has to raise with the government's plans is: Does Queen's Park intend to ensure there is orderly growth and development west of Metropolitan Toronto? Or will Queen's Park simply leave the two counties with restructured local governments without interfering, and therefore allow the kind of growth and development that is occurring there now? Will it step in; or will it, in the name of local autonomy, leave Mississauga—the town council in particular—as the dominant force in Peel county in directing the future of growth and development in that area, permanently creating a kind of linear city between here and Hamilton, permanently paving over the whole area, and creating no sense of distinction between Metro Toronto and Hamilton but simply wall-to-wall suburbs and wall-to-wall highrise all the way on that 40 or 50 mile stretch.

Mr. Speaker, it's a political kind of thing, and I think it's fair to say the member for Chatham-Kent would not have had it shoved down his throat the way the former member for Huron (Mr. MacNaughton) and the provincial Treasurer have accepted the truncation of those two contiguous counties, which should have been brought together into one regional government.

It's a very high price to pay, in view of what's going to happen in that area as a consequence of the creation of weak governments; and I think what may happen in the Hamilton-Wentworth area is also a high price to pay. The government, really, is so political at times about these things. Just because the people of Hamilton have the good sense not to elect only Tories but also to elect New Democrats to represent them in the Legislature, they get the short end of the stick every time. This is the petty political way in which the government punishes the people of Hamilton for having elected such fine representatives as they have here in this Legislature.

I would also point out that the developers know perfectly well what the government is doing west of Metro. According to the Globe and Mail on Tuesday of last week, McLaughlin, the largest developer in Mississauga, announced that it had sold a half interest in 2,600 acres of land for $38 million. And just who is involved? Who's coming in for the kill, now that the government has laid Peel county open for the killing with the servicing and the restructuring of government? Well, five Canadian institutions: the Royal Bank, Toronto Dominion Bank, Canada Trust — in London, incidentally — Canadian General Electric Credit and TD Realty Investments, which is a subsidiary of the Toronto Dominion Bank.

McLaughlin puts it this way: "With this money we have absolutely no financial constraints placed on us." Worry about money is usually the thing that slows down development, according to Mr. Bruce McLaughlin. "With this," he said, "we only have to be concerned with the various government approvals." Well, the precedents in the town of Mississauga and the precedents of this government would suggest there won't be much need to worry about that.

I recall Mr. Speaker, just in passing, that the Premier, Bill Kelly and a few others, when they were raising funds before the last election, used to have lunch, or perhaps it was breakfast, with developers; and the price of those meals was pretty high. It's more than one would pay in the Waldorf or the Royal York. The figure I had heard mentioned, in order to ensure the continuation of good government, was $20,000. West of Metro, Mr. Speaker, the developers are certainly getting good government in their terms, even if the rest of the province and the citizens of the province are the ones who will suffer.

There was a leak in the paper the other day about what's happening east of Metro, Mr. Speaker. East of Metro, the government gratuitously and with no forewarning brought the Port Hope Cobourg area and Hope township into the Oshawa regional government plan. The reaction in that area was immediate and intense.

The member for Grenville-Dundas and the two members in the area affected have been manfully defending a decision which by any criteria is insupportable. It is insupportable on the grounds of community of interest and of a need for a balanced geographical kind of dispersion; and it is insupportable by any of the other criteria in the government's regional government programme.

However, these members went along, and they said, "Look, we have to do it." About the one thing that I can recall they said was, "Well, Port Hope-Cobourg on its own would not be able to defend agricultural land in the area; it would become part of the Toronto conturbation."

I would have thought that agricultural land, Mr. Speaker, would be much more subject to linearization—that is to extension of the linear city from Metro Toronto west through Oshawa and Bowmanville all the way to Port Hope and Cobourg—if it was under one regional government. Then, if it was not, I would have thought that the government's own proposals for protecting agricultural farmland and the determination of people in the Port Hope-Cobourg area that they will not be subject to the accelerated and inordinate rate of growth that the government seems to want for them, would be protection enough, without having to put them into a regional government whose headquarters will be 30 or 40 miles to the east, in Oshawa, which is an area where the people of Port Hope and Cobourg have virtually no common interest or community of interest at all.

One of the things that bothers us about the programme of local government reform as it has been produced by the government is the fact that there haven't been any facts. The reports which have been distributed have been full of the most glittering generalities. In the west of Metro proposals by the

government there was not one word, Mr. Speaker, to defend the government's decision to include Burlington in Halton county rather than putting Burlington where it belonged, in the Hamilton-Wentworth regional government; and in the proposals for east of Metro there was also not a word to defend the decision to bring Port Hope and Cobourg into the new regional government east of Metro.

You know, west of Metro they had three cabinet ministers on their side and they got what the local nabobs seem to want, which was separate county government. East of Metro—well, the members there apparently don't have the same kind of clout. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker—and I would point out that the member for Northumberland (Mr. Rowe) is in the chair—why is it that you don't have the same influence on the government as the members for Halton East (Mr. Snow) or Halton West (Mr. Kerr), or as the Premier? Why can't you do tricks of magic that they are able to do?

I would say this to the member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers) as well. You have had to go around defending a decision which you know is insupportable. One of the aspects of this that has concerned people, and very rightly, is the fact that regional government has meant very substantial tax increases and they have not been given any kind of clear picture from the government.

Some facts are available about east of Metro now, Mr. Speaker, and what surprised me when I learned about these the other day was that the government, once it finally generated them, didn't rush to give them to the people! Oh no! On March 23, I think it was, a week before the extended deadline for submissions from the public about regional government in the area east of Metro, the clerks and treasurers of the municipalities affected were called in and given a set of figures which were almost incomprehensible to them, let alone to the public.

They did not even release them to their own elected people in the one or two cases that I checked up on. I hope that other clerks and treasurers did. They certainly were under no instructions to release them. Those figures were not given out to the press, and therefore one of the vital elements in local government reform in that area—what's it going to cost me—has been an area of complete vacuum as far as the people in the area are concerned.

I can give a few figures, Mr. Speaker, because I have had a look at this report. The figures show that in 1971, if regional government had been introduced and no other changes had been made—which is a pretty conservative set of assumptions—the tax rate in East Whitby would have gone up by 37 per cent. It would have gone up in Manvers by 25 per cent, in South Hamilton township by 20 per cent, in Hope township by 35 per cent—and they get Metro Toronto's garbage as well—and in Alnwick by 15 per cent. The tax rate would have gone up in East Darlington by 12 per cent but in West Darlington by 65 per cent.

The government has a plan to phase those increases in over a period of five or six years. Fine, but that doesn't stop the fact that after five or six years of steadily increasing taxation, quite apart from the increased costs imposed by regional government in every area where it has been introduced across the province, the people of West Darlington will have a 65 per cent tax increase and in Hope 35 per cent, and 35 per cent in East Whitby.

How do you balance this? All right, in the urban areas such as Oshawa, Port Hope, Cobourg, there are reductions in tax rates projected of around 10 per cent. People aren't naive, Mr. Speaker, and they know perfectly well that any reduction in taxes would be swallowed up within the first year of regional government by the increased level of services.

If I was in a rural area and if I knew that there was a bit of tax room as far as the urban people were concerned, I would be doubly afraid because they would bring their taxes up to the old level right away in order to spend more money, and they would keep on increasing them.

Mr. Speaker, those facts should have been presented to the public in the area east of Metro at the time the regional government proposals were introduced and not surreptitiously handed over a few days before the final date for submission. That is just inexcusable, Mr. Speaker.

The regional government proposals there should have been accompanied not just by an analysis of the tax impact—which people didn't get—but also by proposals for basic and fundamental reform at the local level, in order to stop situations in which people have to pay $600, $800 or even $1,000 a year for taxes on pretty basic accommodation in areas like Pickering township and other areas of the province.

Whether it is east of Metro or west of Metro, in Brant or Haldimand or any other part of the province, it is no good the province coming in on this grace and favour basis

saying: "Look, if the problem gets too great you come along and knock on our doors and we might do something for you."

In fact the province did do something for St. Catharines. It created a slush fund and then from the slush fund it gave just enough to ensure that the worst of the heat was off. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that people had to go and fight and struggle to get any of that grace and favour kind of patronage money out of the province when they should have had a fundamental tax reform—and they should have had it by right.

Mr. Speaker, we have already talked about an evaluation or re-evaluation of the regional government programme. It appears from what the provincial Treasurer is saying that possibly we are getting a bit more than we bargained for. What we are seeing now is a complete abandonment of the programme; and as I said before God knows what we are going to get next! I shall look with some interest to see what the government comes up with.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): It'll drift for a while.

Mr. Cassidy: It'll drift, that's right. It'll drift but it calls that flexibility. The Premier says he makes decisions, but the Treasurer is flexible.

Mr. Speaker, there is another example of drift or indirection—or it may even be direction; I am sorry the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) isn't in the House right now—which I would just like to mention before going on to the area of housing.

These past few weeks have seen a hearing before the Ontario Municipal Board about the question of new highrises in the St. James Town West area. That hearing was ushered in what is evidently a new climate in the Ontario Municipal Board and it is something which is very concerning to a lot of people, I would say, here in Toronto and in the province. Let's just look at that hearing for a minute.

The commissioner was Mr. W. H. J. Thompson and he is one of the troglodytes, it appears, who inhabited the Ontario Municipal Board back when possibly some of us were a bit seduced.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Troglodytes? That's being too kind.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, dinosaurs, if the member will.

Mr. Foulds: Except for the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko).

Mr. Cassidy: He would fit! He would grace the Municipal Board the way it is going right now.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): He graces the front benches, too.

Mr. Cassidy: The Municipal Board may have conned us a bit, Mr. Speaker, by the power of W. A. Kennedy and the way in which he chose particular cases which were particularly important.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): The opposition is running out of solid argument.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, let's just have a look at this. As a man of the law the minister would surely agree that the defence should not be forced to go forward in a court trial prior to the prosecution having stated its case?

Mr. Foulds: The Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. Winkler) is in his usual shape. He can leave.

Mr. Cassidy: In the case of the St. James Town West development, however, the chairman insisted that before the city, as the applicant for the zoning change, explain what the change was about and explain why it was there—which was a procedure which has been used, I think, in every OMB hearing until a few months ago—the objectors must state their objections without knowing precisely what it was they were objecting to. The board also ruled that the only subject matter for review was the bylaw itself and not the proposed development which gave rise to it—again something which goes directly counter to the practice of the board in previous hearings, including the hearing on the Quebec-Gothic development, where the board specifically reduced the height of the building involved even though it came nowhere close to satisfying the objectors.

But at that point the board certainly acted on the proposed development. In this case the board suggested that ony the bylaw should be discussed; and since the bylaw simply sets out densities—I don't think it even had a site plan attached to it, it sets out densities, height and population and no more—the ruling has been impossible to follow as well as being quite unjustified.

Mr. Speaker, the board has used words such as "interfering" and "obstructionist" to characterize the ratepayers and other people who

came to oppose the bylaw. It has been not just impolite, but downright rude to men of the calibre of Mayor Crombie and of Ald. John Sewell, the alderman for the area. I understand Mayor Crombie came down to the hearing, was asked his name and address and, when he said he lived on Glencairn Ave., was asked what possible interest he had in a development that was not in his particular neighbourhood.

When John Sewell came before the board, the first question the chairman asked was: "How do you spell your name, Mr. Sewell?" And eventually Mr. Sewell refused to testify on the grounds of the board's very obvious bias.

Mr. Laughren: Harassment even.

Mr. Cassidy: Harassment, that's right.

Mr. Foulds: And illiteracy.

Mr. Cassidy: The board was saying there was no point in hearing additional members of the council in opposition to the bylaw because they would all say the same thing anyway. Well, Mr. Shrives, the other board member, denied that the next day.

In another case the board refused to hear evidence from one of the witnesses concerning a report that he had prepared jointly with two or three other people and told the witness that he could only talk about matters on which he had directly written, but not about the remainder of the report in which he had been involved. On the other hand at one point where a city witness was challenged for hearsay evidence, the board advised the city how they could get that evidence on to the record through another means.

The chairman said to Mayor Crombie that opposition to developments such as St. James Town always came from people who had great ideas on how to spend other people's money and how to use other people's land. When he was told of the inadequacies of the scheme for family accommodation, the chairman said: "Well if people don't like it they don't have to live there, and if they do they'll have to put up with the lack of park accommodations."

When he was told that the lack of green space led to children in OHC apartments nearby playing in the elevators, the chairman said this is a permissive society and parents didn't properly control their children. When he was told that there would be a podium surrounding the development which would isolate the occupants from OHC tenants across the street, the chairman said maybe that wasn't such a bad thing. At another point he said people had got along before the Ontario Housing Corp. was created, and better than they do today.

There is substantial evidence, Mr. Speaker, of clear bias on the part of the chairman of the hearing, and I'd just like to know from the government whether in fact this represents a change in policy. I think in fact it does.

I think what's happened, Mr. Speaker, is that when Mr. Palmer was appointed to be chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board, as a dedicated provincial civil servant and a man who had been involved with the various ministers of the Crown ever since 1945, he took his marching orders with him. The marching orders were: "Be legalistic. Forget about what Mr. Kennedy did. Don't meddle. We may eventually fix up the Planning Act, but in the meantime you are causing a lot of trouble to our friends in the development industry, for God's sake stop it. We are counting on you." They may even have pointed out to him that he holds office during pleasure.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Palmer is a man of integrity.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm saying that—

Mr. Bullbrook: The member should know that.

Mr. Cassidy: All right; if that's the case, I would like to know what has happened.

Mr. Bullbrook: He's a man of great integrity.

Mr. Cassidy: All right. I accept that.

The members of the Ontario Municipal Board, it may be, have simply been restrained by Mr. Kennedy and now their natural and rather troglodytic instincts are coming to the fore. I don't know what it is, Mr. Speaker. All I know is that a very definite change has occurred within the Ontario Municipal Board and the effect is that the board is no longer being effective as an ombudsman, as a protector of and last resort for citizens' rights.

What are we seeing now? We're seeing appeal after appeal being directed to the cabinet because of the failure of the Municipal Board to perform its function.

It's significant, Mr. Speaker, that in the Throne Speech the government promised to introduce legislation to implement recommendations contained in the report of the select committee on drainage. By contrast, it

said that as a result of its review of the report of the select committee on the Ontario Municipal Board the government would place proposals before us to make the board more effective in discharging its responsibilities.

I rather regret that difference in phraseology, Mr. Speaker. I think a fairly good report came out of that committee which would, in fact, have achieved the goals of greater municipal and local autonomy while preserving that essential role of the Municipal Board as a last resort for citizens' rights in cases where that became necessary.

The government's putting the cart before the horse, if you will. It promised a review of the Planning Act, that will take two or three years. It promised a greater local voice in planning matters; that will take three or four years before it's in effect. In the meantime, effectively, the Ontario Municipal Board appears to have been stripped of the kinds of powers and responsibilities that it was taking before the retirement of Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a bit about the question of housing. I want to talk about it in a number of different lights.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there not being a quorum present in the House I'd like to call a quorum.

I want to tell you, sir, that one of the reasons I'm doing this is that the committee on the Attorney General's estimates is apparently sitting and insisting on proceeding, which clearly violates the understanding we reached before the orders of the day today. It's really behaviour which is reprehensible and I'd like you to give us an opportunity to clear it up. I'd like to call a quorum.

Mr. Speaker: Clerk, will you take the count please?

Mr. Foulds: I'd like to point out that there are four Tories in the House at the present time.

Clerk of the House: Including yourself, sir, there are 20 members present. This is a quorum.

Mr. Speaker: The Clerk says there is a quorum. Proceed.

Mr. Lewis: There were 19 people present when I called for the quorum. I shall ask some of my colleagues to leave if that need be done. I really don't think the House needs to be subjected to this kind of treatment by the committee system or by the government. We can at least have four minutes in which to try to clear it up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There's not a quorum now the clerk informs me. I shall have the bells rung as required.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order! There is now a quorum present. The member from Ottawa Centre may proceed.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's nice to have an audience here and to see a few of those unfamiliar faces on the other side of the House.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I was just turning to the question of housing. I think it's a darn good thing that people around the province are talking about housing over the last few months as a result of the Comay task force. It's about time that housing became a political issue again, because this government has done everything it can to submerge it and to pretend that the housing crisis that we have in this province just isn't there.

I've got some figures that would indicate, Mr. Speaker, just how deep that housing crisis is. For example, if you take figures which were produced by an authority that I'm sure the government would respect—namely the Urban Development Institute—it reckons that 28 per cent of the people living in Metro Toronto in 1961 were able to afford the cost of a house within a reasonable portion of their income.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's down to either 11 or four per cent of the population of this city and this region—depending on whose figures you happen to count on—because of the exceptionally high cost of housing, mortgages and all of the other things that enter into it.

The Urban Development Institute, Mr. Speaker, flatters itself that in the apartment field competition has made housing relatively more accessible to people in the last 10 years because of the fact that rents have gone up less than average weekly earnings over the past 10 years.

However, when you look at its figures, Mr. Speaker, something very remarkable comes out. The housing experts have always said that you shouldn't pay more than one week's

salary for rent or housing costs every month; approximately 25 per cent of your income.

Well, back in 1961 the average weekly earnings in the Toronto area were about $82 a week and monthly rents for a bachelor apartment were about $85 a month. So back in 1961 your average Torontonian could safely afford a bachelor apartment within his earnings.

In 1971, weekly earnings are up to $145, according to the builders' figures. The rent on a bachelor apartment is up to $142 on average; and that means that now your average Torontonian can afford a bachelor apartment within 25 per cent of his income and have $2.50 left over to buy himself a meal or a couple of beers.

That's progress, according to the Urban Development Institute, Mr. Speaker.

But the fact is that average Torontonians are not all single. Some of them have families, some of them have two and three and four, even five or six children; as well as grandparents and other people living with them. You can't squeeze people into bachelor apartments which rent at 25 per cent of your income.

But that's the kind of housing crisis we have gotten ourselves into, Mr. Speaker. For the person earning an average wage in the city of Toronto and venturing out into the private market, all they can safely afford is a one-room apartment.

Mr. Speaker, rents in Toronto for a two-bedroom apartment—the smallest you need for a family—now run about $203 a month average, according to the Urban Development Institute.

Again, its own figures for 1971 show that out of 1,200,000 taxpayers in Metro Toronto, Mr. Speaker, that only 17 per cent had a declared income of more than $10,000; and that 19 per cent had a declared income of $7,000 to $10,000; and approximately two-thirds of the taxpayers in Toronto had income of under $7,000 a year.

In other words, less than one-fifth of the taxpayers in Toronto could afford one of the developers' two-bedroom apartments; and another group of less than one-fifth could afford it by stretching their budgets; and the rest couldn't afford it at all.

We did some checks up in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, where the income distribution is rather similar. We found that with rents that prevail in Ottawa right now, that on an income of $5,000 a family needing a two-bedroom apartment—which is too small for most families—would have to pay 48 per cent of their income on shelter. And even at the $10,000 mark, they would have to pay 24 per cent of their income on shelter. At $8,000 they'd have to pay 30 per cent of their income on shelter. And, Mr. Speaker, 80 per cent of the families in the Ottawa area have incomes of less than $10,000.

The housing crisis we have, Mr. Speaker, isn't just a problem of a few unfortunate, low-income families who can't cope. It's a problem which now spreads into virtually every group within our major metropolitan areas. It is an economic problem for families, Mr. Speaker, and it's getting worse and worse and worse every year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other day a nice middle-class university teacher of my acquaintance, who lives with her young son in a house in Ottawa which she rents for $230 a month, had a visit from her landlord. The landlord came to announce that the rent was going to go up by 50 per cent to $350 a month; and if she didn't like it she could move at the end of her lease.

Some questions were asked about this kind of exorbitant and unjustified rent increase on the house; and the minister simply said: "Well, we haven't got the power to do anything about it." For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, the government ought to get the power!

Another case which epitomizes the kind of problems that low-income families have is a family with four children, aged one to seven, three of whom are girls, who live in Ottawa on a take-home income of $108 a week to take home. They were renting a three-bedroom house at $165 and paying for the heat on top of that.

That family was paying almost two weeks' income every month for their shelter, and they got no repairs from the landlord. One day the ceiling over the kitchen fell in. They felt the landlord should really do something about that and they asked him for some repairs.

Mr. Foulds: That really wasn't asking too much.

Mr. Cassidy: That wasn't asking too much, Mr. Speaker. The health department issued an order in late March to that landlord to make repairs by May 9, which is an inadequate kind of order in the first place. That order came before the end of March, and that family was given its orders to be evicted, to get out of the place, by April 30. They had no recourse, being on a monthly tenancy.

They had absolutely no recourse under Ontario law.

Mr. Speaker, as for the price of land in the major cities, such as Ottawa and Toronto, nobody can really quote you figures on this anymore, because it is going up so fast. The other night I was up in North York at a meeting of the Comay task force and was told that a semi-detached lot for two houses now costs $39,000 in North York. Once $20,000 or more used to be considered a reasonable price for a house, not for a plot of land 30 or 40 feet wide by 100 foot deep on which you have possibly the privilege of putting together a house.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the government doesn't have a housing policy. As I shall attempt to demonstrate, what it has done in the field of housing has been inadequate. It has been oriented toward developers and not to the users, the people who need housing. The government has been insensitive to the needs of people, of citizens of this province, in getting decent housing. It is not solving the problems, and in fact it is probably making the problem worse. Certainly in Ottawa that is what we see; the problem is getting worse rather than better.

Just to start with a very brief example of how the government is insensitive. If it is true that people should pay no more than 25 per cent of their income in rent, then why is it that in Toronto, in Ottawa, in Sudbury, probably in Thunder Bay and in other parts of the province, people who are receiving social assistance at the municipal or provincial level pay 45, 50 and even 60 per cent of their income in housing before they have any money to pay for their kids' food, clothing and other essentials of life? How can the government defend that if it believes, as governments of all levels are saying these days, that decent housing at a reasonable cost is a right and is not a privilege?

Mr. Speaker, let's just look at some of the things that the Ontario Housing Corp. has been doing and see how it bears out the government's claims to be so sensitive in the field of housing. What we have seen recently, as I mentioned before, is the Minister of Revenue charging that it is ratepayer opposition that is stopping OHC and preventing it from providing the necessary housing.

I am not sure if I have the figures here, but in 1970-1971 OHC accounted for something like 12 per cent of the housing starts in the province. In 1972 that dropped to about 4.5 or five per cent of the housing starts in the province. In 1971, the OHC started more than 6,000 rent-geared-to-income units in Metro Toronto. In 1972 that was down to just over 1,000.

The minister's vaunted claims about how much he is spending for housing, when you look at them through the eyes of Metro Toronto in its brief to the Comay commission, come down to this: 12,000 new units over the period from 1964 to 1972, or an average of about 1,600 units per year.

What about that charge that it is ratepayers and other people, and not the OHC, who have been holding back the housing? Metro reported, Mr. Speaker, that back in the period between 1968 and 1971 the housing advisory committee of Metro government considered 76 projects and about 21,000 units. Mr. Speaker, that advisory committee rejected only 1,000 units as being unsuitable, leaving about 20,000. But the Ontario Housing Corp. did not proceed with that 20,000. It went ahead with only about 7,000.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Metro people admit that their committee was at no time crucial in those decisions. It was purely advisory, and the OHC did what it wanted to.

Up in Otawa, Mr. Speaker, where I had some direct experience, the OHC earned the kind of opposition it is getting in isolated instances right now by the way in which it imposed its will on the Ottawa city council. It simply presented a list of six to seven projects and said: "From all that we have received, these are the ones we want to do, and if you don't want any of them, if you want to knock them out, we will give you no guarantee that we will replace those units." And that in a city which was desperately short of rent-geared-to-income housing.

It's that kind of insensitivity, Mr. Speaker, which really makes it very difficult to accept the minister's charges.

One of the things we also notice in terms of the way in which OHC is dealing with the problems of the amount of housing that is needed, is in fact in OHC's own report to Metro back in February of this year. As is well known, the need for housing is at its most urgent, at its gravest, among larger families. We found, doing some analysis in Ottawa, that it was particularly among larger families on family benefits or other forms of provincial assistance. But here in Toronto, Mr. Speaker, the OHC has been steadily reducing the number of units with large bedroom counts, while at the same time it has been increasing or keeping static the number

of units with small bedroom counts. I've got the figures here, Mr. Speaker.

Thus, about 30 per cent of OHC units under management are three bedrooms, but only about 15 per cent of the projects under development will have three bedrooms. And barely four per cent will have four and five bedrooms, compared with about double that proportion in the existing housing stock owned by OHC.

Of the units under construction and development in Toronto, if you look at one bedroom and bachelor units OHC is building enough to satisfy the current housing list. At the two bedroom level barely half of the demand will be met by the forthcoming supply. At the three bedroom level less than half the demand will be met. When you get up to the five bedroom level, the large families that have real problems finding housing anywhere, only 10 per cent of the demand will be met, Mr. Speaker.

It suggests to us that OHC, once again, is geared to developers' proposals, to two bedroom units that come off the shelf and which are convenient and quick. Quick profits for the developers to put up; and for that matter an aggrandizement of the minister who will then be able to get up in this House to say how many housing units he has been responsible for creating, without regard to their use, to the need, and how they respond to the need.

Let's look at another aspect of the minister, Mr. Speaker. Out in Malvern, which is certainly an area where public housing ought to be integrated with the housing going in, the proposal says only five per cent of the units will be for subsidized accommodation. Well if only five per cent is going to be there, and if 50 per cent or more of the people in this city need some kind of assistance with housing, then who's to blame if there's a housing crisis if it isn't the minister, the government and the kind of policies they are putting together?

We're concerned as well, Mr. Speaker, about the Malvern project because of the way in which the government is catering to upwardly mobile members of the middle class and not genuinely getting to the housing needs of people on moderate and on low incomes.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the cost of developing that land was about 60 per cent of what is known as the current market value. But the OHC intends to sell that land, after leasing it for a few years, at the current market value. And it intends to sell it to people who in turn can then sell on the private market, and they too will stand to make a profit.

Everybody gains in this business except the people in the province who need—and desperately need—housing; and except the low and moderate income people who can't get into that project now, and will certainly never be able to get into it when the prices have gone up by $10,000 or $15,000, as they will do, without any shadow of a doubt, in five or six years, given the current government's policy.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, OHC stands to make a profit of about $40 million, and probably far more, on the land at Malvern because of the policy which it is adopting of selling out at the market price after five years. The people who buy will in turn also make a profit, which we believe to be unjustified, of $40 million or more when they sell out. And there's a terrible incentive for them to take this government-sponsored housing, to sell it on the private market and then to go back—I don't know what they'll do after that. But there is an incentive for them to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the legal minimum income for someone moving into Malvern is about $8,500 a year. And there are only 35 units out of the first 650, Mr. Speaker, which are even suited to that particular income range.

When you look at the incomes that will be catered for, you find that this low and moderate income support development—well there are projects there that can't be bought unless you have an income of $12,000 or more. When you look at the lower ranges—$8,500, $8,900 or so—32 per cent of gross income has to go into housing cost in order to afford the units going up in Malvern. It is 38 per cent of net income when you take away deductions for taxes and that kind of thing.

That's the kind of policy, Mr. Speaker, which this government is adopting. They are going to take a profit that they shouldn't; they are going to price housing out of the reach of ordinary Toronto and Metro Toronto residents; and they do it with a smile on their face.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about something else related to OHC, and that is the kind of patronage which it undertakes in making its proposals.

Nobody knows, Mr. Speaker, how the OHC chooses developments on its proposal call system. But it seems to be no accident that in the Ottawa area the developers who do

best under the OHC are those who are known to have close and continuing links with the Conservative Party. As I understand it, that's the case in Thunder Bay, in Toronto and elsewhere in the province; and there is no check on that, Mr. Speaker—none at all.

The Provincial Auditor spoke rather generally last year about weaknesses in procedures at the OHC, and he may have been talking about the proposal call. We don't know. Certainly there have been a number of cases where it has been admitted by people involved in the process that the objective criteria haven't been followed, that inadequate buildings have been accepted by the OHC, that inadequate standards have been glossed over, that in fact the public's money could have been used far, far better than it had been.

Another aspect of this privatization and it was the vogue word in the government last year—that has taken place has been the use of builders at places like Malvern and other HOME projects, not just to build the houses but also to allot them. And certainly there is the prospect there that nephews and sisters and other people who are in a privileged position have the chance of getting into that development before your ordinary citizen.

Mr. Speaker, the government went into that system because it said it didn't want to have the lineups which had occurred in Hamilton and other HOME projects, where OHC did the allocation of lots. Now to me it just defies belief that a system couldn't have been established by which people in the income ranges to which that housing is directed, couldn't get first call on it rather than allowing the builders to give it out to whomever they wanted.

There's a real incentive, you know Mr. Speaker, if a builder has a house which is available to people with an income as low as $10,000, to give it to somebody who is earning $15,000 or $20,000. He knows they'll get the mortgage quickly; he knows there is no financial risk. He knows he won't get caught and he'll move the property that much quicker; he can get in, build it, get out, make his profit and go elsewhere.

When we look at the people who have got into Malvern and use the OHC figures, 14 per cent of them earn less than $8,000 which is the level at which they are meant to be able to qualify to go in. The fact is that these figures exclude the wife's income. These are people who probably are in genuine need and deserve to get in there, and are using the wife's income to get in.

About 70 per cent are in the range between $8,000 to $12,000, not counting the wife's income. In other words, some of those are in the income range of up to $18,000 or $20,000. Another 15 per cent or so earn over $12,000 and have no business being in a publicly-sponsored project which is designed to meet the needs of home purchasers who can't compete in the private market here in Toronto. These are figures just for the heads of households and not for the rest of the household.

Why does the OHC have to give the power of decision to the builders? Why does it not even insist that income criteria be respected? Why does it allow some people to buy these houses?

Some of them are now building additions and carports and other things like that because they got housing cheaper than they would on the private market and have lots of money to burn. Why does it allow them to make a capital profit, to make a killing, on a very low downpayment, in five years' time? In fact, their money can earn about 500 per cent in five years' time if one looks at the downpayment and the kinds of profit that they stand to make. Why can't we have a sensible use of publicly-owned land instead of what we have had at Malvern?

Mr. Speaker, I have said that the government has been tied up with developers and I would like to talk very briefly about condominiums. This is some publicity for condominiums, and it's very pretty. It's part of the image for a place called Flemingdon Woods.

Flemingdon Woods is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because it is one of three or four condominium developments in the city where the Ontario government said to the developer: "Go ahead and build it, but if you can't sell it we will buy back the units and insure you against any loss." Now that sure is socialism for the rich!

In addition, Mr. Speaker, when the government went into this condominium business in a big way a few years ago, it did everything in its power to stack things in favour of the developers. It's interesting that there is not a single person in the Ontario Housing Corp. whose job it is to protect the rights of condominium purchasers, but there is a whole division or a whole department which concerns itself with the problems of condominium developers. According to the law and the agreements with the mortgagor, who is the Ontario Housing Corp. in many cases, changes in the agreement or in the building

can be made with the consent of the mortgagor but the tenants or the people who buy in are not consulted.

The Ontario Housing Corp. claims to itself, according to its report to Metro, the right to approve management contracts but insists that those management contracts be drawn up with the developer or with his agent or subsidiary for a period of five years after the development has begun, and then approves the rental fee or the management fee.

In the case of Flemingdon Woods, Mr. Speaker, the management fee is $10 a month per unit, which will be paid for the next five years by the owners of those units. They were not consulted about it; they got no services for that. They have to pay for the superintendents, the janitors, the cleaning, the repairs, all the other things that would normally come under a management fee; and then they have got to pay their builder $10 a month in order to manage this—a job which could be done for about $2 or $2.50 a month if they were able to hire their own management.

Mr. Speaker, the government in the case of these condominiums has stacked things in favour of the developers. Let me state somethings else about what the government has done with the condominium industry. The OHC participates in the activities of the condominium industry, in the joint condominium committee which is made up of the Urban Development Institute and a few other developer outfits, the Law Society and the Ontario Condominium Association. That's an association that ought to represent condominium tenants. Condominium tenants in fact belong on the basis of a fee of $35 per building, but the Urban Development Institute provides the major funds for the Condominium Association, which is a public relations organization. It has held booths at the national exhibition here in Toronto in order to popularize the condominium concept and to bring more people in.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that condominium owners have no rights in the management of these buildings in this new condominium concept until two-thirds of the units are occupied and registered? And the registration is at the behest of the developer. Why is it that they have not even a member on the board of directors? Why can't they look at condominium books until they assume the management?

Why is it that the Ontario Housing Corp. allows condominium developers to get by with verbal warranties that aren't worth the words they are uttered in; or to get by with one-year agreements which expire the moment a genuine complaint or grievance is brought in? Why is it that the Ontario Housing Corp. countenances advertising that promises the moon in terms of rooftop gardens, sunken swimming pools and that kind of thing, but bears no responsibility for ensuring that the developer delivers on his promises and even connives with devices that are designed to allow the developer to avoid that kind of situation.

Again, at Flemingdon Woods, the developer has agreed verbally to sell the recreation building to the condominium corporation for $1 when he feels like it. He hasn't got much need for it, so he'll probably carry through on that verbal agreement. But because they are buying it for only a dollar—the money already has been paid by the tenants in the form of their mortgages—the tenants have absolutely no control over what's put into that recreation building. After all, they are getting it for a buck, so why should they complain?

The whole area of condominium law cries out desperately for reform in order to ensure that the rights of people who move in are protected rather than being trampled the way they are right now.

The member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) talked about problems with a housing development in his area. And when people complained, the government said: "Go and get yourself a lawyer." That's what the government is saying to condominium purchasers as well: "Go get yourself a lawyer. Spend $300 or $400 or $500 and find a lawyer and maybe you can enforce your rights."

Mr. Speaker, that's not who condominiums were meant to cater to. That's not the moderate income group. They haven't got the $300 or $400. In fact, in some cases they have next to nothing with which to work.

I will give a final example about the kind of economic situation that this province has created in the housing field in Metro and in other parts of the province by its housing policies.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Even if they get a lawyer, they can't effect any changes.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right—and they can't afford the lawyer either.

Mr. Speaker, in order to bail out the developers of Crescent Town, Chapel Glen and Flemingdon Woods, the government recently brought in, almost unnoticed—they

didn't say anything about it—a new programme of subsidized mortgages for people in lower-income groups. The effect was to cut the monthly cost of these units by about $15 or $20 a month—at Crescent Town, it was to cut the cost of a two-bedroom apartment for a family to about $200 a month.

According to the way in which the government computed these things, that apartment now is accessible to someone earning $6,800 a year; and if in fact that were true, it would be a pretty desirable thing. That's certainly a moderate income family; and it allows them to get housing and to protect themselves against rent increases. But if we look at it more closely, I don't think anybody in this House would accept the kind of living conditions they would have to tolerate in order to own that place on $6,800 a year.

Between Canada Pension and unemployment insurance, $20 a month for Medicare and about $60 a month in income tax, that $6,800 translates to $5,700 in take-home pay. They'd have to pay $2,550 for their housing, their principal and interest, taxes, maintenance charges and so on; another $125 to ride on the TTC twice a day; $100 for a telephone. It brings it up, Mr. Speaker, to about $2,800 for housing out of an income of $5,700—in other words, just under 50 per cent of net income for housing—and would leave $250 a month for everything else.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect there isn't a single member of this Legislature who doesn't have $250 a month in his pocket for his own personal expenses, let alone the problems of raising a family, clothing it, buying insurance and doing all of the other things that families need to do with their money.

Mr. Foulds: The Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr) probably has it right now.

Mr. Cassidy: He probably has it right now, and he knows he can get far more if he needs it.

Mr. Foulds: Just for today!

Mr. Cassidy: Just for today! That's today's allotment, that's right!

But the government doesn't realize the kind of economic situation it's been pushing people through in this field of housing.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Comay report may be a bit of a shock to the government, because there have been a lot of suggestions come in from a lot of quarters. And it hasn't just been the Dan Heaps of this world who have been making radical suggestions. It has been the eminently respectable bodies such as the Metropolitan Toronto city government, a regional government, the city of Ottawa—

Mr. Foulds: Dan Heap is more respectable than they are.

Mr. Cassidy: —the confederation of ratepayers here in the city of Toronto. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, from the way in which Mr. Comay himself is engaging with these people, that he is very sensitive—much more sensitive than the government is—to the housing crisis that exists in this province and to the lack of any answers on the part of the government.

The minister, his ministry and his corporation are really virtually irrelevant to the real housing problems. The minister rushes in with Band-Aids and sticking plasters in order to solve a problem and pretends that is all that needs to be done. He boasts about how important OHC is and doesn't see the wreckage that is being created in housing all around him.

The minister apparently is unaware of the problems of housing inflation which are taking place. He doesn't believe in interfering with the private sector, and yet as the CORRA brief said there are no effective public controls over the use of land. There is no way right now, because of the lack of development controls, that municipalities can direct and ensure that the housing that is produced will be at income levels or directed to income levels so that people can afford it. It is only by accident that municipalities can stipulate a certain housing mix, only if they happen to have control over a certain part of the land.

The confederation of ratepayers, Mr. Speaker, was recommending among other things that there should be charges under the Combines Act for the monopolistic and oligopolistic practices of the housing industry and of the development industry, and that the government ought to move in.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has suggested the answer should be to service more land. The Urban Development Institute has suggested this as well. As it rightly pointed out, the Toronto-centred region plan didn't even mention housing as one of the goals. But the Urban Development Institute suggested that it was the government's insistence on orderly contiguous development that drove prices up and encouraged speculation. Ob-

viously the builders want disorderly, non-contiguous development in order to give them the maximum freedom.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that may well be what the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon), on behalf of the Liberal Party, is suggesting as well. When we leave land in private hands and bring in more services then we simply put more profit into developers' pockets. We simply allow people in that top 15 per cent or 20 per cent of the income range to buy more land, to have 80-ft lots instead of 60-ft lots; to get chalets for their kids; to have a 150-ft garden instead of a 100-ft garden. We permit more luxuries on behalf of the rich but we do nothing to solve the housing problems of ordinary Canadians.

Mr. Laughren: Is the member directing this to the Tories?

Mr. Cassidy: I am directing this to both parties in fact.

I don't think they understand the problem. I think all of their actions, which have simply made the housing problem worse over the last 10 or 20 years, suggest that they don't understand the problem at all.

Are the builders willing to make any assurance about price if services are brought in to ensure that more land is available? I've certainly heard no suggestion on their part in that way.

In Ottawa we currently have housing land coming available for about 17,000 people in the south Ottawa development area. That land is owned by Campeau and Assaly and other big developers. It was bought in the range of between $500 and $2,500 per acre. It will be sold in the range of $50,000 to $100,000 per acre depending on its ultimate use; and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't cost that much to service that land.

The city of Ottawa is contributing to private profits by bringing a substantial new amount of development land on to the market. That would be all that would happen if we were to follow the prescriptions of the Liberal Party or of the Urban Development Institute.

I want to suggest very briefly, Mr. Speaker, that since we have a housing crisis we better do something about it; and we had better do something about it quickly. We need two things. We need a programme of immediate action, which I will outline right now, and we need some long-term action which will concentrate on the question of land.

I would say that the biggest single problems that are suffered right now are the economic problems of housing. If you can solve people's economic problems in housing, then the problems of ensuring decent standards, of cleaning up slums, of rehabilitating homes and so on, can be solved. But so long as people are pauperized and forced into slum housing, forced under the dominance of slum landlords and put in a position where they have no alternative but to accept substandard housing, then that kind of problem will persist.

No programme of simply building a bit of public housing is going to solve the slum problem, so long as people are at the same time being driven into the slums by the government's economic policies in housing.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we need, first, a shelter allowance which will ensure that no Ontario family has to pay more than 25 per cent of its income for shelter. We need that now.

If you will, it should start with the groups which are particularly house-poor and particularly in need; the groups which are now so often knocking in desperation on doors of the Ontario Housing Corp. and getting nowhere, because there is no way that that public housing programme is going to work. If it does work, of course, it is liable to create ghettos. So the allowance should be directed, initially, to the families on low incomes, let's say under $6,000 a year; to families with young children, five years and under; and finally to senior citizens, 60 and over.

Mr. Speaker, have you ever had a case come to you of a family where one partner is retired and the other partner is unable to work, and because of the legislation that exists in this province and this country they are forced to get by on an income of $150 a month or less?

Mr. Lewis: Sure, he has had that.

Mr. Cassidy: If he has, I wish he would show it a bit more; and I wish that the government would show it as well. Certainly senior citizens ought to qualify for this shelter allowance.

Mr. Renwick: It is $155.

Mr. Cassidy: One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, for a shelter allowance is that the capitalists on that side of the House don't give poor people a choice in housing. They tell them: "You go into that ghetto which has been created by the Ontario Housing Corp., or you sweat it out and pay 50 per

cent of your income in rent." That's no choice in my language.

Mr. Foulds: The self-satisfied, smiling Cheshire cats over there are proud of it.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Better than the member!

Mr. Cassidy: It seems to us, Mr. Speaker, that the choice, which people like the members on that side enjoy in housing, ought to be something which belongs to every Ontario family and not just to those who have investments or rip-offs or other means of getting a very substantial income. It should be something which is extended right through society, so that a poor family can decide whether they want to live in a public housing project, in a co-op, or in a developer project; or whether they want to live in town and have a bit less space but better access to transportation, or out of town and have a bit of green grass around them and maybe better schools for their kids; and so that those choices can be made according to the family's wishes rather than dictated by the Minister of Revenue and by his cohorts in the Ontario Housing Corp.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the shelter allowance should not just be confined to tenants as well, because there are many people on low incomes who are being pauperized even though they are owners of shelter, particularly old people who now find themselves trapped. They can't afford to leave the accommodation they own and they can't afford to stay there either without paying an undue proportion of their income in rent.

But there are also, particularly in rural Ontario, many families who own their own shelter and yet who simply cannot afford the cost of living there, and particularly the cost of rehabilitating it in order to bring it up to an adequate kind of standard.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that if you bring in a shelter allowance you ought also to have rent regulation. We believe that rent regulation is desirable right now—in fact, retroactive to the beginning of this year to forestall any profiteering by the friends of the Conservative Party who tend to be landlords.

Rent increases, Mr. Speaker, would be justified on the basis of increases in costs, but not on the kind of speculative rip-offs that I talked about earlier, which are rife in Toronto, rife in Sudbury, rife in Thunder Bay and in Ottawa. Landlords look at the rents that are being charged elsewhere. Then they blithely come in on somebody who is earning a third or a quarter of what they are and tell them their rent is going up by $20, $30, $40 or $50 a month in order to increase their profits. And then they say to the tenant: "Well, you know how it is."

That's pretty crummy, Mr. Speaker, when the landlord comes up in his Mercedes Benz, or his Buick, or his Cadillac and tells the tenant, who is living in a rat-trap with the ceiling falling in and the back porch needing repair: "Well, you know how it is!"

Sure the tenant knows how it is. He knows that the landlord has power that he hasn't and that this government won't do anything about it.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Look who's talking now.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, we believe that rent regulation isn't enough either. The status of tenants has got to change and this also can be brought in within a very short period of time.

Why is it that a tenant can be kicked out at the end of a year, whereas there are the most enormously elaborate procedures under Ontario expropriation law before you can remove an owner/occupier from his premises? As long as a tenant fulfills the normal obligations with his property, Mr. Speaker, we think he should be able to stay. He should have security of tenure. There should be a landlord-tenant tribunal which would sit in judgement if in fact the landlord wants to get rid of him.

If the landlord can show that he's wrecking the property, fine. If the landlord can show that he's not paying the rent, fine. On the other hand, if the tenant can show that the landlord isn't fixing the property and that the ceiling came in and nothing happened, then at that point the tenant should have the right to withhold his rent.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the books of landlords should be open. We believe that rent increases, which cannot be settled between landlords and tenants equitably, ought to go before the landlord-tenant tribunals and that the whole question of landlord-tenant law should be taken out of the courts. I'm looking at the superminister for Justice right now.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Going to get a lot of apartment buildings that way!

Mr. Cassidy: It should be taken out of the courts, Mr. Speaker, because they have proved themselves biased in favour of land-

lords and totally inadequate for handling this kind of problem.

Mr. Lewis: It makes a nice profit for the minister's legal confreres, but it shouldn't be in the courts.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that it takes up to a year or more for a tenant who brings a case against the landlord in order to get a decision from the courts; but nowadays it takes only 15 or 20 days for a landlord to get an order for eviction against a tenant who is in dispute with the landlord and refuses to move? Now why is that? Is that not a clear example of bias?

Mr. Foulds: It clearly favours the landlord.

Mr. Cassidy: Clearly! And the Landlord and Tenant Act still clearly favours the landlord, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Renwick: It won't be solved until you can set it off against the rent.

Mr. Cassidy: It desperately needs reform. All it did was to civilize a relationship which is basically the law of the jungle and nothing more, and it's the members on that side who have created that.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, there should be a big increase in funds to rehabilitate older housing rather than allowing it to be demolished. I would say that we would welcome the deathbed repentance of the Minister of Revenue and the agreement to go in on the Dundas-Sherbourne development with Mayor Crombie.

Mr. Renwick: He sounded pretty healthy yesterday.

Mr. Cassidy: He did sound a bit healthy, yes.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Too healthy, in fact.

Mr. Cassidy: Also, and in the same vein Mr. Speaker, that problem at Dundas and Sherbourne could have been regulated had there been legislation to regulate demolition permits when they affect the supply of older housing.

It seems intolerable to us that a developer who has absolutely no interest in a property should be able to tear it down and take away the housing accommodation of 10 or 20 people. In one case in Ottawa now, there is a sound apartment building with about 50 units being torn down by a developer.

And so often it is not even to put up a new apartment, not even to put up a new office building, it's to create a parking lot or an extension to an industrial yard.

Mr. Renwick: Or just a bomb crater, as they have in my riding.

Mr. Cassidy: Or just a bomb crater, Mr. Speaker, because the federal tax law gives the developer a break if he tears the building down rather than leaves it in use. We don't think that's justified, Mr. Speaker, and demolition should be justified before it can go ahead.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Laughren: The Justice minister thinks it's all right!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, we believe there should be a provincial ministry of housing and that the government should finally come to having a comprehensive policy for housing which lays down what kind of housing should be built, where it should be built, what income groups it should be directed to, and ensuring the needs of all income groups and not just the upper and upper middle classes would be provided for.

Mr. Martel: Policy on something over there would be helpful!

Mr. Cassidy: Well, it would be welcome that's right!

Mr. Laughren: We are waiting eagerly for Friday morning to get some of these policy statements.

Mr. Cassidy: We also believe, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of gargantuan appetites of the Ontario Housing Corp. should not particularly be furthered, but that OHC should stand in reserve to provide housing when the private and non-profit sector is breaking down. The big expansion in housing should not be in the private sector, Mr. Speaker, it should be in the non-profit sector, with co-ops and other non-profit groups.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cassidy: They should be encouraged by this government by every means that are at its disposal.

Mr. Laughren: It is the member from Timiskaming's fault. It's all his fault.

Mr. Cassidy: And I'm afraid when the Minister of Revenue announced his new programme of integrated housing we saw very little of that. All we saw was a new series of gifts to developers, which the minister himself recognized was to allow them to make a fast buck, and maybe incidentally to provide housing.

The big development corporations, Mr. Speaker, admit their purpose is to make profit, capital gains and long-term earnings. Their function is to build housing, but that is just a byproduct of the desire to make money. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we would hope to see a situation where a third, maybe even half of the housing being built in this province, particularly the rental housing, would be provided by the non-profit sector, by people whose first aim was to make housing for people rather than make profits for themselves.

Mr. Laughren: Let's go along with the needs for the people.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): And for tenants, too, for a change!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, housing policy in this province must include municipal tax reform. It must include it because right now municipalities effectively zone out low income housing. They exclude it because they can't afford it, or because they feel they can't afford it; and until we get a progressive tax system in which the property tax is not a deterrent to housing for any income group we will not be able to have an effective housing policy.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Foulds: So is the member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Cassidy: In addition, as part of the plan, Mr. Speaker, we believe the province, as part of its housing policy, will lay down for different regions of the province the kinds of housing, where they should go and so on, and then the municipalities will be expected to carry their burden rather than excluding public housing as some municipalities, such as Mississauga, do right now. Vacant land should be taxed to its full value.

But finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the fundamental, long-term thing that needs to be done in order to come to grips with the housing situation in this province.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cassidy: And that's the question of land! As long, Mr. Speaker, as urban land is in private hands, then so long will we have the kind of housing crisis which we have today.

There is absolutely no way in which the housing problem can be solved unless land is brought under public ownership and public control.

Mr. Foulds: Well said!

Mr. Cassidy: I want to be unequivocal about that. I think the public of Ontario, as they reflect in their briefs to the Comay task force, now recognize this is the case.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: Get the cabinet in here!

Mr. Cassidy: At times it is called land banking, Mr. Speaker, but land banking is not enough. If the public simply land banks then it makes mistakes such as the Carlsbad Springs land acquisition up in Ottawa. For the sake of people who don't know of it, at Carlsbad Springs there are springs and the land is very wet.

The acquisition of land should begin with the land which is immediately in the line of development, only that land should be acquired at prices related to what it cost to acquire, if it is held by developers, and not to some inflated market value which the government has allowed to prevail.

Mr. Speaker, only if there is control of the land will there be effective control of the planning. We would hope the planning would go on with the maximum kind of co-operation with municipalities and with local citizens, in order to ensure they have a real say in the development, unlike the way they are excluded from the development plans of the Ontario Housing Corp. right now.

Mr. Laughren: The precedent has been set for giving profits to land speculators!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Martel: On the lowest rate possible!

Mr. Cassidy: As far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, in areas like Toronto and Ottawa where the problem is at its most acute, the government should step in right now and simply freeze the price of that land while it decides what to acquire and begins to work out an equitable way of paying for

the land that it needs. This is what was done in fact.

This government doesn't have any hangups about that kind of thing; this in fact is what it did in the Pickering airport area when it decided for its own purposes to acquire land. Why is it that it can do it out there where farmers and people who simply sought a quiet rural life have gone? Why could the government pick on people who are weak like that, but why hasn't it got the guts to pick on the developers and the other people who are holding the citizens of this city up to ransom with the cost of the housing they build?

Mr. Foulds: They are holding hands in our pockets.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. They are holding hands in our pockets.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Show a little determination.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, we also believe that land which is held by the public should not be alienated from the public. It should be leased, but it should not be sold. It shouldn't be sold to developers. It shouldn't be sold for commercial development. It shouldn't be sold to factory owners, to manufacturers; nor for that matter, we would say, should it even be sold to people who are seeking to acquire a home of their own. We believe that there is a better way.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: A 99-year lease!

Mr. Cassidy: We believe it should be on a leasehold system. Certainly with developers and shopping centres and things like that, let's face it, it isn't the developers who pay for those things; it's the tenants, the customers, the people who buy products manufactured in those factories who pay for them. If we can't return the proceeds of that investment by tenants and customers to the people who paid it, at least we can return it to the public in general. Public land should only be leased to developers; for highrise development, for example, when it will come back into public hands with the structures and with the buildings, after 50 or 60 years.

As far as individually occupied homes—duplexes, condominiums, things like that—are concerned, we believe, Mr. Speaker, that a Crown-hold system will provide the benefits of home ownership. It can provide the benefits of unlimited tenure, which is now also held under freehold, without the kind of system that prevails right now by which everybody who buys a home is forced to become a little capitalist.

People are forced to seek the maximum profit from their houses when they sell because they know they are simply going to have to buy another house themselves further on down the line. What's the point of buying a house for $20,000 and selling it for $30,000 if one has to pay $32,000 for the next one? If one buys it for $32,000 and sells for $40,000, one is still on the treadmill.

We want to stop the treadmill, Mr. Speaker. We are saying that if in fact the resale price of that house is controlled so that it becomes accessible to the kind of people who could buy it when it was first purchased—or, for that matter, so that it could be rented, if that was the need at the time—the government can solve a lot of the housing inflation which is crippling Ontario families. It is making the housing crisis steadily worse year by year, and has got us to the pass where even the builders admit that only a handful, five per cent or so, of people in a city like Toronto can afford to buy the kind of houses that are available. It is a sign of the failure of this government in the field of housing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you. Mr. Speaker, there are about five matters I would like to discuss this afternoon and first of all I would like to deal briefly with my concern regarding this Legislature itself. I feel that the general decorum of the Legislature has deteriorated considerably in the six years I have been here.

I am concerned not only at the lack of attendance of cabinet ministers in the House when speeches in the Throne debate are being delivered, but I feel that abuses are creeping in during private members' hours. For example, yesterday in the private members' hour, we were dealing with matters which I felt were of utmost concern to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. White). He was not here, which is perhaps understandable, but surely one of his parliamentary assistants could have been in attendance when we discussed the matter—

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Good: —of a permanent secretariat for tri-level talks. I think this is most important.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): They were busy setting up the lunches!

Mr. Good: I also feel that in our private members' hours, it is not in good taste for members of the Conservative side to mouth the particular feelings of a government ministry or its civil servants, as was done, I am sure, yesterday by the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Wardle). I would think we must remember that our private members' hours must be the individual's interpretation of his position on that particular subject. If he wants to express it as his party's position, he can of course do that. But I hate to see our private members' hour developing into nothing more than the statement of government and opposition positions on particular subjects.

When we deal with a matter such as was raised by an hon. member last year, when he introduced a bill regarding the curtailment of the financial matters of dancing schools, we have unanimity on something unimportant. But, yesterday, when we debated what I considered to be a very important subject, it was not given the importance that I felt it should have been given.

The question period, I am sure the members will all agree, has deteriorated. I think one of the basic problems is that ministers are answering questions which are given in the form of interjections. Perhaps the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) is most responsible for this matter, as well as the ministers who answer those questions, including the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) and the Premier (Mr Davis) himself, who spend long minutes giving answers to questions which are not questions that should even be recognized in question period but are merely interjections. I think that this is one of the prime reasons that the question period has deteriorated to the low depth it has now reached.

We must remember that this is a dignified chamber, in which the business of the province is carried out. We are all guilty, of course, of making interjections, which I think are good; but in the final analysis I think the general spirit must be one in which more of the business of government must be transacted on the floor of the Legislature and not as it is now being done, by orders in council.

I am certainly concerned about the increase in the amount of money being spent in programmes which never reach the floor of the Legislature for debate. This is done by order in council, and I think it is wrong. As representatives of the people, we have a traditional responsibility to debate all money matters in the Legislature. This has been our inherent responsibility throughout the evolution of our whole parliamentary system to its present form.

Among these programmes, just to name a few that developed on which we had no debate—there was no legislation; they were done by order in council, through regulations—there is the farm tax reduction programme, the capital grants for farm development programme, the lotteries branch regulations, the provincial-municipal employment incentive programme. All of these programmes which involve millions of dollars—and I mean millions of dollars—were never debated on the floor of this Legislature.

As members representing the people I think we have a responsibility. The government represents the Crown. The elected members and the backbenchers represent the people. And we must at least go through the mechanics of debating these things even though the government does have the power to do as it wishes in the end.

In each of these instances, however, the Provincial Auditor's report was very critical of the inept manner of handling these programmes, which distributed millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, very often with improper lists, duplication of payments, and unqualified persons and municipalities receiving the money.

The inefficient manner of accounting procedures extended not only to these programmes but to many other government handout programmes, including the residential property tax reduction programme and the supplementary benefits for persons on minimum incomes.

If we have learned nothing more from the auditor's report, it is that our fears have certainly come to fruition. We realize there is very great laxity and a great deal of room for improvement in the handling of funds, whether they be authorized by order in council or by legislation.

Mr. Speaker, turning to another subject, I would ask a question: Would you believe that it is possible for a person—and this includes a person of any age in the Province of Ontario—to be stripped of his life's savings because of illness? I didn't believe this was possible in the Province of Ontario, but let me say that it is. And it is being done to people—not to a great many people, but to people whose cases I have been asked to look into; not because of physical sickness, let me say, but because of mental sickness.

It is hard to believe that in the Province of Ontario today people are being moved out of psychiatric hospitals into homes for special care and their OHIP premiums are not covering their keep in those homes. When it was drawn to my attention, I could scarcely believe that certain individuals are receiving bills for huge sums. By "huge sums" I'm talking about bills of $8,000 or $6,000 after a person has been in a home for special care for some time.

Let me detail for the members several cases which have come to my attention. Under section 41, regulation 438, the Homes for Special Care Act, the responsibilities are outlined for the spouse or the estate of an individual to pay for that person's keep in a home for special care. Only after that person has been reduced to a pauper, only after his or her spouse has been reduced to a pauper, will the government then step in and provide these services. In the Province of Ontario today, in my view, this is entirely unacceptable.

I would like to quote from a letter which was sent to one family in 1967, when the mother was placed in a home for special care. Before I read, I would like to say this: This family was not aware until after the death of the person in 1972 that it was being held responsible for this bill. The letter says:

> This person is deemed to be the type of patient suitable for this type of care and we are recommending that the above-named be considered for transfer to a nursing home.
>
> This type of care is not covered by hospital insurance, but the cost of care in the nursing home will be paid for by funds authorized by the government for homes for special care, up to a maximum of $7.50 a day for those unable to pay for care and maintenance. When the resident is able to pay part of the cost of maintenance, a resident or person responsible for care and maintenance is liable to pay at least $2 a day. The charges will be made quarterly to be collected from the public trustees or relatives where applicable.

The charges were to be made quarterly. For many years, no charges were made against this particular family and on it's behalf I took the matter up with both the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) and members of his recoveries deparment. Finally, I was able to procure from the Minister of Health a letter which said, and I quote from it:

> I would agree with you that it is not as clear as it could have been about the responsibility for payment of maintenance. Steps have been taken to correct this situation.

This is very little comfort to a family that has been greeted with the following news. The estate of the deceased received a letter showing maintenance charges of $18,452 against this person, less credits of $9,907, leaving a balance of $8,600 owing to the Ministry of Health for this lady's keep at Spruce Haven Lodge.

When the hospital transferred the patient, the family was entirely unaware that it would be financially responsible for her keep. The letter further stated that any charges would be made quarterly.

So, we have now, by legislation, established that the spouse and the person himself or either of their estates is definitely responsible for the keep of persons in homes for special care.

I've taken the matter up with both the Minister of Health and the Premier of the province, as has the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton), who has had similar cases. We have had letters back from them stating simply that they are well aware of the situation, they are looking into it, but as yet they haven't made a decision as to what is going to happen.

What if a person's estate is depleted and there's no further money there and one spouse is still living? In the case of which I am aware he was paying his own way in an old people's rest home and the department was willing to take his savings from him and put him on general per diem keep.

I don't think that this is the type of treatment elderly citizens of the Province of Ontario should receive.

In two other instances in the riding of the member for Wellington South, the province has moved to place mortgage liens on the home of the spouse, in the case where each patient had previously died. Surely we have got away from this concept that a person's estate has to be responsible for charges made against that person by the government?

The federal government got away from this 25 or 30 years ago. The municipalities used to charge estates for hospital keep of indigent patients. We've moved away from that concept. But here we have one last isolated instance where the government is determined to reduce persons to pauper status because of mental illness before they move in and take

over the responsibility for that patient. To me it is entirely unacceptable and, Mr. Speaker, I think both the Premier and the Minister of Health should hang their heads in shame that such conditions exist in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): In absentia.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Always in absentia.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Clerk is here, he will take responsibility.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): We are just as charitable as the opposition is.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Not with that maple syrup, the member isn't!

Mr. Gilbertson: That too.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the member for Algoma been into the syrup again.

An hon. member: Maple wine.

Mr. Good: The next matter I'd like to talk about briefly is one which I've been trying to get on the question paper ever since the House started, and I am bringing this matter up at the request of many people, most of whom belong to naturalists, and environmental associations in the Province of Ontario. This has to do with the province and particularly the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), failing to move to establish certain endangered and rare species on our Endangered Species Act.

Prior to the last election, I think it was in June or July 1971, we passed an Endangered Species Act. We were told there was a study committee which would place on this list certain species of plant life, mammals, reptiles, birds and amphibians. To my knowledge nothing has been placed in the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are thinking of putting the NDP in.

Mrs. Campbell: I don't know if I would protect them.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): They are on the list.

Mrs. Campbell: In absentia.

Mr. Good: Some time ago, one of the naturalists' societies from my riding sent a letter to the director of the wildlife branch and they said among the people who have approached them there are those who:

> . . . because of last autumn's campaign [I was speaking in the last provincial election] and the passage of the bill believed that protection is now accorded to certain species. Recently a citizen contacted us about the large scale vending of certain wild flowers, ladyslippers, at the Kitchener market. There is no legislation to protect these.

Not even the provincial trillium, our flower emblem, is protected in the Province of Ontario. There is no legislation protecting our provincial flower, and are you aware, Mr. Speaker, that when a trillium is picked, the plant usually dies?

The strange part about this whole matter is that in 1970 in the spring and summer issue of Ontario Fish and Wildlife was published what has been deemed to be a very accurate list of rare and endangered species of mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians in the Province of Ontario. And there are those biologists who are working in the naturalists' societies who said that if the province would even start from its own list, it would have sufficient evidence of the need for implementation of this legislation and to get the regulations drawn up and get some names on this endangered species list.

The ironical part of the whole thing is that I just read in the recent March issue of the Ontario Naturalist a big, full-page ad with the name of the Minister of Natural Resources and also that of the deputy minister in it. It is promoting the fact that we must protect our wildlife because it is so important in the Province of Ontario. The ad says:

> Things are changing, but as far as wildlife is concerned, not always for the better. Small fields separated by wildlife-rich hedgerows are being replaced by large coverless tracks.

They go on to say how important it is that we consider the protection of our environment.

The same ministry has had three years to have its committee take action under the Endangered Species Act, and as yet it has not.

I would invite a response from the ministry's wildlife department to some of the following questions:

Why has it not placed certain plants and animals on that list? Why is there no special specific advisory committee and no budget to research rare species and implement effec-

tive protection? Why is the white trillium not protected? Why are rare species like the prairie white fringed orchid, wild blue hyacinth, bald eagle, white pelican and wolverine not given special protection as endangered species?

These are things which I think are perhaps not as important as some issues in this province, but there is absolutely no excuse why a minister with a huge section of his ministry devoted completely to wildlife, when asked why it hasn't done anything, should reply by saying:

> You will appreciate that the government has received requests to protect about just about everything that runs, flies, swims or walks. I am certain that if we made a list of everything that has been submitted, you would agree that there has to be some very serious consideration given to the plants and animals which should be on the list. As a consequence, the best means of developing regulations are now under study.

Well, a pretty flippant reply, I would say, to a letter writer who considered this matter most seriously.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The flora and fauna must be protected.

Mr. Good: Yes, and we have the legislation to do it; but they won't act.

The next matter I would like to talk about is one that is of great concern to me. It is one that is known to some of the members in the Legislature. It is a matter which I don't think has ever been discussed on the floor of the House in detail, and that is the mess which has developed in Century City.

Last week I went out to meet with some of the people; and these are farmers who were farming their land in Uxbridge township as recently as 1968. They were approached by real estate firms who wanted to buy their land and in every instance they were told that their land was being bought for farming purposes. The land was bought in the name of nominees and on the pretence that it was being bought for a brother of somebody who wanted to get in the farming business. Eventually there was a company formed called Mark Valley Farms Ltd.

Late in 1968, as those members who are concerned will remember, Century City Development Ltd. was formed, which was a subsidiary of Revenue Properties Central Development Ltd. The real estate firm which did most of the buying was Thos. N. Shea Ltd., which is still in business in the Markham area. The approach to the farmers was that the land was going to be bought for farming purposes.

Well, finally in December of 1968, as members will recall, we heard here in the House, and we discussed it, the announcements that Revenue Properties was buying the land to form this great Century City, a development of some 7,000 acres. I remember particularly because I opposed the original conception that the land should be approved as an improvement district.

This would mean that this development would be set apart and separate from the municipality, that the municipality would have no control over the planning or the development of this area as it affected the surrounding areas. Fortunately, the Minister of Municipal Affairs did not permit them to develop it as an improvement district.

The land comprised practically all land between the first and the fourth concessions of Uxbridge township and from the Pickering-Uxbridge line up to Goodwood. Later the company did buy some land in the north end of Pickering township as well.

The terms of the sale were basically that 30 to 40 per cent was paid to the vendor and then a mortgage was taken back, usually on 10 years with five years renewable. Interest was paid about twice a year, although some were quarterly. The unfortunate part was that almost immediately these mortgages were in default, so the company rearranged its financing with Kaufman and Broad, which is a large US financier.

However, in May, 1970, I think most of us were out at the announcement of the Toronto-centred region plan. To the consternation of the developers, the area was designated as an agricultural greenbelt and Kaufman and Broad withdrew its support. Consequently, no payments of any kind since 1970, interest or principal, have been made to these farmers.

The odd farmer was fortunate in that he had a lease-back arrangement so that he could live on his farm for several years. When the mortgages did get in default, those people who had a lease-back arrangement just continued to live on their farms.

No taxes have been paid by Revenue Properties Ltd. and there is now over $150,000 owing to Uxbridge township. The township is having to borrow money in order to keep going and, of course, it has to pay interest on the money that it borrows.

One wonders, then, why the farmers couldn't just go ahead and foreclose on their mortgages. This is where the problem arises, of which the government has known for two years but on which the government has refused to take action.

I would like to read from a letter from one of the law firms engaged by the farmers in the area. Let me, at this point, state that the group of some 66 farmers has spent over $40,000 in legal fees trying to correct the situation which has now developed.

I will quote from a letter from the law firm to Mr. and Mrs. Grant Drewry, who are among the farmers concerned. I might say at this point that my interest in this matter stems from having spent five years of my high-school days in the area. By sheer coincidence, the farm on which I met these people last week was one on which I had worked briefly during the summer, I think of 1936 — somewhere in there. I was very young of course.

An hon. member: The member must have been in diapers.

Mr. Good: Quoting:

> Pursuant to the recent meeting, with respect to the mortgages given back by Century City, we have been asked by most of you as to our advice as to whether or not to join the association.

The farmers were joining an association to see what could be done.

> Our advice is that you should join the association and that the only effective way and the most economical way to attack this problem is by united action.
>
> So that you may follow the reasoning, we would like to report to you on our efforts to date. We have issued writs on behalf of eight clients and have agreed to act for two others when we have established the proper course of action to take in these matters. Most writs were issued in June and July, 1970, after several telephone calls and letters to Century City in an attempt to resolve the problem, all of which were without success.
>
> Of the eight writs issued, five had motions brought to strike out the writs for various reasons. In some of these applications, Century City succeeded in getting an order for further particulars and these were provided.
>
> Century City again moved to strike out the writs in certain instances and were unsuccessful. Century City then appealed these decisions and again were unsuccessful in the appeal. We then took the writs and gave them to the sheriff of the county of York for service. This took a considerable period of time as Century City kept changing its directors but eventually everyone was served by about Nov. 15, 1970. The solicitor for Century City then filed an affidavit of merit [that's a defence to the action] which, in essence, states that because they own all the adjoining lands a judgement for foreclosure would contravene the provisions of the Planning Act.

I would like to stop right there and explain something. Those of you who were in the House in 1969 and 1970 will remember that we amended the Planning Act on two occasions.

The purpose of this amendment to section 26 of the Planning Act was that where adjacent properties whose boundaries were adjoining, were owned by one individual these properties would be considered to be one property. This legislation was put in, as I remember it, to do away with what was happening in Whiterock Estates, and similar instances, where people were subdividing property and selling it with no thought of a person ever being able to get to it.

However, in putting in these amendments to the Planning Act, we found that we created a monster which was being used by Revenue Properties to claim that these mortgages had been illegally drawn up. The second amendment to the Planning Act, I believe, was put in in 1970, which was after the mortgages had been drawn up. If I am not mistaken — and I could be on this matter — I believe the original amendment was also put in after the mortgages were drawn up.

In essence, our amendment to the Planning Act created the situation whereby Revenue Properties, in the opinion of most lawyers, has a very good case that the mortgages held by these farmers are invalid. From there, we must then assume that what has to be done is that the government has to amend the Planning Act. For two years it has been aware of this situation. For two years it has promised to do something about it but as yet nothing has happened.

Mrs. Campbell: In the fullness of time.

Mr. Stokes: Is that what they used to say?

Mrs. Campbell: That is what they have been saying ever since the beginning.

Mr. Good: Revenue Properties is hiding behind this section of the Planning Act. To my knowledge no other developer, and I have checked with some, has used this section of the Planning Act to try to get out of payment of mortgages which were drawn up on similar adjacent properties. The way the Act reads, if you mortgage one, you must mortgage them all. This, of course, wasn't done and consequently the company is saying that the mortgages are invalid.

It is also interesting to note that I have been told that the company has claimed that before it started to assemble the land it met with cabinet ministers. I saw stacks and stacks of correspondence and legal documents and one of these letters named the cabinet ministers who were present at the meeting when Revenue Properties was told that it could go ahead on this basis, that everything was all right. By memory, I have been told that Mr. MacNaughton and the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) were definitely there. At this time I am unaware of who the others were.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Bill Kelly.

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, Kelly.

Mr. Good: The statement of claim to the Supreme Court of Ontario was put in. Mr. Drewry and his group of 39 or 40 looked after this through their legal counsel.

In the statement of defence the defendant, Revenue Properties, is pleading and further alleges that as a result of the illegality of the securities — that's the mortgages — the plaintiffs are not entitled to either quiet possession of the land, as alleged in their statement of claim, or to enforce the debts sought to be enforced. The claimant claims that the vendors' mortgages are illegal and other mortgages held would move up one step.

The farmers hold the first mortgages. Royal Trust, Montreal Trust and Kaufman and Broad hold mortgages behind that. Revenue Properties is saying the farmers' mortgages are no good and the other mortgages will all move up one step.

Can members imagine putting out an argument on this basis simply because Revenue Properties is hiding behind a section of the Planning Act which wasn't intended to be used for that purpose?

This wouldn't be quite as serious, if it were not for the fact that many members of government have been aware of this situation, and nothing has been done. The group has spent over $40,000 in legal fees. There are $4 million worth of mortgages in question here, and that does not include back interest. There are about 66 property owners, most of whom are farmers.

I'd like to tell members just a few instances of what is happening, and I won't use names here. One gentleman moved off his property and built another house with the downpayment. He figured he would meet his payments as his mortgage money came in from his farm. Well, he hasn't got any mortgage money; so he's lost his house. The big-hearted development company has allowed him to move back on his farm, providing he pays them rent. So he's back in his old house paying them rent, if you can believe such a situation.

Another couple retired when they sold their farm and moved into a home in the village of Stouffville. They are practically on the verge of losing that. They are at their wits' end. They have no income. They thought their mortgage money would be coming and it just isn't coming. Some properties have been partly expropriated by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, but no money is being paid to the farmer. It is being placed in trust until this mess is cleared up. One family was evicted from its former farm.

The whole matter, of course, is complicated by the fact that the federal government is expropriating some of this land for airport purposes. I can't for the life of me see why we as legislators in this House can't prepare the necessary legislation and get this mess cleaned up.

Mrs. Campbell: They have to want to first.

Mr. Good: In closing on this point, let me say this, all of the cabinet are aware of the plight of these farmers. The Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) went out and met with the same people I met. He had great expectations, until he came back the second time. Something cooled him off. Nobody knows what. He wasn't so sure then when, or if, anything was going to be done.

The member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) is well aware of what this problem is, as he's been involved with it. The member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond) in whose riding this situation exists, has been well aware of it, and as yet, nothing has been done. Everybody is most sympathetic at first, but, as yet, they are not prepared to do anything.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I can only draw one conclusion, and that is that the government is not acting because it wants to protect the interest of Revenue Properties and Development until such time as something happens to keep it from going under.

There is no reason whatsoever why the necessary legislation shouldn't be passed, so that people can foreclose their mortgages and at least get their properties back. I'm glad to see the member for Ontario South shaking his head in agreement. It is a frightful condition and one which should never be allowed to exist in the Province of Ontario.

For over three years this thing has gone on. The Premier of the province was first approached on this matter during his campaign to become leader of his party. He has known about it since then and has made some great promises at that time. But, as yet, nothing has been done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Good: The last matter I would like to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is one of more local interest, in my riding. This has to do with some of the local problems. May I start out by saying that I very vigorously disagree with the statement made by Don Collins, chairman of the regional municipality of Sudbury, when he said that he feels "the province is disgusted with squabbling, ineffective, local governments, unable to comprehend and service urban municipalities." Mr. Collins said regional government has fallen into disrepute because of the constant criticism of it and he felt it was time to concentrate on attracting the best men available into the expanded forms of government. Well, I don't for one minute agree that councillors at the local level are creating the problems with municipal government in this province. I believe the responsibility rests right here at Queen's Park.

Very recently, the new budget for the regional government of Niagara was set forth. I'm sure the member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) will deal with it in more detail at a later date, but, as is to be expected, we have nothing but increases. This same condition exists in all regional governments. We, in Waterloo region—

Mr. W. Hodgson (North York): York has a decrease.

Mr. Good: We in Waterloo are waiting for our first budget and our first tax bill. It's very interesting to note that the provincial Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernment Affairs, is now changing his mind considerably about regional government. When he spoke to the convention of regions and municipalities only last week he was talking about strengthening the country government rather than, as he said in the House the other day, imposing regional government.

I would like to make just one point and it is simply this, I think the greatest mistake which is being made, or has been made, in setting up the regional governments is the appointment of a regional chairman. In my view the appointment of a regional chairman brings everything out of its context. Nothing is developed by the local municipality. Let me explain why.

In our own area when the regional chairman was appointed — and at this time let me say that he is acting very efficiently, I'm sure as efficiently as Queen's Park wants him to act on their behalf — he was given a considerable budget, in our case something like $375,000, to operate the setting up of the region from the summer until Jan. 1 when the councillors take over. During that time he has ample money to prepare studies, to do more studies, to hire whoever he wishes, to set up and use committees to get people working, and by the time the regional council takes over it appears to the average layman that all it is doing is rubber-stamping whatever the regional chairman has said.

I was so bold as to ask the mayor of our municipality why it is that it appears that all the new regional council is doing is rubber-stamping everything that the new chairman of the regional municipality suggests to it. He said: "Well, you know, Ed, Jack comes in with everything well researched, well presented in quadruplicate, with copious quotes from the various departments at Queen's Park of what we should have and everything. How can you argue with that? Everything is just as they would like to have it, and consequently we have no alternative but to pass it."

Well, I don't think that the Ministry of Social and Family Services, for instance, while meeting with the local committee of social services under the regional government last fall, is qualified to say that we need 10 additional field workers in our social services committee of regional government. This came directly from the advisers from Queen's Park when they met with the local people.

I think the secret to a successful regional government has to be an evolutionary process where the people in the area develop

the programmes on the priorities that they want. This cannot be accomplished if you have a superimposed chairman who is not elected by the people of the area but is appointed from Queen's Park. Consequently, I just can't understand why this government would go so far as to appoint a civil servant from Toronto to be regional chairman in Sudbury. It just doesn't make any sense to me at all.

The administrative hierarchy is built up before the new councillors take over on Jan. 1, when the regional government starts, and consequently they have no alternative but to accept.

It's interesting to note, and this point I think I must discuss very briefly, that the officials from the Ministry of Transportation and Communications met with the area governments in our regional government section, which are the three rural governments in my riding, and the press reports came out this way: "Wilmot Approves Road Needs Study Despite Arguments of Blackmail." What really happened was the Ministry of Transportation and Communications officials simply told the area government councils: "If you don't do a road needs study, do you know what's going to happen."

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Good: "You won't get any more subsidy than you got last year. Now take your choice." It was as simple as that.

Well on the road needs study, what would normally happen in rural municipalities is that at the beginning of the year the councillors would probably get in a bus or a couple of cars, take the road superintendent or the county engineer with them, and make a complete run up and down all the roads. They would note which bridges looked as though they needed repair, the length of the time they had been constructed and so on. Perhaps after two days of surveying, the engineer or the road superintendent would make his report to council that: "Well, we have to do some work on this road; we have to do some work on that road; and we have to do some here." And it would be done, and perhaps accomplished for as little as a few hundred dollars. But that isn't good enough when you come to regional government.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): They want the experts.

Mr. Good: The province comes up and tells you that you have to hire a consulting firm, and let me make it plain right here that the province told them they could not hire a consulting firm that hadn't done this type of work before. In other words, you've got to use the people who are doing it for the government all the time.

On top of that, the other report from Woolwich township says they made it clear —and when they say "they", it means the officials from the ministry—made it clear before they opened the bids that they would not necessarily accept the low tender. In other words, "we've got to steer this into its proper channels."

And the only argument the provincial representatives have is: "Don't worry about it, if it does cost $20,000, we're going to pay 75 per cent of it." Well I just don't buy that kind of logic, that it doesn't matter on the local level how much it costs because the province is paying 75 per cent. From whom does the province think it gets its money? The same people! There is only one taxpayer, and he has to get hooked at three levels.

These townships have no alternative but to bow to the demands of the provincial officials, and so they have to inaugurate the road needs study.

Mr. Speaker, I had some other local issues I wanted to speak about but I did give my word I would leave sufficient time for the next speaker. In that regard I think we must recognize that the government does conduct the business of the House and if they want to wind this thing up tonight I don't think it's in very good taste, as the speaker before me did, to take almost two hours in delivering an address.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lanark.

Mr. D. J. Wiseman (Lanark): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to have this opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech debate.

In the field of housing, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see we are continuing to help the moderate income wage earner. In Lanark county we have had a reasonable growth rate in both senior citizens and low-rental units, but there is still continued need for more growth in both of these areas. I am hopeful that our government will continue to help Lanark county along these lines.

I would also like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, some notes I have made in regard to Design for Development on the eastern Ontario programmes.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I bet the member was really happy with that one.

Mr. Wiseman: We surely were. I have been told that this booklet was published with the intention of having the people of the area involved in the direction of their communities. The people of Lanark county have come up with some good ideas and briefs, explaining their feelings and the direction they would like to take.

In Lanark county we had many well-attended meetings in the towns of Perth, Smiths Falls and Almonte. I feel that the residents of my riding have made their point, and have done it quite strongly, in advising the civil servants who prepared the booklet that in Lanark county we cannot live on tourism alone.

Mr. Speaker, in Lanark county we have industrial parks with good services at reasonable rates per acre. We need, and have the right to expect, a reasonable growth rate in industry. We need industry in all of our towns throughout Lanark county and not concentrated in one area, so that the residents don't have to drive an unreasonable distance to and from their place of employment every day.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the area of tourism, as it affects my riding. Tourism plays a very important role in Lanark county because we have so many beautiful lakes and rivers within our boundaries. I am pleased to see our government including new guidelines for financial assistance to the tourism industry—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The minister doesn't believe that, does he?

Mr. Wiseman: —as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I hope that this assistance will come in the form of low-interest loans to enable the tourist operators to renovate and update their premises and to meet the demands placed upon them.

I was also pleased to read in the Speech from the Throne that we are going to be asked to approve a programme designed to increase our government's activity in the area of forest management. I believe that this programme is essential to all communities, and particularly to my county of Lanark. There have been instances in the county where people from outside have come in and cut logs, leaving the bush in a very poor condition. I am sure that the residents who have brought these problems to my attention in the past will be very pleased with the new programme of forest management.

Mr. Speaker, I am greatly in favour of land-use controls where agricultural land is concerned, so that good land may be retained for agricultural purposes. Being a farmer myself, it breaks my heart to see good agricultural land being used for housing when we in Lanark have many areas that are rocky and unsuitable for farming—

Mr. Haggerty: The member has got the minister's attention now.

Mr. Wiseman: —but would be well suited for building housing projects. In the near future we are going to need every acre of agricultural land that we can lay our hands on because of the ever-increasing demands to supply food to a growing population.

With regard to land use as it applies to our lakes and rivers in eastern Ontario and in Lanark county, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the government explain to the people their reasons for limiting development on the lakes in many areas. I would like to suggest that a meeting be set up in the areas of natural resources, municipal affairs, health and environment, outlining the reasons for restricting further development along our lakes.

The people should be told that by cleaning up their septic systems and so on, we will be able to open up our lakes to controlled development. If we find as we have in the past, that one-third of our septic systems are not in working order, we should try to develop a programme whereby the residents should be forced to install new septic systems with government assistance in the form of low-interest loans over an extended period.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that a programme of this kind would help to encourage people to improve their septic systems and would further open the beautiful lands along the lakeshores to more residents.

Mr. Stokes: The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) doesn't agree with that.

Mr. Wiseman: The final area that I wish to comment on, Mr. Speaker, is the area of roads. I feel that the people of Lanark county need more money for road improvement. The funds they received last year were not sufficient to keep the roads in a satisfactory condition. I realize we are holding the line on spending, Mr. Speaker, but I hope the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) will be given a budget that will enable our people to have the type of roads that they deserve and have become accustomed to.

Mr. Stokes: They are spending it all on Toronto.

Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to see the Minister of Transportation and Communications investigate the possibility of establishing a GO train system from Almonte, Carleton Place and Smiths Falls to Ottawa. I believe that this type of transportation system would enable many of the young people in the area to stay in Lanark county and work in Ottawa, returning to their homes at night. It would also be a good service to our senior citizens and residents of the county as they would be able to visit Ottawa quite frequently. I feel that this system would also benefit residents of Ottawa who would like to visit the rural areas without the necessity of taking a car.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I feel that we will have a very productive and worthwhile session, and I know the government will continue to assist my area, as it will all of Ontario during this session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: Applause from all two of his colleagues.

Mr. Bounsall: Oh, there are more than two here.

I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, the lack of any reference in the Speech from the Throne to impending changes in labour legislation in Ontario, or the introduction of any new legislation or any reference to it, particularly in the area of outlawing professional strike-breaking firms. We have seen them cause so much damage – perhaps irreparable damage – to labour relations at certain industrial locations in Ontario; souring relationships for years, and perhaps permanently, between specific industries and their bargaining agents representing the workers in those plants.

Canadian Driver Pool Ltd. and its guiding force, Mr. Richard Grange – the most blatant example of such disruptive efforts – appears at the moment to have disappeared from the scene temporarily; no doubt, only temporarily. We must formulate now in this province, legislation that makes illegal all strike-breaking activity, and management consultant services – as they now so euphemistically call the services which they provide.

Mr. Speaker, never were the disruptive and violent results of Canadian Driver Pool activities more evident for all to observe than in the strike at Dare Foods (Biscuit Division) Ltd. in Kitchener by Local 173 of the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Soft drink and Distillery Workers of America. This is a long and bitter strike. It is long and bitter primarily because of the introduction on the scene of this strike-breaking company, 10½ months ago to date, with violent passions engendered on both sides to the point of violence on occasion.

I am going to spend some time, Mr. Speaker, developing and laying out the steps which occurred in this particular strike, which in many ways is a microcosm of all that is still wrong in labour relations in Ontario and negligent in labour legislation in this province. The areas that I can see where our labour relations are falling down, and our legislation is not adequate, are these:

1. The use of professional strike-breaking firms, and the permission by this Legislature for them to operate, through the legislative inactivity by this government in prohibiting them—this government which does little better or little more than observe with interest their machinations and whose members, at best, shake their heads in sadness at the chaos they produce, and then only when we extract it out of the government by questions from this side of the House.

2. The involvement of the judiciary in this province by the continued use of injunctions in labour disputes—and to a certain extent, although this could not be handled in a legislative sense, by the decisions and sentences which it hands down.

3. In labour relations and matters, the employment of the police in every instance on behalf of the company. Indeed, under our present laws they can't do very much otherwise, even if they felt so inclined.

4. The application of the legislation relating to collective bargaining in good faith in this province, and quotes from the Act such as, "making every reasonable effort to reach a collective agreement." Mr. Speaker, these are meaningless motherhood phrases when the ministry will not, independently, assess a situation and apply the statutes themselves in a given situation, rather than one side—usually the bargaining agent—applying them itself; and in the case of not bargaining in good faith, with such pittance fines resulting when successful. The feeling across the whole of the labour movement in this province is that one really just shouldn't

bother unless one is purely interested only in scoring debating points.

5. The whole attitude of the government-industrial complex to equality of women and their rights and their dignity in this province—a situation which the Ministry of Labour has not felt inclined to really change, in spite of having under its aegis the Women's Bureau and the Ontario Human Rights Commission and Code. It has not given the proper leadership.

Returning particularly to the Dare situation, Mr. Speaker, this company has a 10-year history of collective bargaining with the Brewery Workers since they received their certification in 1963. One year prior to that, in 1962, the Brewery Workers failed narrowly to receive certification when the executive vice-president addressed all three shifts within the plant within the time limit that he was allowed. This caused the vote to be shifted into the period of the summer when a considerable number of employees were on vacation.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, in that 1962 vote the reason for the address to all three shifts, when normally only two shifts are employed at this particular plant, was because a third shift had been recently added. The third shift was added because of the strike at the Vancouver, B.C. plant of the one other division of Dare which makes biscuits. The attempt was, of course, to have the west coast of Canada supplied with biscuits produced in this unorganized Dare factory in Ontario.

I will mention at this point a certain personal involvement of a long-range sort in this particular company at Kitchener; and in the actions that took place in 1962 when certification was not gained, and in 1963 when it was.

My wife, Joanne—then my fiancee in 1962—worked with the employees at Dare, first on the packing belt, where in 1962 she received a take-home pay that varied between $30 and $35 a week for standing on her feet throughout the shift in temperatures that sometimes ranged as high as 130 deg. Partway through that summer, Mr. Speaker, she was shifted to the personnel department and with the grandiose take-home pay for this advancement of $50 a week.

In both positions that she occupied she was involved, one might say, in helping the workers to form themselves into a union. One might say that she was a union agitator—although in the second half of her employment it was assumed by this company that, of course, she wasn't.

To return to the present situation at Dare—or by "the present situation," meaning a return to almost a year ago — contract negotiations commenced in February, 1972, for renewal of the contract, with April 30, 1972, being the termination date of that contract. Memoranda of agreement were prepared in fact, Mr. Speaker — they had got that far—to the terms of which the negotiating committee agreed.

Finally, on May 27, a secret ballot vote was taken by the membership of that unit, 75 to 80 per cent of which were women. They rejected the final offer on the basis of the discrimination against women. It offered both men and women 30 cents an hour increase in the first year of the contract, but in the second year of the contract, it provided for 10 cents an hour difference between men and women, the offer being 25 cents and 15 cents respectively.

This was incredible in this day of a heightened consciousness of women's contribution to the workplace and to our society—incredible in this day of women's rightful demands for equal opportunity and equal treatment.

In the light of subsequent events that occurred at Dare, Mr. Speaker, one almost suspects that this discriminatory offer was deliberately tendered, knowing that the workers could not and would not agree. Ninety-seven per cent are reported to have voted to reject this contract based on discrimination between men and women.

It was a case, therefore, of the women standing up for their rights in this plant, but the men standing with them in support of those rights. This was on May 27. On May 29, at midnight, the strike commenced with a special picket line thrown up around the company.

Well, it's hard to speculate, but with this small difference—and this being the main point of rejection of the contract; a 10 cent an hour differential between men and women—one might have suspected that the strike would be of short duration and that Dare cookies would soon be available to the general public in the Province of Ontario.

Such was not to be the case, Mr. Speaker, because almost immediately, Canadian Driver Pool — with its whole strike-breaking organization and its group of employees with their shatterproof trucks — was brought into this situation. They arrived on the scene on June 1, ostensibly for the purpose of removing

from the plant the cookies which had been produced prior to the strike. However, as is well documented in many other areas across this province where Driver Pool has been involved, they employed much more than that.

In this situation they did not bring their dogs across the picket lines, which has been so often their action and so often has accelerated feelings between the workers and the company. But they certainly brought in their cameras and their security guards with the intent of alienating as much as possible the workers in this strike.

The direct involvement of this strike-breaking firm did not appear to last very long—June 1 through June 5, increasing to a large degree of intensity, disappearing from the scene around June 9 roughly. However, the very appearance at this site of a strike-breaking firm—with its history in this province, with those heading this company having been charged under various Acts in this province for their activities concerning unions was bound to, and it certainly did at this point, cause feelings to be tremendously accelerated.

On June 6 a very regrettable incident occurred. It is now estimated that $38,000 worth of damage occurred at this company as windows were broken in both cars and in the factory. There are charges pending on the events of this particular night. One can say two things of that night. It was certainly brought on by the appearance of Driver Pool and the rest of its strike-breakers at that site. There were outside people involved. At one point in this strike, the representatives of the Brewery Workers and some of the striking workers at this company joined hands in an attempt to keep the outsiders from perpetrating further damage at the site.

There is some evidence—certainly not complete in the sense of being able to indicate specifically where and in what manner — to indicate that not all the damage was done by the outside agitators; but there was some damage, as tempers flared on both sides to make the situation appear worse than what it was, by people inside the plant. That damage could not be attributed to either the Brewery Workers or whoever the outside people were in this situation.

The police at this point, by and large, took a hands-off attitude. There were many on the scene. They stood back and watched what was happening, almost as if they were willing to see the $45,000—which was first reported and then more reliably estimated to be $38,000—of damage proceed. They stood back and watched. When the group of workers joined arms to try to hold back various people causing the damage and to prevent further damage occurring, they did not, it appears, join with them in this endeavour or in any particular way try to cool down the feelings of the people so involved.

Mr. Speaker, this very regrettable incident occurred. It was top news in all the newspapers in Ontario. When one reflects that all this damage occurred and that Driver Pool was involved, all because of 10 cents an hour less offered to women than to men in the second year of a contract, it's almost incredible. To continue further on this women's aspect, one can say this was in a sense, a very small stand for women's rights, although a very important one. The women in this plant were not saying they wanted equal pay with the men in the plant.

An hon. member: They should have been.

Mr. Bounsall: They had different jobs. They were not really stressing at this point that they wanted complete openness and access to those jobs; which they could have done. They were saying something very much less. They were just saying that no matter what jobs they had they would like to see—and we are saying this as well—they would like to see the same increases pertaining to both men and women; which situation did pertain and was offered in the first year of the two-year contract that was being negotiated.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): It should be legislated, but this government will never do it. It is sexist—and gutless!

Mr. Bounsall: There was an opportunity at this time in light of the situation that developed—really before the situation developed—that having known about details of this particular offer, the Ministry of Labour, if it were really involved in seeing that women had their rightful opportunity in this province and their dignity in this province, should and could have been suggesting to Mr. Carl Dare, the owner of the company, or the executive vice-president Mr. Thoms, that it might be appropriate in the second year of this contract to make the offer of equal pay to both men and women employees. In point of fact —

Mr. Laughren: Where was the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon)?

Mr. Bounsall: —the whole situation of this company and what it has offered over the

years does not make a very sterling impression that it is interested very much in helping its employees in any material way.

Let's take a look, for example, at the situations that pertain to this plant in Kitchener and to the plant in Vancouver.

In Vancouver one has a 40-hour week. In Kitchener one has a 42½-hour week; they were hoping to reduce it to 40. For female work—this is mainly in the packing area—at Kitchener the rate is $2.26 an hour; at Vancouver, $3.06 an hour. Here we have a company in Ontario which is not very interested in seeing that equal opportunity prevails among its men and women workers in terms of jobs; it is not really interested in seeing that parity be achieved. It is not at all interested, apparently, in seeing that they are treated equally in terms of offers for the future. It also has such a sorry record in terms of what it pays here in Ontario relative to what is being paid in Vancouver.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): And this is supposed to be the province of opportunity.

Mr. Laughren: Where is the Women's Bureau?

Hon. E. A. Winkler: (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): It is there.

An hon. member: They get 80 cents an hour less.

Mr. Foulds: Almost $1 less.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not better, the best.

Mr. Bounsall: How can this province, which is supposed to be the province of opportunity, see 80 cents an hour less for the women in this province? This is a commentary, Mr. Speaker, I believe, on what the Ministry of Labour thinks is acceptable—or, by its omission of activity in this area, thinks is acceptable. The male help, for that matter, isn't that much better relative to Vancouver. The male help, as a starting salary, runs from $2.66 to $2.95 in Ontario, compared to $3.77 to $4.07 in Vancouver.

I have more remarks on this subject, Mr. Speaker, but as we are at a natural break point in my remarks before I shift into another major area, I would like to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary to adjourn the debate. The hon. member may carry on when we resume at 8.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 10, 1973

Kingston tercentenary, statement by Mr. Apps 723

Federal-provincial meeting of industry ministers, statement by Mr. Bennett 724

Great Lakes flood damage, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Spence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid 724

Adoption of foreign children, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. R. F. Nixon 726

Government intentions on regionalization, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. R. F. Nixon 727

Ontario Northland Railway, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon 730

Espanola water condition, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Good 731

Ryerson radio station, questions of Mr. McNie: Mrs. Scrivener, Mr. R. F. Nixon 732

Use of government aircraft, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Sargent 732

Great Lakes flood damage, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Burr 732

Elizabeth Gardens project, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Bounsall 733

Ontario Hydro labour dispute, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deacon 733

Air pollution in Toronto, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Shulman 733

Jail sentence for keeping dogs, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Good 733

Great Lakes flood damage, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Deans 733

Early learning programme, questions of Mr. Wells: Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Lewis 734

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Drea, first reading 735

Waste Disposal and Reclamation Act, bill to establish, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 735

Adjudicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roy, first reading 736

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Good, Mr. Wiseman, Mr. Bounsall 737

Recess, 6 o'clock 769

No. 19



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1973

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West was speaking at the hour of recess.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I will continue more briefly, perhaps, than I did before the break for supper at 6 o'clock.

In the situation at Dare Foods Co., Kitchener, there is, as I mentioned, a prolonged strike. It has gone on for 10½ months and is mainly based on the fact that in the second year of the contract the women at that plant were offered 10 cents an hour less than the men were offered. Their first year of the contract was identical.

Mr. Speaker, I have already mentioned the introduction into this strike of a firm which is guaranteed to escalate feelings, that is Canadian Driver Pool. Its continued presence for some days escalated feelings on both sides while it trucked out the products already manufactured before the strike came into being.

We had violence which occurred on June 6. We now move into the interesting area of the continued use in this province of injunctions in labour disputes. On June 12, Dare Foods obtained an injunction from the Supreme Court of Ontario which would allow peaceful entrance to and exit from the plant. This was to assure, Mr. Speaker, that the products could be moved from that plant and that people could enter freely and perhaps employees be found and hired — non-union employees, commonly referred to as scabs— in order possibly to continue production at this plant.

Ex-parte injunctions are no longer used in Ontario. Ex-parte injunctions passed out just a short time ago. Injunctions have been used in labour disputes since 1880 or 1890 as a means of breaking strikes and, even though the lawyers or representatives of the union involved in a strike may be present, they are still granted. One wonders just how much attention, if any, is paid to the representation made on behalf of the workers in this province with respect to any strike injunctions.

In many states in the United States injunctions are no longer granted in labour disputes; in some of them since 1936. It is time now—if not 20 or 30 years overdue—that the use of injunctions in labour disputes in this province be banned.

July 6 saw the first appearance of non-union labour in large quantities at this plant.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): All injunctions or just ex-parte?

Mr. Bounsall: Ex-parte are already not used in the Province of Ontario in labour disputes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No injunction should be permitted.

Mr. Bounsall: This is present in some states in the United States and in some states as far back as 1936.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was in 1937 when our labour laws took a great step forward as I recall it.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The member for Brant can remember! Like everything else the government was behind the times.

Mr. Bounsall: Some more violence arose at that time as the picketers, needless to say—with the involvement of Driver Pool and the history of this strike up to this point—were involved in some breaking of car windows and some jostling of the people attempting to get in. There were attempts by the strikers to prevent the entry of vehicles, and as a result, various court actions were taken by the company. I'll mention court actions in a little more detail later on. But it appears that again we had Canadian Driver Pool involved by the use of station wagons to bring personnel in and, of course, escorted throughout by the Kitchener police. The way our laws now read—laws which we should consider changing — they really had no other choice but to so do.

In any event, as a result of this a second injunction was passed on July 14 which limited severely the number of pickets to four at any one time at any one of the four entrances. The picketers were limited to Dare employees and officers of the local union No. 173. It, in fact, prohibited international staff of this union from going on the picket line, and if there is any group of people who might be able to not further escalate feelings but bring more sanity and rationality to a situation it would be some of the international staff. It's an unusual decision, as far as I can see, that members of this group should have been prohibited from appearing on the picket line as one of those four.

The injunction further required that at least 50 per cent of the pickets at any one entrance be women. This injunction assured continued production at this plant, even in a very small way if you like, by the use of strikebreaking employees, employees who would be assured of being transported into the plant under the care and protection of the police.

I might just mention at this point a couple of small thoughts on the police involvement in this strike. I'm not going to dwell unduly on it except to say that there was one incident which was indeed interesting.

On Monday, June 5—this was when Driver Pool was still sending large vehicles into this plant to take out the production—on Highway 8, at about noon, there was a three-vehicle pileup. This came about as a result of tractor-trailers heading for the strikebound plant being involved in a collision when, as they were being escorted by a police cruiser at their head, they collided when the police cruiser pulled up rather sharply, having noticed a radio station news car of CHYM stationed near the Freeport Bridge to report on their noon-hour news the arrival of any further vehicles to help in the removal of production. As the cruiser braked it was struck from behind by a green panel truck which, in turn, was rammed by the lead tractor-trailer heading for the strike. Other tractor-trailers then piled into each other. Each truck carried a driver and a passenger and some three persons were injured.

There was a bit of a furore in Kitchener police circles as to what authority this particular policeman had outside of the boundaries of Kitchener in the apparent escorting of trucks of Driver Pool to Dare, and his immediate reaction upon seeing a radio station car which might be reporting their approach. The damage was estimated at $8,150 and it's reported that Canadian Driver Pool was paying the damages that resulted from these collisions.

The only other thing that I might report about police involvement is that the chief of police in Kitchener was often heard to complain about the cost of that strike to the taxpayers of the city of Kitchener, as they were all required to be paid overtime for duty at that particular location. When one policeman was being paid $8 or $9 an hour, and in some cases there were 40-plus policemen there, the police were being paid over $300 an hour and sometimes close to $400 an hour to be present.

These police turned up repeatedly. They were sent by the city of Kitchener and by the police chief, in spite of requests on the part of the union to have the police not appear as that seemed to them to be one of the causes of tempers and feelings being escalated. In spite of their requests, they were sent at that terrific cost per hour to the taxpayers of the city of Kitchener.

One might ask what was the company doing, apart from employing the services of strike-breakers throughout all this? In mid-June it withdrew all its previous offers and put back on the bargaining table the fact that it would no longer agree to a union shop or checkoff provisions. It demanded that the union pay the full amount of the damages that occurred to the company property as a result of the June 6 incidents there. They also continued in the month of July and thereafter to advertise quite widely for workers in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record. In point of fact, Manpower in the city of Kitchener provided workers for this particular opening.

When the federal Minister of Labour was informed that they were referring people to the strikebound plants, a spokesman, on being questioned said that the federal job placement service tries to maintain neutrality when dealing with a strike-breaking plant.

He said, "We cannot refuse service to a company where there is a strike. We accept their requirements when the job seeker shows an interest in vacancies at that plant, but we make very sure he knows about the strike. Any referral slip we give a potential employee records the fact that we are informing him of the strike, but it's his job to make the decision as to whether or not to go."

That's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that throughout this with the company on strike Manpower should be playing this sort of a

role in interfering with labour relations in the Province of Ontario—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Absolutely shameful!

Mr. Bounsall: —and be referring prospective employees to a strikebound plant. I think that should no longer be tolerated in the civilized areas of our province, where the province so often tries it appears, with greater or lesser degrees of success, to solve the differences amongst the parties involved.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Shameful, but not surprising.

Mr. Bounsall: They also put out several letters and made numerous phone calls to all employees of the company to persuade them to return. They used the technique of phoning one person up and saying her particular friend—the company was small enough so that one knew who were friends of whom—is thinking of returning to work or was going to be returning to work, so why didn't she come back too? They made those two phone calls simultaneously, with the information being by and large incorrect in each case, so that one figured the other was going back and this caused both to turn up.

They also issued various letters to their employees. I won't read these letters in detail but, as a result of these letters, writs came out.

Mr. Laughren: Go ahead!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Read them.

Mr. Laughren: The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot) would like to hear them.

Mr. Bounsall: The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot) would like to hear them.

An hon. member: In detail.

Mr. Deans: Spell the big words.

Mr. Foulds: Being anti-labour, he'd like to hear these.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): I'd read them out.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Go ahead! I have heard a lot of fairy tales.

Mr. Deans: Spell the words over the size of "and."

Mr. Bounsall: Right. These are letters of June 23 and July 19, in which they—

Mr. Laughren: Try to get his attention first. The member for Timiskaming, please listen.

Mr. Bounsall: —really contravene various portions of the Labour Relations Act in intimidating and trying to change the salaries which they were offering, all of which is against the Labour Relations Act. This resulted in the Ontario Labour Relations Board on Oct. 5 granting the petition of the union for leave to prosecute the company under sections 56, 58(a), 58(c), 59 and 61 of the Labour Relations Act, which relate to the intimidation of the trade union and the representatives of the employees by their advertisements and their letters discriminating against members of the trade union because they are members of the trade union exercising their right, and because of advertisements to compel the employees to refrain from becoming or continuing to be members of the particular union. They said through the advertisements that William M. Thom, the executive vice-president, sought by intimidation and coercion to compel persons to refrain from becoming or continuing to be, and hopefully ceasing to be, members of that particular trade union.

Mr. Deans: He was following the government line.

Mr. Laughren: Shocking, but not surprising.

Mr. Bounsall: Leave to prosecute has been granted and I understand that the hearing in this particular prosecution is coming up this Friday.

Throughout this there have been attempts at mediation. On July 21 the mediation department convened a meeting in which the company did offer an additional 10 cents per hour to the female employees, and the employees had to agree to pay damages which the company sustained—the 10 cents an hour being the reason why the strike was held in the first place. But, here again, the offer was made in a way that couldn't possibly be accepted because it provided that the union shop clause had to be removed and the checkoff provisions dropped; so the acceptance of this would have meant that part of the plant would be run by union personnel and they would be allowed to use non-union personnel as well.

Shortly after the decision on Oct. 5, in which Local 173 was allowed to prosecute Dare, the company, presumably in a fit of pique over that particular decision and as

a result of a quite successful boycott of their products in some areas around the province and by some of the major supermarkets which did not renew their contracts with Dare until this strike was settled, filed a $1.6-million suit against the union and the Ontario Federation of Labour for this particular kind of action.

Another mediation attempt took place on Nov. 2. A Ministry of Labour mediator, Mr. Hal Howells, again came down and presented Dare's latest offer to the brewery workers. Again, it contained no union shop, no retroactive pay; the company would reserve the right to discipline or discharge employees convicted of offences. They said they would not rehire 10 employees, those names to be released after the agreement was reached; and there would be 10 employees who they would suspend for a further six months, and again with the names not to be released unless it was agreed to. They said they would pay the extra 10 cents an hour to the female workers in the second year, and withdrew the $38,000 damage claim.

Mr. Foulds: Sounds like the Court of the Star Chamber.

Mr. Bounsall: But again, it was automatic that this sort of proposal would be rejected with the entire security, retroactive pay and union shop points in that proposal. With respect to the women's involvement in this particular strike, the Ontario Committee on the Status of Women at one point in September wrote to Mr. C. M. Dare, the president of Dare Biscuits, and said to him, and I quote:

> On behalf of the fair employment practices subcommittee of the Ontario Committee on the Status of Women, I respectfully request that you personally make a sincere offer to bring management and striking workers at Dare Biscuits together and back to work because of the following practices, which in our opinion discriminate against women: A smaller wage offered to the women, thereby increasing the already wide gap between men's and women's wages; assembly-line speedups occurred whenever the company desired, all personnel being female that were involved; no fixed lunch breaks for women, subject to the company's requirements; female employees obliged to stand at all times; no sitting permitted in the work area even during a pause or breakdown in production; female workers obliged to raise their hands and ask permission to go to the washroom.

Again, they mention that the company employed the services of a strike-breaking firm, Canadian Driver Pool, against the strikers, over 80 per cent of whom were women. They go on to talk further in general about the strike, and it's signed by Pat Sellers, on behalf of the fair employment practices subcommittee of the Ontario committee on the status of women.

It shows how this group of women was concerned about what really is the major issue in this strike. When one looks further at the discrimination occurring against women here in this strike, one finds some other interesting points on which they would like to have some say, and I think which we would feel were only just.

One of the points is that women must wear dress uniforms as opposed to the men's uniforms, which do, of course, have pants. The women would like this same provision extended to them. This is rather important, because in the fly and mosquito time the packers on the belt have no opportunity to take care of this particular irritation, and sometimes it has become so bad that management goes down the line and sprays the women's legs. In one case, there was a woman who was doing a job usually done by a man, but who didn't receive the regular job pay because the company said she wasn't doing the full job. Later she was laid off and a man with much less experience and less seniority took over the job and he received the full job rate.

Mr. Laughren: Sounds like a civil service job to me.

Mr. Bounsall: One really wonders whether they were making any serious attempt at any time to be fair with the women in this company.

Mr. Foulds: Sounds like a task force on the state of early childhood education.

An hon. member: Sounds like the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells).

Mr. Bounsall: On the subject of washrooms, there are three washrooms for 30 men who are there per shift, and one washroom for the 70 to 100 women per shift who are employed at this plant.

Mr. Foulds: Intolerable discrimination.

Mr. Bounsall: There are several other minor points. The men have long, large

lockers; the women have boxlike ones. This again, in a plant in which 80 per cent of the workers are women.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at some length about all the injustices that have occurred here. I won't go on any further except to mention another odd point or two about the extent to which feelings were affected in this particular strike. It lead to the death of one particular employee, by suicide, a Mr. David Ruston, who—as a result of his activities on the night of July 2 and July 7, when the first group of strike-breakers was being escorted in by the police and Driver Pool—was charged and a court order issued that he had to stay 1,000 feet away from the picket line, have no contact with union members, and could no longer attend union meetings. This person, Mr. Speaker, was very depressed by this and eventually in the month of August committed suicide because of this depression. At least, he committed suicide by asphyxiation; it would appear that the particular requirements laid on him as a result of this activity brought it about.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, there have been six people charged and sentenced in this strike. Four of them are appealing; one is serving sentence and one person has already completed his sentence. Again, it shows the degree of feelings involved in this strike for events of this nature to take place. What is needed in this strike, Mr. Speaker, beyond any shadow of a doubt, is that from here on in, if possible, feelings be cooled as much as possible in the hope that a reasonable settlement can be achieved; a settlement which would allow these women to return to work under conditions that are humane and just to them.

Throughout this, acts of violence occurred on both sides, particularly with the introduction of the professional strike-breaking company, Canadian Driver Pool. In this province, we must form legislation to prevent the operation of any and all professional strike-breaking companies.

When the history of labour in this half century in this province is written, this strike will certainly be recorded as the first instance when women really stood up for their rights in this province and the men stood with them. This is a strike which, as I say, will go down in history and from that point, if no other, is a very just one.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, before the next speaker in this debate, I might draw to the attention of the House that we have the galleries filled tonight with residents of Scarborough North. This is an annual pilgrimage to Queen's Park and I thought I would mention that in about 15 minutes these people will leave and the other 200 waiting outside will take their place.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I deem it an honour to be given this opportunity to speak to the assembly considering that I have occupied this seat in the House for such a short period of time.

Before I begin my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the wise old saying, "Blessed be the man who, having nothing to say, refrains from giving ample evidence of that fact." If at the end of my speech, Mr. Speaker, I am able to sense the feeling of the assembly and I am left with the impression that I should have taken a message from this saying, I won't be too highly insulted. From my brief observations I am quite convinced I won't have been the only one who stood in these chambers to speak and actually had very little, if anything, of great importance to say.

However, in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, I do have something important to say! Before launching out in my delivery I think it is worthy of note that I am talking, more or less, into a vacuum for as I look out over the House all I can see are empty blue chairs. I realize that anything I might say at this early stage of my political life might be considered by the more experienced members to be of very little significance, and that more important work is awaiting them elsewhere.

However, I was shocked to see the ministers and most of the other members of the Conservative Party vacate their chairs when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) stood up to debate the Speech from the Throne. And in my humble opinion this was the most disgraceful, distasteful, disrespectful and irresponsible act that I have ever seen performed by persons who are supposedly entrusted with the ability and authority and confidence of their constituents to govern the affairs of the country with a certain degree of accountability and responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, at the swearing-in ceremony for the hon. member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), and myself, and at the same time we were introduced to the Legislature, you witnessed the attendance of some 250 people

from our riding, the large majority of whom, sir, have never been in the House before. And you must have been embarrassed, as I was, to see the Conservative members vacate their chairs when the hon. leader of the Liberal Party got up to debate the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that these people were astounded at such behaviour. It was not only their feeling, but mine as well, that if more of the electorates throughout Ontario would visit the House unannounced while it was in session, the Conservatives might find themselves sitting on the opposition side of the House after the next general election.

It is our contention, Mr. Speaker, that this will happen anyway—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Right on.

Mr. Riddell: —for never has the Province of Ontario been in such a sorry state of affairs as it is in today, simply because of irresponsible government; and the people now know it.

At the time of the by-elections, Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Davis) and his colleagues stated many times that the Liberal and NDP candidates were creating issues that didn't exist. Red herrings, they called it! Well, Mr. Speaker, with a provincial deficit of $800 million, or as it has been more accurately predicted, $1 billion, I would prefer to think that we were dealing with a big blue herring! And the sooner that this big blue herring is diminished in size, either through genetic means or more preferably through elected means, the sooner accountability will be brought back to government.

The threat of regional government in our riding was supposedly another red herring, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is now denying charges that he ever intended regional government to become established in western Ontario. Yet the former member for Huron and his hand-picked candidate, who contested the by-election in the Huron riding, openly stated that regional government was recommended for Huron county, but on a present county boundary basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you can tell me how regional government can be kept within the confines of present boundaries when it can't hope to meet the population guidelines laid down by the government of 150,000. Huron county has a population of 52,000 people and the largest urban centre in the county has a population of around 6,000 people, which in itself wouldn't even qualify for local government guidelines of 10,000 to 12,000 people under a regional government system.

This means that for regional government to become established in western Ontario under the present standards, neighbouring counties would have to be amalgamated with Huron county and three or four towns scattered across the riding would have to be governed by one body.

Mr. Speaker, I can inform you that the constituents in the Huron riding are not going to be treated as nothing more than a cog in a wheel of the big blue machine. And municipal governments are not going to disband in favour of a bureaucracy.

I firmly believe that the results of the last two by-elections have given the Premier a pretty good indication that people still want to have a say in the affairs of their country. It is rather obvious that the Premier is starting to listen. Saturday's edition of the London Free Press quoted the Treasurer (Mr. White) who, I am sure consults with the Premier once in a while, as saying that the provincial government will consider a two-year moratorium on the implementation of regional government in the Hamilton-Wentworth area. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this two-year period is simply a random selection or could it be coincidental with the time set for the next general election?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Could be!

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): It was in the last election.

Mr. Riddell: It would appear that the government is losing the confidence of the people and it knows this only too well at this particular stage of the game.

I call it a game, Mr. Speaker, because really the government has been playing games at the expense of the taxpayers. Rather than acting in the best interests of the country, many of the ministers and their colleagues have obviously been acting in their own selfish interests along with those of their friends. As long as this government is re-elected with such an overbearing majority, I am afraid the trend will continue whereby a few people become very wealthy at the expense of many.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Riddell: I will even go out on a limb, Mr. Speaker, and say that many of the present members of the Conservative Party

will, in all probability, not choose to contest the next general election—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Dreamer!

Mr. Riddell: —simply because they have lost faith in their party policies and administration and, more particularly, in their present leadership.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How about that!

Mr. Riddell: As an example of my predictions, I would be surprised if the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) contests the next election, not because he is dissatisfied with the affairs of his own ministry but because he is a man of integrity. He must surely be disturbed—

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): He only took $3,000.

Mr. Riddell: —with some of the practices of his colleagues.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): And he's afraid of Max Chikofsky!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Riddell: I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to pay my respects to Bill Stewart. I believe he is one of the few ministers who know what is going on within their ministries. I think, by and large, that Mr. Stewart has served the rural people of Ontario well.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I would like to point out, with respect, to the hon. member that we do not refer to ministers by their first names or last names. We must use the term, the hon. minister.

Mr. Riddell: My apologies, sir.

Mr. Ruston: He doesn't mind. Bill doesn't mind.

Mr. Riddell: I think, by and large, that the hon. Mr. Stewart—the hon. minister—

Mr. Lewis: The member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) wrote this portion.

Mr. Riddell: —has served the rural people of Ontario well—

Mr. Germa: He is going to pave the farmyard.

Mr. Riddell: —through his ministry. I am sure that he has not only been a great asset to his constituency and rural people right across Ontario—but also to the Conservative Party in the Ontario Legislature.

Mr. Havrot: Just like the rest of the Conservative members.

Mr. Riddell: Although we might fault him for using poor judgement in some matters, such as spending $3,000 of the taxpayers' money to pave his feed lot, I do not believe that his intentions were ever to sacrifice the people of Ontario for his own personal gain.

An hon. member: What is the member talking about?

Mr. Riddell: While I am handing out bouquets, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the former member for the Huron riding who most certainly was a good man for Huron, and obviously, by the number of ministries that he headed in government during his political career, he must have been considered a good man for the Conservative Party; and I am sure he must have been well respected by his own colleagues and leaders.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Riddell: However, the former member for Huron, to the amazement of his own supporters, blemished his character somewhat: first by forcing his executive assistant, Mr. Southcott, on the people in the recent by-election; and second, by stating after the election results were in that the people of Huron county would regret their decision. I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that this was a statement made at the spur of the moment, and if the former member for Huron had given this matter some thought, he would have realized the complete absurdity of such a statement and no doubt would have abstained from making it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, he is on the racing commission now; so he will feel a little better about that.

Mr. Riddell: However, because the statement was made, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to say that I will work every bit as hard as the former member for Huron did for the betterment of society in Huron county—and in Ontario for that matter. If I fail to live up to this commitment, then I will be prepared to surrender my position with integrity and with honour when the next election rolls around. And I trust that I will be man enough to congratulate my successor and wish him the very best in his future endeavours.

An hon. member: See what happens.

Mr. Havrot: It will be another Conservative.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, as yet I have said very little about Huron county, but I feel obligated to do so seeing that it is one of the most aggressive and self-sustaining counties in Ontario, and is unique in that there's practically an even balance of rural and urban people with the scale being tipped a little in favour of the rural people.

I was somewhat amused but also highly insulted by the statement that Mr. Southcott, Conservative candidate in the last by-election, made in a flyer that he sent out across the riding. The article read as follows:

> Don Southcott says he is amazed at the talent he found while covering the riding. He says he has met more people who are sure that they can do three things better than anyone else on earth—like drive a car, make love and organize a political campaign.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): In that order, yes.

Mr. Riddell: Have you ever heard such nonsense—

Mr. Singer: Tory nonsense.

Mr. Riddell: —from one who aspired to become a political figure?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Sounds like the member for Downsview.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, any time we in this Legislature think that we have been bestowed with God-given rights and talents that others supposedly do not possess, then we had better get back out into our constituencies and observe for ourselves that God shows no favouritism.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I hope those Tories up there are better at making love than they are at organizing a Tory campaign.

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Agriculture and Food is disgusted at that.

Mr. Riddell: Huron county has very capable people at local and county levels who are able to plan and make decisions on their own initiative and who are not prepared to accept policies imposed by the Ontario government without being consulted and without having a voice in the proposal of policies which will ultimately affect the area in which they live and work. They remember too well the railroad job that was done in establishing county school boards.

Mr. Singer: Order, Mr. Speaker, for the members who want to listen.

Mr. Riddell: They have seen the cost of education escalate beyond reason, since the centralization of our local schools and school boards.

Strange as it may seem, the added costs have not been justified by an enhanced educational system. According to an article in Saturday's London Free Press, 22 London elementary public schools were checked and the tests showed that pupils are below the national standard in many subject areas such as vocabulary, mathematical concepts and mathematical problem solving. This may not have anything to do with the administration of our schools, but it does say something about the educational programme which is supposedly designed for the benefit of the students.

As a former trustee of the Huron county school board, I respect the ability and dedication of my former colleagues and the board's administrators. I am inclined to believe that larger units of administration have made possible the provision of special education services that would not have been economically possible under the former fragmented system. However, the centralization of our local school boards under a county system is a typical example of the workings of regional government where the powers and authority and the decisions rests with the provincial government.

The regional governments are expected to cater to its every whim and fancy. The county school boards are really nothing more than rubber stamps. I am sure that if the boards had been given the responsibility of running their own affairs, our educational standards would not now be jeopardized because of imposed ceilings on the boards' budgets.

I think I should point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the boards of education were not responsible for the building of more schools in the wake of declining enrolment, but that such misjudgement and mismanagement of public funds again stems from the complete inadequacy of the present government.

An hon. member: Right on. The minister's got the message. He's got to go.

Mr. Havrot: Blame it on the school boards.

Mr. Singer: The minister knows. He knows.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Restrain yourself.

Mr. Riddell: As a result, schools will be closed down and many teachers will be dismissed.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Did the member for Downsview write that? Did he write that speech?

Mr. Singer: Wells' speech? No, no; the minister won't listen to me.

Mr. Riddell: How then do you explain the expenditures that are tied up in these vacated schools? I am probably not as concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the business administration of our schools as I am about the educational programmes to which our young people are subjected. Our educational curriculums have been bounced around like a volleyball, dating back to the time that Mr. Robarts was Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. Singer: Education.

Mr. Riddell: Minister of Education, pardon me.

Mr. Singer: He ran it like the Department of Agriculture.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Riddell: The greatest bounce came when the present Premier was acting in that capacity. We have seen the system go from one of structured courses, basic compulsory subjects, and disciplinary measures, to one of open concepts, a do-your-own-thing attitude, a definite lack of discipline, and now a credit system that has affected secondary school education much more than the formation of larger units of administration.

The credit system might have some merits, but I am inclined to believe that pupils at the grade 8 level are neither mature enough, wise enough nor sufficiently sure of future goals to pick the right subjects, if there are such things, for grade 9. I am afraid that many grade subjects are picked either on the basis of prejudice of older brothers or sisters, sometimes even parents, or on the consensus of popularity by the peer group. Sometimes a rather frustrating or bitter past experience with a teacher can easily colour a youngster's perspective. Conversely, a happy experience that has nothing really to do with the subject itself can have a powerful influence.

I am one of the proponents of a compulsory course at the first- and second-year levels in secondary school education, and I'm sure that had the Premier been compelled to study mathematics in secondary school, he could have added $600 million and $200 million and arrived at $800 million with very little difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, if you will pardon the digression, I will get back to remarks I wish to make about Huron county. At the present time there are in the county 16 townships with a population of approximately 29,000, there are five towns with a population of 18,500 people, and five villages with a population of approximately 4,000 people. This, according to my mathematics, adds up to 51,500 people.

By the year 1990 the county planners have proposed that the rural population in the townships will remain the same, but the five towns will increase their population by 12,000 and the villages by 3,000 people. It is anticipated that the increased urbanization of the London and Kitchener areas will begin to have a spillover effect in Huron county.

Although the long-term historical population trend has been a reduction in population of about 300 to 500 persons per annum since 1880, which has been brought about in the past by the depopulation of the rural farming communities of the county due to the mechanization and economics of the farming industry, it is probable that this trend has substantially ceased and that a stable population of the farming industry will be experienced in the future.

It is anticipated that the modest population increase in the 10 incorporated towns and villages will continue and will increase as these municipalities offer a higher level of municipal services. It is assumed that the public interest is best served by directing future urban growth to those areas and municipalities which have the capacity to absorb additional development as economically as possible.

Most future urban development in the county will occur on full municipal services. Rural residential development may be permitted in areas designated as agricultural, subject of course to the land division policy of the county plan.

It is assumed that it is not in the public interest to allow substantial additions to the cottage development along Lake Huron and that further lakeshore development will be curtailed until such time as it has been

found that no municipality or county or provincial agency wishes to acquire additional land for public purposes.

It is assumed that the necessary additional municipal services for water supply and sewage disposal, as noted in the plan, will be undertaken by the respective local municipalities and that the capacity for urban development will be made available.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned briefly the plans for Huron county and, as you well know, the implementation of such plans poses many problems. Planning is not new. It was done more than 140 years ago with very little change or concern for planning until these past few years. The original surveys divided their land into neat 100-acre parcels, bounded by roads laid out in a systematic manner. Towns and villages were first located at river mouths, on streams and later on railway lines, as means of transportation were important.

Most towns, villages and hamlets were surveyed in a proper way, with streets properly laid out. Some of these prospered and some disappeared. Nevertheless, this system was adequate for over 100 years. Within recent years, however, a spillover has occurred and the trend is continuing. Towns and cities are bulging and spilling out into the county concessions and locating in clusters here and there with no thought given to the effects of these developments on the rural countryside and the wise use of our land resources.

At present, Huron county and the Province of Ontario are co-operating in a study of rural development and its effects and desirability. Such development cannot be justified without a resonable consolidation of land to maintain field efficiency. We in Huron can still put together a viable farm unit but without proper planning the problem will occur. In planning our livestock operations, a new series of problems arises, such as air pollution from animal waste products, either in storage or when spread on fields, and pollution from sprays which strikes fear in the urban mother with a small family on a small lot in the country. Fences around farm boundaries are always a problem. There is an apparent lack of respect for fences by sports enthusiasts. Dogs owned by urban people seeking a country home cause considerable concern to farm operators as well.

From the study must come recommendations for the amount and location of recreational land available for both private and public development. Sound planning must be done for housing and commercial and industrial development to avoid a clash between true farming interests and non-farming interests. Since the original planning over 100 years ago, the trend has been to fragment these 100 acres into one, 10, or even 25-acre lots for the construction of houses, gas stations, and so forth.

A study in Wisconsin indicated that by 1980 a cash crop farm in that area capable of returning a good income would require 1,600 acres. Beef and hog farms would have to have investments of between $500,000 and $1 million in order to operate profitably.

These are probably inflated figures for Ontario, but the trend is there and may be more true than we realize. These are realities from which we cannot escape. These farm units cannot be established by accumulating 10 acres here, the back end of a farm there, and another 50 acres up the road. Proof of the trend towards more acres is that the largest increase in tractor sales in the past few years has been in the over-100 horsepower class.

Standards of service must be upgraded in the rural areas to acommodate the urbanites, services such as snowploughing early in the morning to permit travel to and from work, grading of roads, garbage disposal and other services. School bus routes are often changed to accommodate the most children in one area, resulting in rural children on the concession roads being picked up first and returned home last.

These are just a few problems, Mr. Speaker, associated with rural planning, but there are just as many problems in connection with planning urban areas. Towns are struggling to maintain industries in order to keep their people employed and their taxes to a minimum, as most villages are heavily populated with retired people. Most villages and some towns have documented evidence of septic tank contamination of nearby streams and have no alternative but the installation of expensive sewage systems.

A lack of planning in some towns and villages resulted in a great number of nonconforming uses in zoned areas. The expense of services such as water, sewage, roads and recreation to serve a few people has led to real hardship for small towns and villages. Yet our towns and villages are essential to the farming community.

One area which could stand to be improved in helping our towns and villages to survive would be a speeding-up and a lessening of the red tape involved, in setting up five- to 20-lot subdivisions within their limits.

This would benefit towns and lessen the pressure for lot development in rural areas.

In all cases, a positive approach to planning is a progressive approach, but it must be done at the local level. The idea that planning results in protection must be stressed. The person wanting a house and lot in the country because there are no zoning regulations against it, must recognize that in that situation there are also no regulations against an expanded hog operation, or a gas station, or the village dump being located next to him.

With no planning, you get a hodge-podge of conflicting land uses and they all seem to land on the lap of the municipal council. At the present time there is not a shortage of good agricultural land in Ontario. However, the need for preserving it is becoming more clear every year as we see more good farmland being paved, built on, driven on or excavated. It is a crop rotation, Mr. Speaker, which cannot be repeated.

Again, all of us wish to preserve the visual effects of our countryside, such as maple tree bush, river valleys and rolling pasture land, but who is going to pay for this preservation? The landowner who has his land frozen for recreational or agricultural purposes, who might otherwise realize $1,000 per acre for some other use? Or the taxpayer who could be asked to share in compensation to landowners whose land is frozen at a value less than could be realized on the open market?

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that the land is the farmer's bank account, or his retirement savings plan, or his nest egg against hard times, and by freezing the value of this land his savings have been reduced by one half. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it will take brilliant minds to solve that problem.

Mr. Speaker, I seem to be emphasizing the importance of planning at all levels of government and the reason for this is that I personally believe there has been a very definite deficiency in this area on the part of all government. I am not that naive to think that regional planning is unnecessary and that regional planning no doubt suggests the necessity of having a regional form of government, which I am opposed to on the basis of the manner in which it has been proposed and imposed.

I don't believe you can have regional planning without having a regional form of government, providing that such a government is structured to simply reinforce municipal and county governments.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Riddell: Regional planning is not a single-purpose planning scheme which would serve to only establish policy or design for one project for one given area. Rather, regional planning is comprehensive planning, combining numerous single functions to benefit a large area.

Therefore, the implication of reinforced municipal and county government bodies is quite apparent and certainly the Ontario government becomes quite involved, as it is the only government which has the authority, both moral and legislative, to implement a broad range of social, economic and physical policies and programmes.

Ontario's regional policy, Mr. Speaker, both planning and government, is confused and confusing.

Mr. Good: That's for sure.

Mr. Riddell: Simply stated, there are two opposing forces in regional definitions for purposes of regional planning. Functional planning requires large areas for control—not for efficiency, as is so often stated—whereas social planning requires small areas for human interactions and relationships. Put another way, policies are set for large areas in general terms while implementation requires small areas for local adjustment and interpretation. These factors conflict in defining regions and the region will always be a compromise between the two.

Here are a few observations, Mr. Speaker, in connection with regional planning in rural areas. The Ontario planning regions, five in all, are too large for regional planning. They are based on urban economic theory, more commonly called growth points or growth poles. In such theory, rural areas are treated as residual areas and are definitely of secondary importance.

Although urban areas have larger problems in the provincial sense, this does not mean the rural areas do not have problems which are very significant to the people living there. The province has neither the quality nor quantity of staff for a regional planning programme of the magnitude it is talking about. Planners with rural municipal experience are virtually non-existent.

The regional planning programme is essentially regional economic analysis with a minimum of physical and no social planning. Hence, it is not very comprehensive and does not deal in implementation except via sweeping control methods, such as ministers' zoning

orders. Public participation is non-existent and, based on the size of the regions, non-attainable.

In summarizing my remarks about planning, I would like to review Huron county's planning approach and point out certain key factors. Huron county is carrying out certain phases of regional planning. It has a county plan and, based on this plan, local municipal plans which contain a great deal of public participation are being developed. The restraining factor is local staff and not provincial staff.

One point which should be made, and made quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, is that municipalities or regions, regardless of size, must plan. They must, I feel, set policies to determine their future. They cannot just drift. I believe the province must be prepared to assist in both a financial and an advisory capacity.

I detected in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that the government is concerned about preserving the province's land, environment and resources. Therefore, I would like to say a word about conservation in Huron county.

Approximately 98 per cent of Huron county is covered by conservation authorities, primarily by the Ausable, Bayfield and Maitland Valleys Conservation Authorities. The Saugeen Valley authority extends into the northern fringe of the county. Conservation authorities are a type of regional government but at a grass-roots level and although they do not really govern, they do manage the renewable natural resources of the watershed.

Every municipality in the county but one has a representative on one or two of the conservation authorities. These authority members decide what programmes will be undertaken and ensure the wise use and management of the county's natural resources. Examples of some of these programmes which have benefited the county are flood control, erosion control, reforestation and provision of recreational open space. I would like to elaborate on each one of these programmes, Mr. Speaker, but time does not permit.

Other less visible but equally important programmes include the restoration and conservation of fish and wildlife; conservation education; pollution monitoring; conservation services for landowners, such as tree planting; land-use planning input to official plan; zoning bylaws; severance applications; and subdivision proposals.

Concerns of the authorities for the future will be, first, continued acquisition of key recreational lands for public use in the face of accelerating demands for these lands by private individuals; second, further control of flood plains and valley lands to keep development out of hazardous areas and reduce the necessity for costly flood-prevention measures such as dams and concrete channels; third, continued work on the problem of prime agricultural land washing away into gulleys, and a serious look at what should be done along the Lake Huron shoreline; and fourth, stepped-up programmes to increase fish and wildlife populations and protect existing important swamp and wooded areas.

All of these activities take money—money for staff and offices, tools and equipment, and money for engineering and construction projects. Traditionally, this has never been much of a problem. The local people saw the benefits and put up their share, which ranged from 30 to 50 per cent of the authority's budget. The government of Ontario was always ready to help with its share. Dollar value received, the authorities have, through the conservation authorities branch, since 1946 provided more services to the people at a lower cost than any other government programme.

Now the crunch is coming, Mr. Speaker. The big squeeze is on. The municipalities still have their share ready, but it appears that the government is falling down on its part of the deal. The quickest way to make an organization inefficient and ineffective is to cut back its operating funds until it can no longer operate.

The conservation authorities across Ontario, now numbering 39, have just about been pushed to this point. Already many authorities have had to curtail, cancel or postpone programmes for lack of government grants. The government of this province has consistently and repeatedly reiterated its support for, and belief in, the conservation authority movement. Every municipality and every citizen stands to lose if this support turns out to be nothing more than verbal.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier realized that there are areas outside of Toronto which require adequate financial assistance, and that people in these outlying areas are not convinced that what is good for Toronto is also good for them. I would rather choose to believe, sir, that the reverse is true and that the lives of people in large urban centres is largely affected by the conditions that prevail in the rest of the province.

Now, in winding up my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the business of farming in Huron county, seeing that it plays such a major role in generating revenue for the county and income for its inhabitants.

A total of 5,052 Huron farms were recorded in 1961, with a decline to 4,213 farms according to the 1971 Statistics Canada information. Some of these farms could conceivably be one acre in size with sales of agricultural products amounting to $50 or more annually. It has been suggested that farmers producing under $2,500 per year in gross agricultural sales are not very actively involved in the business of modern farming. So, more realistically, there exists at the present time about 3,563 farms reporting a gross income of over $2,500.

It is also significant to note that the number of farmers receiving $10,000 and over gross farm income increased from 923 in 1961 to 2,247 in 1971. In relation to other counties in Ontario, Huron has the most improved farmland and the largest inventory value of livestock and poultry. Huron is first in production of white beans, barley and silage corn; second in total cattle and marketings; third in forage crops and total hogs.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Looks like it has been well represented for many years.

Mr. Singer: Never heard that before.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Too bad the Minister of Agriculture and Food isn't listening.

Mr. Riddell: In the economics of the agricultural industry, while beef and pork prices have been generally favourable this year, many will remember the 1972 crop season for a long time. The very severe June 10 frost was only the beginning of a long list of unfavourable happenings during the cool and cloudy summer. Although some replanted corn made suitable silage, the necessary heat units were lacking for the optimum growth of grain, corn and other crops.

The lack of feed value in the silage and grains is definitely showing up in the performance of the livestock. Producers have had to rely more heavily on purchased protein feeds to supplement their rations. This has added to their cost tremendously and certainly justifies any increase in price that they have received for their product.

With prices at their present level, Mr. Speaker, farmers are just now beginning to enjoy a standard of living that is comparable to that of those in industry. The swine producer, for example, is netting about $8 per hog, so if he feeds 1,000 hogs a year he is making an income of approximately $8,000. The beef producer is netting about $50 per cattle beast, so if he feeds 200 cattle a year he is realizing an income of $10,000.

The fluid milk shipper is netting 60 cents per hundredweight for bottled milk, which amounts to approximately $3,000 from 40 cows producing an average of 12,000 pounds of milk per year. The industrial milk shipper, after taking all costs into consideration, is barely breaking even on his milk sales, but considering the income from the calves and surplus stock, both the fluid milk shipper and the industrial milk shipper are making an additional $4,000 to $8,000, depending on the particular feeding programme, for their young stock.

I think it is worthy of note that the figures I am using pertain to the better-than-average farmer in a year when prices have never been equalled. As a comparison, the average farm income in 1965 was $4,000 and declined to $3,400 in 1971. We, therefore, can't begrudge the farmer making a better-than-normal income this year. I would hope that this level of buoyancy in the farming industry will continue as an encouragement for the younger generation to return to the family farm.

It is also interesting to note that, even though retail food prices are up 33 per cent, per capita income is up 62 per cent since the year 1965. With personal income dollars up nearly twice as much as food prices since the mid-1960s, is it so surprising that the cost of eating is up as much as it is? The consumers are only spending one-fifth of their income on food, which is the one basic ingredient that is necessary above all else for survival. As consumers, let's be thankful that we are getting our food so cheaply and in such abundance, and let's also use our better judgement before we become too reactionary on matters pertaining to food.

For too long now the farmer has been sacrificed at the altar of his own efficiency. We need the farmers and they certainly deserve a standard of living that is equal to that of other segments of society.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for some length of time and talk about problems of our society and inadequacies of our government to cope with such problems, but time is of the essence. I will simply summarize by reiterating that there was never anything more

sure in my mind than the fact that many of our present-day problems would be virtually non-existent, if local governments were given the freedom and financial assistance to run their own affairs with as little interference by the provincial government as possible, other than in a moral and legislative capacity.

So what then, Mr. Speaker, is our job as members of the Ontario Legislature? Well, I'll sum it up in this way;

It's not our job to run the train,
The whistle we cannot blow.
It's not our job to say how far
The train is allowed to go.
It's not our job to shoot off steam,
Nor even clang the bell.
But let the damned train jump the track,
Then see who catches hell.

Thank you very much.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, in my years in this building I can't recall that chair being graced by one so—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Fair.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Pretty.

Mr. Martel: —so witty and—

Mr. Laughren: Intelligent.

Mr. Martel: —so abounding with wisdom.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): And with such a beautiful tan!

Mr. Martel: I know you'll serve your tenure there well.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): That's the quietest he's been in five years.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Give him a few points of order to rule on.

An hon. member: He has justice and compassion.

Mr. Jessiman: He looks well rested after his holiday.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, in considering what one could discuss, after listening to the Throne Speech and what it lacks, one could have discussed at great length the necessity for a uniform building code, which the province has steadfastly refused to bring in; my colleague, the hon. member from somewhere around Niagara, is thinking of bringing that in. We don't really need it in Sudbury, with the likes of Trasco, Cambrian and now Posan and a few more. But we could have had something there indicative, and we hope that the ministry will see fit to introduce that legislation before the fall.

We might have taken heart when they came to that portion of the Throne Speech which announced yet another school for the deaf. And lo and behold, the location was the showplace of Ontario—London. One in Milton, one in Belleville and a third in London. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, advocating on many occasions that such a facility be built in northern Ontario, in view of the traumatic experience suffered by young kiddies when they're torn from home and have to travel 800, 900, 1,000 or 1,200 miles to attend such a facility.

But the government didn't see fit, and the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) argued against it when we asked that he at least put in an amount comparable to what is spent per student by the various school boards in places like Belleville, to allow the larger school boards in northern Ontario to develop a comparable programme within their school system which would not necessitate kids leaving home. That $6,000, of course, was also denied; and there was really no need for a third facility. Yet, lo and behold, in the budget we have a third one announced; and, as I say, in the showplace—London. I don't know what the attraction is in London, Mr. Speaker, but certainly it's there.

We could also have discussed roads and the lack of them in northern Ontario, but I thought the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Rhodes) and the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane), both of them Conservatives, did a rather adequate job of putting the problem in perspective.

I'm not sure that the cabinet will listen any more closely to Tory backbenchers than it has to the opposition over the years. I suspect it won't, because northern Ontario is just a place from which it draws wealth, brings it to the south and processes it. I see my friend from the Lakehead agreeing with that; despite the fact he sits on the Tory benches, he too is cognizant of that fact.

Mr. Gilbertson: I have to have someplace to sit.

Mr. Laughren: They've forgotten how to listen.

Mr. Jessiman: And maple syrup.

Mr. Martel: Well, that's going to do the province a great deal of good. With that in

mind and the fact that the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) was fighting about roads, and so on, I thought I'd discuss that portion which was left in the budget again, natural resources, and anything that might look like a programme which would satisfy the needs of Ontario and which would be related to the natural resources field—particularly the non-renewable, the mining industry. As I searched about to try to find some material to discuss on this topic, I turned to the 1971 report of the Ontario Department of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): That's the latest?

Mr. Martel: No, 1972 is the latest.

Mr. Laughren: He is taking out certain information.

Mr. Martel: I just picked out certain facts which would indicate just how well the Tory government treats its friends in the mining industry. I'm going to quote a couple of sections from the 1971 report. It starts out under the heading "Mineral Production in Recent Years" and says:

> Although there have been dips in a few years, the story of Ontario's mineral industry since the turn of the century is one of remarkably consistent progress and development.

I wish someone would tell the people of northern Ontario that, in view of the boom and bust economy that we experience in Sudbury constantly every three years when it comes time to negotiate contracts and Inco lays off a couple of thousand men. Despite the number of communities which lie dormant and the number of ghost towns which exist, we've got these spook writers or these ghost writers for the Department of Mines writing this type of nonsense. It's indicative of the mentality which pervades that department, about which I am going to have a good deal to say in a few moments.

The next statement in the report is a great statement. It says:

> The estimated total value of metals prior to 1891, when the Ontario Bureau of Mines was established was $9 million [in rough terms]. No estimate of the output of non-metallics up to that time has been made. Between 1891 and 1899, the total mineral output was $53 million.

Mr. Gilbertson: The member is always trying to get into their pocketbooks, isn't he?

Mr. Martel: The member is so right.

Mr. Laughren: Then let them get their hands out of ours.

Mr. Martel: And I just want the member for Algoma to listen for the next couple of minutes to see what we've got out of that industry.

Mr. Laughren: He's forgotten how to listen, too.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): His ears are filled with maple syrup.

Mr. Martel: To continue with the report:

> The overall [production of mineral resources in the period 1900 to the present] is $25,287,989,000.

If you add the last two years, where in fact there was another $3 billion worth of production, we're talking almost totally of $30 billion of mineral production. If you turn to another part of the book, in the chapter, "Mines Produce Government Revenue," it says:

> This department has always been a revenue-producing arm of the government. [Well, let's see.] From the fiscal year 1919-1920—

Mr. Laughren: The member for Fort William should leave too. They are embarrassing statistics for the government.

Mr. Martel: To continue:

> —to 1969-1970, the total ordinary revenue derived by the department amounted to $300 million.

On a production of almost $30 billion, our share in provincial revenues was 300 million.

Mr. Laughren: Include dividends of $2 billion.

Mr. Martel: One per cent—1.19 per cent to be precise—was Ontario's share of the largess.

Mr. Laughren: Shame! How can there be a Tory member from the north?

Mr. Martel: The department likes these statistics, Mr. Speaker. We don't hear from the member for Algoma any more because he—

Mr. Laughren: He's very embarrassed.

Mr. Gilbertson: There wouldn't be any Sudbury if it wasn't for Inco. The member wouldn't have that nice home and all that.

Mr. Martel: I would suspect that if it wasn't Inco it would be someone else. I don't happen to live in Sudbury.

Mr. Haggerty: And three cars.

Mr. Martel: We got 1.19 per cent on $30 billion of production, hardly anything with which one would finance a province and hardly anything which would assist the budgets with which this government tries to keep the tax situation in hand.

What we notice from those statements I have read is the attitude which pervades that department and the Tory government in particular. Our generosity to the mining industry is obvious. The attitude of the Tory government is obvious and the attitude of those who comprise the mining section of the Ministry of Natural Resources is, in my estimation, company oriented. In no way are the needs of the province considered, and I will have a good deal more to say about that in just a little while, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: We'll be here until 2 o'clock.

Mr. Martel: That's right. We had a boom year. In 1967 the then Department of Mines put out a booklet, its annual report. Members will notice that great rocket on it, "Through the billion-dollar barrier." That's magnificent—$1 billion—in fact, that year we reached $1,192 million. That's a magnificent total, isn't it, of mineral production? Ontario's share in tax from the mining industry that year was $10,640,000 or 0.89 of one per cent.

Mr. Laughren: The Americans got more than we did.

Mr. Martel: We did not get one per cent return on $1 billion of production. Maybe the member for Algoma would like to comment on that?

Mr. Laughren: Vietnam got more than that.

Mr. Martel: Less than one per cent, and that was a boom year! The increase in production was only 24 per cent from the previous year when it was only $964,000. That's why we have the cover on this showing the cracking of the $1 billion mark, as though it meant something to the people of Ontario. All it meant was something for the mining industry in Ontario; our share was $10 million. How does a government finance a province on that sort of malarkey?

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): They financed the Conservative Party on that.

Mr. Gilbertson: There are 90,000 people employed in the industry.

Mr. Germa: How much did the Tories get out of that?

Mr. Martel: Well, 1968 was another banner year. In fact, we cracked the $1 billion mark.

Mr. Gilbertson: International Nickel feeds them all. They have nice new cars; they are living off the fat of the land.

Mr. Martel: Does the member want the floor? If he wants the floor, I will yield for a few moments.

Mr. Gilbertson: No, I am finished now.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): We challenge the member to stand in a straight line.

Mr. Martel: If he wants, I'll yield and he can speak. Let him tell us how well we have done.

Mr. Speaker, we did much better in 1968. The value of mineral production was only $1,340 million and that year we got something like $16 million in taxes. It was a big year for Ontario, 1.2 per cent. If one considers the federal share in corporation tax—our 12 points back—we got $14 million from them. In total that year, Ontario derived from $1,340 million of mineral production some $30 million or 2.26 per cent of the value of mineral production.

Mr. Germa: A sellout.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A ripoff.

Mr. Martel: It is interesting that the job opportunities that year went down by 41! We have all of this production and there are no job opportunities. Well, 1969 was a good year, too.

Mr. Laughren: That was the year they appointed the Women's Bureau, wasn't it?

Mr. Martel: That's right, so they could get people to work underground! About the only ministry one would get women in would be the Ministry of Natural Resources. They would put them underground!

Mr. Laughren: That was a token year for the Tories.

Mr. Martel: It was a poor year that year, only $1,214,000,000 and our share was $19 million or 1.61 per cent.

Mr. Laughren: But no prosecutions.

Mr. Martel: Then 1970 was a real banner year. We got it all the way up to $1.6 billion and our share was $23 million or 1.46 per cent of the value of mineral production.

Mr. Deans: Isn't the member for Algoma ashamed?

Mr. Gilbertson: It's going up all the time.

Mr. Deans: Isn't he ashamed?

Mr. Martel: We are coming up? Well, I am going to disillusion the member. He keeps putting his foot in it. Now 1972 was a banner year—

Mr. MacDonald: He's got it in the sugar toffee again.

Mr. Martel: In 1972, Mr. Speaker, production was $1,521,415,000; our share was $16 million. That's down from $23 million in 1970 and $25 million in 1971. It represented 1.05 per cent.

Mr. Germa: Shame!

Mr. Martel: It was 1.05 per cent and if we include the federal tax, it measures in the area of 2 to 2.2 per cent. That is what we get back in this province on over $1 billion of mining revenue. The Tories sit there and I hear Treasurer after Treasurer—and we go through them every three or four months—crying the blues that they have no room to move in the tax field. Yet, here is an area that is wide open; where it is estimated that this industry does not pay 13 per cent tax on profit total.

But in no way will this government move in on its friends. It will sit back. It will raise taxes in a variety of fashions, as it has done in the past year-and-a-half, to the ordinary taxpayer—I am going to come to the Minister of Mines' statement in a moment—but not to the mining industry.

But the job opportunities—I want to show you that as well. In 1967 there were 50,700 job opportunities. In 1972 there were 53,000. So that in fact we have gone up almost 2,200 jobs, or about five per cent, in the mining industry and production has increased by 70 per cent. Tremendous job opportunities, aren't there?

What are we getting from these companies? Absolutely nothing, because we have the expertise ourselves to develop those mines. We don't get jobs. We don't get taxes. What do we get outside of some campaign funds? I would like someone over there to tell me. Our share of the resources from that industry is negligible. And so is the return in jobs, as is evident from the last six years—an increase in production of 70 per cent, and job opportunities by 5½ or 6.

Mr. Germa: And the job isn't even worthwhile keeping.

Mr. Martel: My colleague from Sudbury well knows, having spent 36 years at "father" Inco—or "mother" Inco—whichever term you would like to use.

Mr. Germa: The worst job I had in all my life.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): What about this one?

Mr. Bounsall: Even worse than this?

Mr. Martel: Well, Mr. Speaker, you can see that what we derive from that industry doesn't even support the provincial budget to any degree. I'm going to talk about that in a moment.

Mr. Laughren: It hardly supports the bag man.

Mr. Martel: I can recall two years ago bringing some of these figures to the ministry estimates. That ministry, as I say, is sick, and so are the people in it. We will have a good deal to say about them. But I got into an exchange with the mining assessor; he is the man who knows all about the money—one Brady Lee. It becomes obvious when you listen to Brady Lee just where his sympathies are—and they are not with the province. We were talking about money. I just quoted the 1968 figures and Brady Lee jumped into the fray. He said the municipalities receive a lot of money from the industrial minerals that does not come to the government.

I put the question to Brady Lee. I said: "In 1968?" He said: "In every year." And I said: "What kind?" He said: "They assess them on the value of the properties." My comment then was: "When did they start paying mining municipal assessments?"

They do not pay mining municipal assessments because these people are not assessed as mines under the Mining Tax Act, therefore the municipality is allowed to tax them. And I said to Brady Lee: "How much? Give us the figure of how much we got in 1968?" And his reply: "I do not know what each municipality got. I have not the foggiest notion." Then I said: "Give us an example."

And he said: "I do not even have an example."

But you will recall his opening statement was that the municipalities receive a lot of money. And here is the mining assessor who, when you pin him down and you ask him to tell how much the municipalities received, doesn't know; and he is not interested. And his chore of accruing this wealth—the type of wealth I have indicated in the opening remarks; and the percentages I have shown—was indicative to me that Brady Lee is from the dark ages.

Now, suppose we get a provincial share that is similar to Manitoba—and Manitoba gets 2.26 per cent from the mining industry. This came out in the report by Mr. Eric Kierans, the former minister, and there was an editorial column in the Toronto Star recently and it made the following point:

> Assuming the return in Ontario is roughly the same—a reasonable assumption given the similar pattern of fees and taxes—Ontario last year got back $28.7 million from the production of metal mineral valued at $1.25 billion.

In other words, about two per cent. That includes federal corporations tax; that includes provincial tax at all levels to the province, whether they be municipal or direct provincial tax against the mining industry. About 2.2 per cent. That has to change. But I'm convinced that it won't change with the people involved in that department and even more so with the minister who heads up the department.

In a speech at the Royal York on March 14, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) made the following statement with respect to taxing these industries—and he's speaking, of course to a rather notorious group, the Prospectors and Developers Association:

> Nor can we in Ontario assume, as some have suggested, that we can continue to load the mining industry with taxes and other basic costs of refining ores in Ontario.

We cannot load the mining industry with taxes! What kind of nonsense is being written by his ghost writers over there to suggest that an increase on the 2.2 per cent that they pay would be loading that industry with tax? Is that entire department sick?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Martel: Is that entire government sick, to tolerate that kind of nonsense? A 2.2 per cent return, and the minister gets up and says: "We can't tax them any more or load them down any more." There is something wrong in the state of Denmark.

The minister goes on and he says:

> The time has come when we all must look for new ways to reduce our costs, develop and improve technology to assist in the development and processing of ore, and develop new markets.

I suggest to you that it might be time we started to take a look at finding a way of extracting a little more of the largess, which is our just right, because those natural resources belong to the people of Ontario, not to the mining companies. Two per cent, and the minister says we can't extract any more from them. If I were the ministers opposite I'd dissociate myself from that individual and that whole department. In fact I think the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) should come and sit over here.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister of Transportation is obviously contemplating that.

Mr. Lewis: Don't push it, don't push it. The government can get a lot more from the resource industry than it is getting, and it's refusing.

Mr. Martel: It is getting none. The minister goes on: "In addition to those who urge us to nationalize our industry"—and of course the ghost writers in that department are making reference to what Kierans suggested to the people in Manitoba—

Mr. MacDonald: You can't nationalize what you own.

Mr. Martel: —but how can you nationalize something you already own? We own the natural resources. We just give them the right to utilize them—and I say "give them the right," we don't even charge them. In fact if things get any worse we will be paying them.

Mr. Lewis: We do for a portion.

Mr. Martel: In fact we do. In fact we do in social costs. I am going to come to that in a moment. In fact I am going to come to it right now. It just irritates me so.

In 1968 we collected $16 million as the provincial share on a production of minerals worth $1,340. We got roughly $16.5 million, and if you add all the other little fringe benefits we got $18 million total. The budget for that year, Mr. Speaker, was $2,296 mil-

lion. Do you know what our return represented?

If we don't include the federal government's $14 million that we got back, and Ontario's total take from the mining industry, and we applied it to the budget, do you know what part of the Ontario budget that financed? Just 0.7 per cent! We don't even get enough out of the mining industry to cover one per cent of the budget and we go around blowing our horn about this province and its abundance of natural resources. But the people aren't getting any of it. When are the Tories going to wake up to that?

Mr. Germa: The jobs aren't even there.

Mr. Martel: Less than one per cent of the financing of our budget comes from that industry that we hear so much bragging about. And if we include the federal share, it comes to 1.4 per cent. If we just look at the provincial tax it's 0.7 per cent—or seven-tenths of one per cent to put it another way —of the total cost of running the province. If we include the federal government's share, it's 1.4 per cent. That's a magnificent amount on which to build an industrial base, isn't it —the most of which is taken out of the country anyway and processed somewhere else into the finished commodity, and nothing changes.

Mr. Germa: And it's non-renewable.

Mr. Martel: That's very important. My colleague from Sudbury says it's non-renewable.

Mr. Germa: It's obvious.

Mr. Martel: Well, we had some better years. As the budget got bigger our share didn't get any bigger—in fact, it lessened. In 1971 we got $25 million from the mining industry and the budget was $3,848 million, and I'll forget the remainder.

Mr. Gilbertson: The member wouldn't want them to move out, would he?

Mr. Martel: I wouldn't mind. I absolutely wouldn't mind if they moved out tomorrow.

An hon. member: What would the member do?

Mr. Deans: Let them go.

Mr. Gilbertson: Then the member would have to go with them.

Mr. Martel: Because in fact in that year, Mr. Speaker, the contribution from mining tax in financing this province was 0.79 per cent—four-fifths of one per cent to finance the Province of Ontario. Rather sick, isn't it, when one hears various cabinet ministers going around this province gloating about the great wealth we get from the mining industry. We don't get enough year after year to finance one per cent of the budget! We don't get the jobs because it's capital intensive. If you look at Sudbury, production has gone up over 100 per cent in the last 10 years—

Mr. Laughren: OHIP premiums pay for it.

Mr. Martel: —but the jobs are fewer.

Mr. Gilbertson: Look at all the member's friends who go to Florida in the winter.

Mr. Germa: The friends of the member for Algoma in the maple syrup business.

Mr. Martel: My friends don't go. They can't afford to go.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Sudbury East's friends to Florida?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It was the Minister of Education who went to Florida.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, 1972 was even a better year. In 1972, and it's on the record and it's in the public accounts, the budget is $5,200 million, or was, and on the value of mineral production of $1,521 million we got, in Ontario, $16 million. And on a budget of $5,223 million that represents one-third of one per cent.

Mr. MacDonald: It's getting worse!

An hon. member: What a ripoff!

Mr. Martel: One-third of one per cent! I want to be honest. I'm excluding federal tax because I can't get my hands on it.

Mr. Lewis: That would bring it up to half of one per cent.

Mr. Martel: But the federal tax is even lower than our provincial returns. One-third of one per cent of the budget of the province we finance with our returns from the mining industry. It's sick.

An hon. member: We're financing the Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Martel: It's absolutely sick.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Martel: It's incomprehensible that we can give away non-renewable natural resources where the wealth accrues to people who aren't resident in Canada, or Ontario, and where the natural resources are taken out and processed somewhere else. What do we get?

Mr. Gilbertson: The member gets the biggest nickel in the world.

An hon. member: We get shafted with it!

Mr. Gilbertson: They have been shafted before.

Mr. Martel: And does the member know what I'd like to do with that big nickel? Believe me, if it fits—

An hon. member: Don't press the question!

Mr. Martel: —I'd shove it.

Mr. Deans: The jokes aren't even worthwhile taking.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: Well, after the last boner Falconbridge pulled on the $60 million deal, they'll need someone new, because I understand they're going to fire everyone in sight. They blew $60 million because they wouldn't even listen to the engineers.

So we see in 1972 a real banner year, one-third of one per cent of the budget financed out of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, it's a sick government. It's a very sick government. So we get two per cent roughly and things won't change.

An hon. member: Ripoff.

Mr. Gilbertson: The member is not making it very good for Sudbury, talking like that.

Mr. Martel: Well, Mr. Speaker, if one were to look at what we get from the federal tax—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: I'm not talking about Sudbury. I'm just glad the member for Algoma reminded me of that. I want to talk about what we got in Sudbury in tax in 1971.

Mr. Gilbertson: I heard it was $16 million—

Mr. Martel: Yes. Well, we'll find out.

An hon. member: Plus $1 million in debts.

Mr. Martel: We'll find out what we got from Inco in tax in 1971, okay?

Mr. Laughren: No ETV either.

An hon. member: And no maple syrup.

Mr. Martel: There is great wealth in our natural resources, but to appreciate it fully one has to leave the town and the mines and head back to the executive suite. Those softly lit, carpeted rooms present quite another picture. There the story is told of how in 1971 Inco had net earnings of some $210 million and a clear profit of $94,200,000. But when it came time to pay income tax, the federal government—I want to include the Liberals because they are part of this bag—

Mr. Laughren: Same gang.

Mr. Martel: Same gang.

Mr. Laughren: They are all in the same bed.

An hon. member: You can't tell the difference.

Mr. Martel: The federal government declined and they said, "Don't pay us." They were saying in Ottawa, "We'll pay you." On a clear profit of $94,200,000, not a single cent was collected in income tax, while the government in 1971 gave Inco a tax credit of $2,800,000.

As I said a little earlier, before long we'll be paying them to take it out of the ground—and in fact that's what we did in 1971. We paid them. By comparison, of course, the non-corporate citizens of Sudbury—members will recall that their average income was $7,500 that year per worker—paid income tax at the rate of 25 per cent of taxable income. Nothing for the industry that made $94 million; 25 per cent on the taxable income for the peasants. That's what the member for Algoma wants to hear about, isn't it? Keep them down on the farm.

Mr. MacDonald: Or in the sugar grove.

Mr. Deans: They can't even afford to buy the member's maple sugar.

Mr. Laughren: What's good enough for the member for Algoma is good enough for everybody.

Mr. Germa: And the job isn't even any good.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, in social terms, there are other people who now are starting to realize that the social costs aren't met. It almost makes one question whether in fact we should be overly concerned about the

exploitation of the natural resources, because all they are doing is serving some master off in some board room in some other country. They are not serving the needs of the people of Ontario.

An hon. member: Right on.

Mr. Martel: I want to quote from a book written by Prof. Eric Kierans who was once a Liberal cabinet minister but who has seen the light, unlike many of his colleagues who haven't, because we will talk about the new tax structure federally in a few moments.

Mr. Haggerty: They are coming around again.

Mr. Martel: Oh, they are coming around, yes. If the member stays around we'll find out how far they have come around. They've made it even bigger and better for the mining companies and I hope the member stays around to hear about it. In fact, I invite him.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): The member has said it all before.

Mr. Martel: Well, I can't recall having given this one before.

Mr. Good: Some day you'll get out of the Tory bed.

Mr. Martel: Some day you might get out of the Tory bed or the Liberal bed and worry about providence.

Mr. Haggerty: This is Eric Kierans' speech, isn't it?

Mr. Martel: Well, what does Kierans say about this?

An hon. member: Kierans is a good Liberal.

Mr. Martel: I'm not sure; the Liberals used to consider him a good Liberal but they are turning on him. They are dissociating themselves from him.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): He is an enlightened Liberal.

Mr. Martel: Yes. Well, it wouldn't be hard to be enlightened when you compare it to that motley group.

Now what does Kierans say? He says:

> Even where the province recieves some income in the form of royalties or income tax received, this revenue will certainly not be sufficient to finance the costs of highways, schools, hospitals, and other services that are required to make a new community livable. Here the mining development will be subsidized by the taxpayer at large.

Of course, that is what is happening in Ontario. When we get one-third of one per cent of the budget from the mining industry, in fact the citizens are subsidizing the industry, because nothing—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: —we accrue is sufficient to meet the social costs.

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Martel: How does the government meet social costs? Even for northern Ontario, if the government ploughed the full $16 million that we get—

Mr. Laughren: It would even build a highway.

An hon. member: It wouldn't pay for the cost of the carton.

Mr. Deans: But they can blow $50 million.

An hon. member: It wouldn't build an overpass.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Didn't the member build a $60,000 home?

Mr. Martel: No, not quite; it's going down. The last time I heard, it was $80,000.

Mr. Singer: Ah, good, good!

Mr. Martel: Now here it's $60,000—in Happy Valley.

The social costs will exceed the returns; and the resource development, far from yielding a net income to the province, becomes a burden on the whole community; I suggest to you that is exactly what's happening, based on our tax returns in the province.

And to go on is absolutely ridiculous. One would wonder why, though, the various governments have been so generous to these poor companies. For example, if one examines how much they earned in 1969, nearly half a billion dollars of the profits of metal mining companies and nearly $400 million of the profits of oil and gas producers were untouched by the federal income tax in 1969; which of course accounts for why the province receives so little from Ottawa. Ottawa isn't taxing them. But that surely gives the province the leverage to increase the provincial share. If Ottawa isn't going to tax them, why can't the province?

Mr. MacDonald: That's the tax room the provincial government has been wanting them to give Ontario.

Mr. Martel: Yes, I've heard this Treasurer (Mr. White), and his three or four predecessors in the last two or three years, scream they had no tax room. Well, the government has got all kinds of tax room. When the federal government cannot look at hundreds of millions of dollars of profit, not tax them at all, surely the province could move in and extract a fairer return. But that won't happen under this government.

As I read to the members, the minister responsible for mining says: "Nor can we in Ontario assume, as some have suggested, that we continue to load the mining industry with taxes." Well, certainly we are not going to move into that field, because the minister and his ministry feel they are overburdened; $16 million worth last year—and that's a great extraction from them, isn't it?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to continue with this discussion on what we derive, to try to put it in the proper perspective; to destroy some of the arguments my friend from Algoma-Manitoulin makes, because his seating mate the other night used the same arguments, and I—

Mr. Gilbertson: It's not Manitoulin. It is just Algoma.

Mr. Martel: —was saving it for tonight. I am going to relish it as we hear the same arguments over and over again that we're going to drive out exploration and they are not going to develop; and they quake and they quiver in their boots. In fact, the mining companies just have to—

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. Martel: —cough, and someone over there in that ministry sneezes; they've got a cold; they're so frightened, so petrified.

Mr. Gilbertson: The member is going to kill the goose.

Mr. Martel: Well, we're going to come to killing the golden goose. In fact, that is the term Eric Kierans uses. The same argument the member for Algoma is now trying to use is pretty well documented by what's happening in Manitoba. Based on the fact that the taxes and tax structure in Manitoba and Ontario are basically the same, then we can assume that the problems confronting Ontario are basically the same and so are the returns, which we have already documented.

I want to suggest that the first thing this department could do, aside from taxing, would be to convene a conference of all the resource ministers of this country to stop allowing the mining companies to play off one province against the other. This was obvious when Falconbridge went to Quebec two years ago, and it was able to extract from the Quebec people 20 tax-free years, reduced hydro power, reduced rail—

An hon. member: Free land.

Mr. Martel: Free land!

Mr. Laughren: What kind of government is that?

An hon. member: That's a Liberal government.

Mr. Laughren: Must be a Liberal government

Mr. Martel: Well, the interesting thing is that they played Quebec off against Ontario and extracted additional concessions for the mining industry, which of course is only interested in one thing—not the people, but the maximization of profit. They were able to extract all of those concessions over and above the seven they had already received via the generosity of the federal government in Ottawa.

Mr. Laughren: Would my friend repeat his entire remarks for the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot), please. He doesn't understand.

Mr. Martel: It would be over his head.

Mr. Deans: One has to speak slowly in single-syllable words.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): He'd have to spell it out.

Mr. Germa: He is responsible. Look at him.

Mr. Deans: He is not responsible. Don't believe it.

Mr. Laughren: We're just trying to get his name into Hansard for once.

Mr. Martel: Well, in such a conference of ministers to prevent the likes of Falconbridge or Inco manipulating the various provinces as they jockey to try to get a few more jobs, like the increase in 1941, this provincial government should take the lead in such a conference. Because this should be the key—and I am quoting from Kierans: "A better resource policy would attempt to provide and

maintain the same number of jobs while retaining all or a greater portion of the disappearing billions". That's something Ontario might look at. And as I go along I want to indicate some of the interesting figures that come to light.

> It is sufficient here to emphasize the encouragement given to the metal mining industry by the federal government through its tax legislation. Profits before taxes for the years 1965 to 1970, as recorded in the books of the corporations themselves, amounted to $3,165 million. Through preferential tax legislation, they were permitted to report $591 million only as subject to corporation income tax. More than $2.5 billion in profits escaped provincial and federal taxation.

Mr. Gilbertson: That's good for the shareholders.

Mr. Martel: The shareholders? Even the shareholders don't get it. That's the stupidity of it all.

Mr. Gilbertson: Oh yes they do!

Mr. Martel: We'll come to that too. The shareholders aren't getting it; it's being kept in retained earnings, which aren't even passed on to the shareholders.

Mr. Laughren: Less than five per cent of the population of Canada are shareholders.

Mr. Martel: The member for Algoma keeps putting his foot in it; he's helping me. I need his guidance; just keep me right on track so that I can take the arguments apart one by one. Keep coaching, okay?

Mr. Gilbertson: All right. I'll quit if the hon. member quits.

Mr. Martel: Oh, I'm not going to quit yet.

Mr. Laughren: Just the member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Deans: Don't quit. He needs a straight man.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on $2.5 billion there was no corporation tax and no provincial tax! My good God, what are we doing? Is there any conscience over there at all?

Mr. Deans: Just from the Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Martel: Well, I want to come to what my friend from Algoma talks about, the shareholders and the fear that they won't produce. There is an illusion in Canada, you know—and, of course, we know who perpetrates that illusion: the industry itself—the public image projected by the mining sector is that of a high-risk industry that demands large amounts of capital and where probabilities of loss greatly outweigh those of gain. That is absolute nonsense. The greatest profits aren't in smelting or in refining, but in mining.

They have been able to cajole, kick, scream and pull that government over there into believing that it's such a high-risk industry they won't invest. But in fact prospecting activity and the number of claims staked went down last year, despite the generosity of the Tory government in providing another $1 million, I believe, to the industry to go out and do some exploration. The amount of exploration diminished.

The government can't even pay them. And do you want to know why? They have already got it tapped; they know where it is—they sit on it. That's part of the problem which we will come to in a few moments. They extracted.

It is not a high-risk industry. In fact if one looks at it carefully one finds out that the biggest profits are from mining. They are double anything else. We have listened to that corrupt department—and I use the term "corrupt" not in the sense of theft but in thinking. I am going to document that department in a few minutes and who is in there. I hope the ministers stay around to find out who is in that department and where they came from.

Mr. Laughren: The parliamentary secretary has just arrived.

Mr. Martel: We have talked about the high-risk industry. In 1965 there were 824 mining companies and it is such a high-risk industry that by 1970 there were only 218 left, most of them gobbled up by the way—and I want to quote this very precisely—by 36 firms. Here is what these 36 firms control. This is simply traffic on paper and is unrelated to the mainstream of the industry, but 36 firms in 1969 controlled 87 per cent of the assets of $6.1 billion; 86 per cent of the equities—$4 billion; 84 per cent of the sales —$2.6 billion; and 86 per cent of the profits—$658 million. That was 36 companies in that high-risk industry.

I am glad the member for Sault Ste. Marie joined us because I am just coming to him in a moment. I am delighted that he has seen fit to join us.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): I wouldn't have missed the member for the world.

Mr. Martel: I am glad, I want to put him straight, too. That is the risk area. In fact, it is so risky that all of the large companies are now taking control of the smaller ones and the federal government has, in fact, with its recent tax legislation provided the tools to finish the job. Let's take a look at it.

Mr. Laughren: Are they still building roads to resources?

Mr. Martel: Yes. The new federal tax policy is an even greater assist. There are three major policies and these destroy some of the arguments advanced by my friend from Sault Ste. Marie the other night, and his colleague from Algoma-Manitoulin earlier this evening as he chirped in.

Mr. Gilbertson: Forget about Manitoulin.

Mr. Martel: There he goes again.

Mr. Gilbertson: The member for Manitoulin isn't here.

Mr. Martel: Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Gilbertson: Why doesn't the member just say Algoma?

Mr. Martel: Well, Algoma. It is somewhere up in the boondocks.

Mr. Rhodes: Put that on the record. The boondocks, eh?

Mr. Gilbertson: They won't like the member for Sudbury East up there now.

Mr. Martel: The representation from there isn't too strong, anyway, and not very knowledgeable.

Let's talk about what the federal government has done in terms of assisting those poor, underprivileged, bedraggled, poverty-stricken companies—

Mr. Rhodes: From the boondocks.

Mr. Martel: From the boondocks, okay. The member for Sault Ste. Marie told me the other night that they wouldn't get involved in exploration and development; it was so high and where was that money going to come from? In 1970, the mining companies in Canada got back from the federal government or were allowed to write off $111 million in development and exploration. Not bad for one year. That is where the money comes from! The taxpayers subsidize the development and the exploration. That is who is paying for it.

In 1969, it was a poor year; they only got $128 million in writeoffs; it was a rough year. That is part of it and the new federal tax makes it even better.

The federal government will now permit corporations to deduct in full from their income the interest on money borrowed to buy the shares of other corporations. Thus the 36 corporations will be able to borrow from banks and other investors the funds needed to buy out any of the 218 mining firms, or each other, and to charge such interest against their profits and so reduce their taxable income on existing operations. Well, that is that.

Mr. Gilbertson: David Lewis won't go along with that.

Mr. Martel: No, he won't go along with that; no way.

Clearly the large firms are placed in an even more advantageous position.

I will tell the members who will go along with that for one year—the banana man. When the Canadian Manufacturers Association sent him the big telegram and said, "Now look, Bob, you are not going to vote against that," it didn't take long for old Bob to squirm around and say, "We'll vote for it, for only one year though."

Mr. Cassidy: The Tories here take instructions from the CMA, too.

Mr. Martel: That's the foot in the door. One year, two years, three years; but its there, and old Bob found a way. He was worried about the campaign funds, of course.

Mr. MacDonald: That's what you call slipping on the banana.

Mr. Martel: The Canadian Manufacturers Association wouldn't have paid for the next campaign. And you know, if Bob's got any illusions of making it he's going to have to have some greenbacks, so he altered his position quite noticeably in public.

Well that was the one way. What else did the federal government do?

Mr. Gilbertson: Put David on our side and we'll push him out.

Mr. Martel: The cost of acquiring mineral rights will not be treated any longer as a capital outlay, as an investment by the corporate buyer, but will be considered as additional exploration and development. So here is more consideration for exploration and development cost, all fully deductible against existing income.

Mr. Rhodes: Is that the gospel according to Kierans?

Mr. Martel: Thus acquisitions and takeovers can be expected to be increased and concentration strengthened even further.

Clearly, the 36 resource-rich firms will be able to derive the maximum benefits from the new legislation. So in fact you write off more even when you take over someone who's already operating. That's considered a new development and you get another tax free holiday.

Mr. Germa: That's a ripoff!

Mr. Martel: That's a comfortable position to be in, isn't it? These starving companies!

Well what's the third one? "For every $3 spent on exploration and development the federal government will permit mining corporations to deduct $4 from their income." Now that's not a bad return either. Not a bad way of financing it.

In other words, you know who's financing exploration and development—the people! Through the federal tax field and through the system set up by this government last year to make a return of—what is it, one third of the cost up to $100,000? Something like that.

In fact, we're financing them to go out and explore. Why don't we do it ourselves? That would be too revolutionary, wouldn't it, for the Tory party? Too revolutionary.

So they not only get it from the federal government, they get it from the provincial government, and we end up with, in 1972 as stated earlier, one-third of one per cent of our budget financed from our natural resource industry—non-renewable!

What a great return. What a great return. No wonder there are no roads from Sudbury to Sault Ste. Marie. There's no money from the industry to build those roads.

Mr. Gilbertson: And the member's federal leader is going right along with it.

Mr. Martel: Well, that voice in the wilderness!

Mr. Rhodes: And the boondocks!

Mr. Martel: And the boondocks!

An hon. member: And the sugar shack!

An hon. member: And the big bridge!

Mr. Laughren: You said it!

Mr. Martel: Well Mr. Speaker, the profits are in mining. It's completely documented in Kierans. If you want I'll take the—well, I'll take the trouble; yes I will.

Mr. Germa: Read the whole thing!

Mr. Martel: I'm just going to quote the profit on the mining section.

Mr. Laughren: The hon. member for Timiskaming would like to hear it.

Mr. Martel: Just on the mining section, just one short statement.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Corporate ripoff in Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Rhodes: Written by a Liberal.

Mr. Martel: The net profit on income for the 177 mining companies amounted to 33 per cent; for the nine integrated corporations it was 27 per cent, and for 181 companies in the smelting and refining sector 11 per cent.

So that in fact the mining industry is higher by six per cent than the complete complex; and the smelting industry itself is some 22 per cent less than mining. The profits are in mining, and the mining industry has convinced the minister's department that in fact there are no profits; that it's a high-risk area, and that if we infringe, in fact, they'll back off and they won't explore. They continue to threaten.

Mr. Cassidy: They just want to be sucked in by the government.

Mr. Martel: I'm going to use three quotes in a moment, from such a noted gentleman as Henry S. Wingate, as they apply the leverage and tell the members what they're going to do if the government dares tax them a few cents more. But before doing that I want to turn to this department, a department that as far as I'm concerned in the six years I've been here, is the most immoral and corrupt-in-mentality department I have ever seen.

In fact I want to know if Charlie Hews still writes the mining reports—Charlie Hews, the industrial man from Inco who used to

write the reports for the Minister of Mines. I'm just wondering if he still writes those reports for the Ministry of Natural Resources in the mining section.

We happen to have caught him doing it. It was very embarrassing to the Minister of Mines. But can you imagine? And that's the mentality that prevails, that they would accept reports from company officials and try to pass them off to the members as though they were the result of investigations by the investigating team of the Department of Mines.

Mr. Laughren: Their annual report is written by the company.

Mr. Martel: And you wonder. Well, I put a question to the minister about a year ago. I wrote the minister and I said, "Would you tell me the composition of your department, and those people in it, and their work record, their background?" And old Leo the Lion refused. So I put it on the order paper. And I named certain people. Let's just take a look at where they come from, and you'll wonder why some of the things occur which I am going to briefly outline in a few moments.

You have the Assistant Deputy Minister, A. J. Herridge. He had no previous employment with a mining company. G. A. Jewett, vice-president and general manager of Dressers; Southwest Potash Corp. project manager Canada; Rio Tinto; Rio Algom. That's where that gentleman came from. D. P. Douglass—he had no experience. J. R. McGinn—he worked previously for International Nickel—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, well, that would bring the balance of perspective to the party.

Mr. Martel: —Dome Mines and Stover Gold Mines. H. F. R. Davis—he worked for Noranda and—

Mr. Laughren: It is incestuous—the whole government is.

Mr. Renwick: But it certainly balanced the International Nickel perspective.

Mr. Martel: —Waite Amulet. M. S. Altan —well this is a strange one—he didn't work for a mining company. It's hard to find one who didn't work for some mining company, in fact, when one looks at that department. In fact, I am told that Mr. McGinn travels every day from his home in Oakville with, is it Mr. McIntyre from Inco? Yes, McIntyre. He commutes daily with one of the chief officers of International Nickel.

Now that's where you get that balance when you go to the minister and talk about a condition not being safe, and you are always told that that's not true. It's quite obvious. You know, Mr. McGinn travels daily with the executive officer of International Nickel I am told.

Mr. Lewis: You've got to be careful about that. The member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) asked me to travel daily with her from Scarborough to the Legislature but I wouldn't do it. I knew that you can't handle it.

Mr. Rhodes: No accounting for taste.

Mr. Martel: Well, let's go on with some more. T. J. Baker, he's with the department too, and he worked for Sutherland-Shultz Electrical Co. and International Nickel. And C. M. Barrett, of that department—

Mr. Renwick: Does the minister want to put it on the record that it is not true?

Mr. Martel: —Eldorado and Wright-Hargreaves. You know, I can't find anybody here who worked for the union. Not one. But let's continue. H. J. Bone—he worked with Brunswick Mining and Smelting, and Canadian Westinghouse.

Mr. Lewis: Oh well.

Mr. Martel: M. J. Caron—district mining engineer—previous employer, International Nickel.

Mr. Rhodes: Does the member want a milkman to do that?

Mr. Martel: A milkman would probably do a better job. He would go in with his eyes open.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What has he got against milkmen?

Mr. Martel: In fact he might get beyond the pithead.

Mr. Foulds: Let's have it on the record that the member for Sault Ste. Marie dislikes milkmen.

Mr. Lewis: You know the member for Ontario is embarrassed by this. All those people from Ontario riding are going to vote NDP next time.

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): They are too wise—too wise.

Mr. Martel: Now let's see. Well, I'm using the government's own documentation from its material. What does the member want?

Mr. Dymond: The devil can cite scripture.

Mr. Martel: Oh, now don't give us that nonsense.

Well, let's go down just a few more here to make it interesting. Hoffman—Coldstream Mines and Quemont Mining; Koivu—Noranda Mines; Lazurko—Steep Rock Mines; Lockhart —International Nickel. You know, they sure get in, don't they?

Mr. Renwick: Right on.

Mr. Martel: In fact I would suspect about a third of that department is International Nickel.

Mr. Cassidy: They're insecure. That's why they need so many people there.

Mr. MacDonald: I think the ministry is the outdoor relief department for the mining industry.

Mr. Martel: Well, let's see who else. May—he worked for Guest, Kean and Baldwin. Murray—

Mr. MacDonald: Senatorial appointments.

Mr. Martel: —McKenzie Red Lake, Central Patricia, Gold Eagle, all mining companies. Hurst—Omega and Kerr Addison. E. W. Isaac —he worked for Cadillac Explorations, Noranda Potash, Allan Potash, International Minerals and Chemicals. Kirk – Fryman Gold Mines, Lake Shore Mines, Consolidated Smelters, Wright-Hargreaves. Neils—previous employer, United States Steel Corp.

Mr. Lewis: Oh boy.

Mr. Martel: J. K. Redsell—Kerr Addison and Hollinger.

Mr. Lewis: Terrible.

Mr. Martel: Senkus—Canadian Standards Assoc. and Foundation Engineering of Canada.

Mr. Renwick: All of them little fellows.

Mr. Martel: Thomas—Rio Algom, Paddy Harrison and Noranda Mines. Well, there are only a few left—J. C. Smith, the chief mining recorder; International Nickel—

An hon. member: There they are again.

Mr. Martel: Ah, they just keep showing up—

An hon. member: Don't the members opposite get the message?

Mr. Lewis: And that doesn't include the regionals.

Mr. Martel: C. P. Foster, in charge of pits and quarries in the province—previous employer, International Nickel.

Mr. Lewis: This is what you call incest.

Mr. Martel: What a corrupt ministry. No wonder you get arguments from Brady Lee when he is shooting his face off and says: "We get all kinds of money from the mining industry." And I say, "Okay, well give us an example. And he says, "Well, I have got no example—I don't know."

It is the chief mine assessor making this statement. He collects the money and he is telling us we are getting all kinds. And when you ask for an example, he says: "I don't know." Well, you wonder why that ministry is corrupt.

Falconbridge was ordered by the Minister of Mines to conduct S02 tests when the men complained of the gas—and a year and a half later it still hasn't implemented them.

Well, the mining inspectors knew that. The inspectors knew that. Why weren't they insisting on it? Why not? They are turning their heads the other way.

Then you have got Charlie Hews writing the letters for Allan Lawrence over the years. Charlie Hews works for Inco. He doesn't work for the department, but I would just like to know; and maybe the member for Sault Ste. Marie can find out for me if Charlie Hews still reports for the government and they are passed on as ministry reports.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't know Charlie Hews.

Mr. Martel: Well, ask the minister—he is well aware who Charlie Hews is. He is the fellow in charge of safety who used to write the reports which Allan Lawrence used to pass on to the members as though they were done by his investigators.

An hon. member: He wrote them last year.

Mr. Martel: I just say all of this indicates —when you look at the makeup, the composition, of this ministry, it is obvious why you get the Minister of Mines saying, "Well, we can't tax the industry any greater." It is obvious why you can't get improvements in safety. It is obvious why you never see a charge laid against mining companies. In fact, when Redzel has the courage to suggest to Allan Lawrence that a charge be laid against

Falconbridge—in fact, the way he wrote the letter was:

> Would you please lay a charge. The union knows of three cases. They don't know of the fourth yet, and Martel might find out and we will be in serious trouble."

That was in Mr. Redzel's letter. It wasn't supposed to come into my possession, either. But the ministry didn't lay the charges. And you know it is so obvious to me after seeing the makeup of that ministry why it is such a sick department; why in fact it shouldn't have the right—the only department in government that I know that has the right—to collect the taxes. What in God's name is it doing there? Why isn't it over in Revenue where it belongs?

Mr. Lewis: Here's the chief prospector.

Mr. Martel: Why isn't it over in Revenue where it belongs?

Mr. Lewis: The water boy for the department.

Mr. Renwick: There he is.

Mr. Martel: No wonder they write speeches for the Minister of Mines which say: "Nor can we in Ontario assume, as some have suggested, that we can continue to load the mining industries with taxes. No more can we load the mining tax"—two per cent and we can't load them any more. I am delighted to see the minister responsible for that department here.

An hon. member: Where has he been?

Mr. Renwick: He is too embarrassed to say.

Mr. Lewis: Brady Lee called him and told him he had better get in there.

Mr. Martel: Well I want to tell you why they knuckle under over in that ministry; the threats. I am going to read three threats by the mining industry, from an illustrious gentleman like Henry S. Wingate. I have another term for it—but the usual arguments are advanced. There is one advanced by the member for Sault Ste. Marie the other night that taxes were too high and exploration and development would be curtailed if in fact we didn't give them more concessions. And the Minister of Mines was setting up a programme to give them more money when, in fact, in 1970 they wrote off $111 million for exploration, and that wasn't good enough. The minister, Leo the Lion, gave them another million last year to go out and do some exploration and even that fell on its face. He couldn't buy them then.

Mr. Lewis: Leo the what?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): The member built an $80,000 home on the strength of that!

An hon. member: A toothless tiger.

Mr. Martel: It's $80,000? A moment ago the member for Downsview told me it was $60,000!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a brand new $80,000 home constructed by non-union workers.

Mr. Martel: Well, let's see what the mining industry says, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Leo the what, did the member call him?

Mr. Martel: I mean that lion in—what is that play?

Mr. Lewis: "The Wizard of Oz"?

Mr. Martel: "The Wizard of Oz." That is the lion I'm talking about! That ferocious beast.

Mr. Lewis: Leo the Lollipop.

Mr. Martel: What does the mining industry say every time we talk about taxing it? Mining has been described as a capital-intensive industry and, interestingly enough, the one which perpetuates the myth the most is the mining industry. "In proportion to invested capital the direct employment opportunities offered by the industry are less than those available in manufacturing and service industries." They went to a Hedlin-Menzies report to get that sort of nonsense. Here is what came out of the Hedlin-Menzies report, "An historical impact analysis of resource development prepared for the International Nickel Co. of Canada Ltd.; Hedlin-Menzies and Associates."

This is an amazing claim. In appendix table 112 Hedlin-Menzies listed 1,637 employed in construction at Thompson in 1968 and 3,538 employed in mining operations. Indirect employment was estimated at 12,460, totalling 17,635. "If the end of construction activity is to have no impact as suggested, we have a multiplier effect of five; one job really means five jobs." This study was probably the basis for the famous five-to-one ratio.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Six.

Mr. Martel: Quoting:

> This across-the-board ratio to investment, smelting and refining is just one of many manufacturing activities. One could reasonably conclude that there is no unemployment if one uses Hedlin-Menzies on mining and that there are, in fact, six million job vacancies running round Canada—

looking for someone to take them up, based on the five-to-one ratio that Hedlin-Menzies uses.

What does Wingate say in his defence of less tax?

> Regrettably, the Manitoba government during the year made effective increased income tax rates and enacted an increase in its mining royalty tax [which amounts to 2.3 per cent per annum. That is a tremendous increase!] This means that individuals and industry in Manitoba are paying the highest income tax and that the effective mining royalty tax is amongst the highest in Canada, 2.3 per cent. Such high taxation can only deter new mining investments.

That is what the minister's afraid of.

Mr. Renwick: They may have to go to South Africa.

Mr. Martel: That little thing—"Such high taxation can only deter new mining investment and expansion in the province."—that is what this department and this government is scared of. Every time we even talk about taxing this industry fairly the companies bring out the big stick that they are not going to get involved in exploration; they are not going to get involved in development; they are going to move out. I want to know where they are going to move to and how they are going to drag those natural resources with them.

Mr. Laughren: They'll go to PEI!

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious as I said earlier that the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member would permit me an interruption? Our standing orders do require that we adjourn at 10:30.

Mr. MacDonald: That's a good idea.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that the intention was to continue with this debate. Do we have the unanimous consent of the House to do so?

Mr. Cassidy: For how long?

Mr. Speaker: I am not in any position to say for how long. The unanimous consent would be to continue the debate until the motions before the House are dealt with.

Agreed.

Mr. Martel: We have, Mr. Speaker, the threats. It was interesting when the select committee was in New York and we talked to Anaconda and what they wanted to do was come here to open up in Nakina, in the riding of the member for Thunder Bay. They stated rather emphatically that before they would open up they wanted, from the date development started, a guaranteed annual return of 12½ per cent, otherwise they would not open up in the Nakina area—12½ per cent including the years of development. That's what they want for a return. They extract to no end from the residents, and as I've indicated right along our returns have been most negligible.

Mr. Speaker, if I just might, in concluding, I would like to put forward—

Mr. Renwick: No, don't do that.

An hon. member: Keep it up.

Mr. Foulds: Keep it up, keep it up!

An hon. member: That is just the opening.

Mr. Laughren: Talk about roads to resources.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: See if you can get the attention of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence).

Mr. Laughren: His attention span is very short!

Mr. Martel: I'll summarize then; how's that? I'll put it all together in a concise summary.

An hon. member: And don't repeat it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Why don't the members stop heckling their own member?

Mr. Martel: In Ontario, Mr. Speaker, we don't have the accurate analysis of the mining industry that Manitoba now has; and before the minister runs around gumming it as he did to the prospectors, he might just read—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is a statement that has not been researched.

Mr. Martel: The minister hasn't read the report, has he? It is obvious from his comments at the Royal York that he hasn't read it.

An hon. member: He can't read.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Look at the exploration going on in Manitoba today. It is down, down, down!

Mr. Martel: Did the minister read the report?

Mr. MacDonald: Did the minister read their budget? They are up on every score.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Did the minister read the report?

An hon. member: Including the election results next time; wait and see!

Mr. Martel: Two-point-three per cent is the return in Manitoba. Is that extracting too much from that industry; 2.3 per cent?

An hon. member: We don't think extracting anything is too much!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Pick another province, because the member picked the wrong one.

Mr. Martel: I picked Ontario. Does the minister know what we got last year? I'm glad he is here. Does he know what our return on the mining industry represented of our budget?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They follow everything we do in Ontario.

Mr. Martel: One-third of one per cent of Ontario's budget!

Well, the minister is interjecting; I just wanted to answer him. One-third of one per cent of Ontario's budget for last year was met by returns on the mining industry; $16 million.

How can you justify it? How can you sit there and justify it? A $16 million return on an industry that took in $1.5 billion.

An hon. member: How can he justify a parliamentary assistant?

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member addressing his remarks through the chair?

Mr. Stokes: He is.

Mr. Speaker: Is he? I wasn't sure.

Mr. Martel: I was just circumventing you a little.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I ask you, how can that minister sit there on $1.5 billion in mineral production and say that $16 million tax by the province was sufficient?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not being repetitious is he?

Mr. Martel: No, not a bit! Not a bit, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Not at all; this is the sixth year I have heard it.

Mr. Martel: How can he, when it was only last year he got this $16 million?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Get in your own seat!

Mr. Martel: I can't help it if the minister is so dense it doesn't sink in.

Well I've got the budget in front of me, Mr. Speaker, if I just might—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I want to turn to the budget; the public accounts, 1972. General revenue under the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs was $16,065,000. Is that accurate? I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that accurate?

It is in the public accounts and we are supposed, I believe, to rely on the public accounts. Is the minister denying that we took in more than $16 million as the provincial tax on mining for last year?

He had a lot of audacity a moment ago; he was full of smoke and vigour. What will he answer?

Mr. Stokes: Let the minister give us the right figure!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, he has got faith in the mining industry, he bought an $85,000 home in Sudbury.

Mr. Martel: I don't have an $80,000 home in Sudbury. I don't have a home in Sudbury.

An hon. member: What's that got to do with it.

Mr. Stokes: Another red herring! Another red herring!

Interjection by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Two homes now!

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the minister, through you, that my home is in the municipality of Capreol.

An hon. member: Completely irrelevant!

Mr. Martel: There is no mining in Capreol. Maybe you could convey that to the minister, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: It wouldn't do much good.

Mr. Renwick: The member has got to them, they are all whispering advice to the minister.

Mr. Martel: Well, that would be useless.

Mr. Renwick: Even the house leader is in on it. The Minister of Revenue was in there a minute ago.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I could whisper a little to the member but he never listens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why don't they stop heckling their own member?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We want to hear what he has to say.

Mr. Laughren: The minister for Resources Development up in the back row could enlighten us as to what we actually got.

Mr. Renwick: One would think so.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development is wearing a hat.

Mr. Martel: The minister, Mr. Speaker, indicates we are getting sufficient; and there isn't a year that we have got 2½ per cent return from that industry. I would ask the minister, if he is so sure we are doing such a magnificent job, that he set up an independent commission or committee, not made up of Tory hacks, but economists—

Mr. Laughren: Hire Eric Kierans; he'll get to the facts.

Mr. Martel: —and have them do the study that was done in Manitoba. The minister is so sure that we are getting such a return; is he willing to do that then, set up such a committee to do this type of study? Or is he afraid of the results, of what they'll show?

Mr. Renwick: Of course he is; he's frightened.

Mr. Martel: In fact, Eric Kierans puts it pretty nicely. I think its the last quote I'll take from Kierans.

An hon. member: Careful now, watch it!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's the joke of the century.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He's the former Postmaster General.

Mr. Martel: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He got the mail moving.

Mr. MacDonald: Get Hedlin-Menzies to do it. He's a former chairman of the Tory convention.

Mr. Foulds: What's the minister got against mailmen? Kierans went from mailman to Minister of Finance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the reason the minister won't do it is summed up quite easily. If the government of Ontario decides to maintain the status quo—and it's obvious from the minister's speech the other night that it does; with some marginal increases in taxes, although I doubt that in Ontario—then it should say frankly to the people in Ontario that it is unable and helpless to challenge the power and control of the corporations.

An hon. member: Absolutely true.

Mr. Martel: That's what it is in a nutshell. Every time the minister even talks about increasing the taxes they threaten to move out—and our share is less than 2½ per cent a year. If the minister won't do it, I'm asking the Premier (Mr. Davis) to do it; in fact he should set up a commission to find out exactly what we're getting from that cruddy industry.

An hon. member: That's up to Bill Kelly.

Mr. Martel: One-third of one per cent of the budget last year was financed by mining. How can the government possibly have any type of fiscal policy when the area the minister brags about consistently—the returns from mining—are in the range of $16 million to $17 million a year on production that is valued at $1.5 billion?

Mr. Renwick: That's right.

Mr. Martel: That represents less than one-third of one per cent of Ontario's budget! How in the world do we build anything on the mineral resource industry in Ontario when the materials are taken out and processed

into a finished commodity somewhere else? We subsidize the industry. And if I'm wrong, I challenge the minister to set up a committee to prove me wrong. But I suggest I'm right and this government is afraid to find out the truth because it has backed off so long. That's the one thing I'm asking this minister to do: Set up an independent commission and find out what we're getting.

Mr. Renwick: They're very quiet over there now.

Mr. Martel: Secondly, I'm asking that this department not be allowed the right to continue to collect the revenues from mining. That belongs in the Ministry of Revenue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: What kind of nonsense is this? It's the only branch of the government that collects its own income, and every flunky in that department is a mining company official.

An hon. member: Oh, no!

Mr. Martel: Yes, they are; they're all listed.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member was disappointed when he found out the truth.

Mr. Martel: I've read the names. Only about four have never worked for the Department of Mines.

Mr. MacDonald: And one of them worked for the United States Steel Co.

Mr. Martel: They're all there. Does the minister want me to go over the list again?

Mr. MacDonald: No, please don't.

Mr. Martel: Does he want me to go over the list again?

Mr. MacDonald: No, please don't.

An hon. member: Is the minister going to lose any sleep over it?

Mr. Martel: Thirdly, I want the complete removal of safety inspection from that department and into the Ministry of Labour, where it belongs, and leaving all the flunkies behind. In fact, I want to ask the minister, through the Speaker, if Charlie Hews of Inco still writes the department's reports. You know, Charlie Hews, the safety man for Inco. Does he still write the department's reports?

Mr. Renwick: He's frozen into immobility.

Mr. Martel: Or does the department now write its own reports?

Mr. MacDonald: He has suddenly become silent.

Mr. Laughren: He has to consult with Charlie Hews to find out!

Mr. Martel: That should be removed; it should be over in the Ministry of Labour under the Industrial Safety Act, where it belongs. I'm asking the minister to go along with something I think he's tried to suggest at the mining conference, that there be a convention of ministers of natural resources in Canada so that the various mining companies can stop playing off one province against the other and extracting more than their fair share of the largess. One thing the Tories have to learn is that there is only one motive behind any corporation, and that's the maximization of profit. If they can play off one province against the other, they'll do so; and they've done it beautifully in this province, as was witnessed by Falconbridge going to Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, we in this party would have no qualms about doing what Kierans is doing, or is saying they should do. The minister in his speech at the Royal York suggested nationalization and I'm not sure how you nationalize—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member catered to that.

Mr. Martel: Possibly he can explain how you nationalize what already belongs to the people of Ontario. He should tell me how you nationalize that.

Mr. Renwick: The government gave it away.

Mr. Martel: It already belongs to us.

Mr. Renwick: They gave it away.

Mr. Foulds: He takes their executives into government, that's his theory of nationalization.

Mr. Martel: How do you nationalize something which already belongs to the people?

Mr. Renwick: You give it away for a dollar and they sell it back for several million.

Mr. Martel: That was in the minister's speech. All that diatribe from that group that writes his speeches over there, who are nothing but fronts for the companies.

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. Martel: It was in his speech.

Mr. Laughren: Including the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. He is the biggest flunky of them all.

Mr. Martel: They talked about nationalization and that's why I know the minister didn't read the report, because nowhere—nowhere—does Kierans say "nationalize." And the minister had egg all over his face the day he spoke at the Royal York, because he was saying Kierans was talking about nationalization. He doesn't mention nationalization. The minister had better get his joe boys in that department to read the book so that they can write his next speech accurately.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Read the Manitoba report.

Mr. Martel: I've got the Manitoba report in front of me. By God, that's what this is called, it's called the "Natural Resource Policy in Manitoba," and Kierans goes to great lengths to suggest you can't nationalize that which you already own and that which already belongs to the people—the mineral resources.

It's the minister's people who didn't read this. They took some report out of the Globe and Mail maybe, or the Toronto Star.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Digest it. Read it.

Mr. Martel: They didn't read it.

Mr. MacDonald: The Northern Miner.

Mr. Martel: And that's how bad the minister looks when he gets up and makes stupid statements like he did at the Royal York. It was obvious he didn't read it.

We'd have no problems doing what Kierans says. He says two basic things really. He suggests that Manitoba get involved in a company distinct from mining and do all the explorations and that they then do the mining, in two different companies. That's where the profit is—it isn't in refining and smelting—And that's what they do. They would do nothing with smelting or refining, but they would do the mining, by and large. And they would give the major companies 10 years to get out of the mining field, stock piling all they want. But he doesn't mention nationalization.

Those are the six things this government should do if it's going to get more than two per cent return and not the sellout the Minister of Natural Resources perpetuated in his speech at the Royal York—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Manitoba didn't accept it.

Mr. Martel: —when he said, "We are not going to tax them any more. We can't load them with any more tax."

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: If two per cent is a load of tax then the whole government is sick.

Mr. Germa: Give them a saliva test.

Mr. Martel: If they think that two per cent of taxation on the mining industry is an adequate tax return then the government of Ontario is sick and we are in trouble.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: If the minister had been here all the time he would have learned more tonight than at any time in the last year.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I shall dispense with the formal comments that are made by a member when he first rises to speak in reply to the Speech from the Throne. However, I would like, at the outset, to congratulate the good people in the two ridings, the riding of Huron and the riding of St. George, for their wise selection of Liberal candidates in the recent by-elections.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): I wish they were in the House to hear the member's compliments.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we do know about the government opposite is that they are always draggin' and the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), like St. George, slew the dragon, so those fellows can realize now and can know now that it will not be long before those people will be on this side of the House and we over there.

Their days are numbered. The people have spoken. It has been found out by the people that this government that was supposed to have listened does not listen. As a result, at the next go at the polls they will seek their vengeance and they will return—I shouldn't use the word return—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Elect!

Mr. B. Newman: Elect a Liberal government to run the province's business.

Mr. Speaker, one of the items I would like to make mention of is the problem of the question period. There is a lot of discussion on this side of the House as to who should have the opportunity of asking the next question. There are also the comments that we may not get the full 45 minutes in the question period.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that you have a sweep second clock that could record one hour duration and that you operate it, or the Clerk operate it, when the question period starts. Everyone in this chamber could see the exact amount of time left in the question period. In this way there would be no undue criticism whatsoever levelled at you in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, I introduced in this House a bill intituled an Act to establish the Ontario Waste Disposal and Reclamation Commission. I would like at this time to make a few comments concerning that bill. The richest natural resource ever discovered by man is now garbage. Canadians produce great amounts of garbage every year, and more so each ensuing year. The total national output for 1970 has been estimated at 673 million tons, or approximately 4.3 pounds per person per day collected in the urban areas. So you can see when we talk about garbage, its disposal and the reclamation of byproducts from garbage, that we have a job that will require an enormous amount of ingenuity on the part of our scientists, and likewise a big responsibility on the part of government.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, as I made mention—and the latest statistics are for 1970—we produce only 4.3 pounds per person. It is estimated that within approximately 20 years that amount of garbage will double to almost nine pounds. So you can see that the problem does not diminish, but it seems to accelerate, and accelerate at an extremely rapid rate.

At the present time, natural resources are supplied continually, but they are not unlimited and are not incapable of depletion or abuse. Estimates predict that present sources of many metal ores will be depleted in the near future, necessitating greater costs in money and energy if a continued supply of these metals is to be obtained from the earth.

Present methods of garbage disposal do not take these facts into consideration and very little is done to try to conserve the reusable components of garbage. The three traditional methods of garbage disposal, as everyone knows, are the open dump, landfill and incineration. Unfortunately, none of these methods is problem-free. Many open garbage dumps are unorganized and often create unsightly littering. They have long been recognized as a health hazard and they are often infested with insects and rodents. Furthermore, they present a danger to the environment because of decay and decomposition.

The problem with landfills is that suitable spaces are not in great supply. No one wants a landfill in his neighbourhood. Sometimes this landfill method of disposal has become quite expensive, if the garbage must be shipped to a distant landfill site. You can recall, Mr. Speaker, the discussion recently concerning the metropolitan area here wishing to export its garbage into the northern regions of this province.

Incineration of garbage always creates a residue which is now put into a landfill. One of the main problems with incineration, of course, is air pollution. According to Pollution Probe, at least four of Toronto's seven incinerators are operating in violation of the Air Pollution Control Act.

Therefore, it's easy to conclude that our present methods of garbage disposal represent a destruction of resources, accompanied by economic, environmental and possibly public health damage. A new method of garbage handling is needed that is not harmful to the environment and that at the same time conserves and recycles some of the reusable ingredients of garbage.

I have a proposal, Mr. Speaker, to which I hope the government will give serious consideration. The province should establish an Ontario waste disposal and reclamation commission that would operate on the same basis as Ontario Hydro. In other words, it would become a provincial authority or a provincial utility. This commission would be responsible for all waste disposal in the province, including sanitary landfill and incineration. However, before disposal, the garbage would be processed in a plant for the reclamation of paper, metals and glass. The commission could then market reclaimed materials to industry for recycling.

Many municipalities would find it extremely difficult to set up their own reclamation plant because of the great financial burden involved. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the province should have the responsibility of setting up these plants on a regional basis.

It is estimated that processing 200,000 tons of waste annually would make the operation of such a plant economically feasible. In regions and towns where waste collection procedures are uneconomical for local authorities, the commission would provide collection services as well. In more densely populated regions and municipalities, collection would continue to be provided by the local authorities, but disposal and reclamation would be provided by the commission.

As I mentioned previously, Mr. Speaker, resources are being wasted through burning and burying. Given the dwindling supply of natural resources, we should make every effort to conserve and recycle existing resources. I understand 40 to 50 per cent of all municipal garbage is paper. In spite of the projected shortages, urban centres in Canada are throwing away millions of tons annually. If paper is incinerated, it contributes to harmful air pollution, as complete combustion seldom, if ever, occurs. Paper is the principal source of harmful gases and particulates which can be produced by inefficient incineration of garbage. Paper recycling technology is well developed, but manufacturers and consumers must be educated about the desirability and benefits of recycling paper.

Mr. Speaker, glass represents about six per cent of municipal refuse, mostly in the form of glass containers. The increasing use of non-returnable bottles has greatly increased the amount of glass in our garbage. A ban on these bottles would go a long way to eliminating waste glass. As long as this is not done, we must continue, and will continue, to have unnecessarily large amounts of glass in our garbage.

Since metal is available in limited amounts, we must try to recycle existing supplies. Larger scale recycling of metals seems technologically feasible and financially beneficial. Disposal of metals in garbage is not dangerous with landfill, but the release of gas from metals during incineration is potentially a great health hazard.

By making reclamation plants operational, many of the environmental hazards I have mentioned can be eliminated. Such a plant, Mr. Speaker, has been built by the Black-Clawson Co. in Franklin, Ohio. Contrary to our systems, this plant operates at a profit instead of a loss.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this province could solve many of the problems of garbage disposal by establishing the Ontario waste disposal and reclamation commission. I do hope that my proposal will receive study and serious consideration by the government.

Mr. Speaker, I could make mention of the project in the city of Kingston that has been in operation since 1971. Pollution Probe in the area has provided a series of statistics and they have shown that the plant—even though it is heavily oriented to manual labour—can operate at a profit. The Black-Clawson Co., of Franklin, Ohio, that I mentioned previously, Mr. Speaker, operates only a 150-ton plant and it serves only 10,000 people. It processes garbage for $6 a ton. All sorting and screening is done mechanically, so that there is no handpicking whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. The Kingston operation uses a little more manpower than this and as a result is a little more expensive.

It is said by the Black-Clawson people that a 1,000-ton-a-day plant, which would cost about $10 million, would produce approximately $8,600 worth of reclaimed materials each and every day of its operation. That plant would be able to operate at $2.90 a ton of garbage.

The city of Toronto proposed a Kipling-Horner incinerator that originally was planned to cost $10 million. Now I understand that with the heat recovery units in the plant it will cost approximately $18 million to complete. The Black-Clawson plant in Franklin, Ohio, operates at $5.70 a ton profit, whereas the Toronto incinerator today operates at a loss of approximately $4 a ton. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that there is an alternative to the present method; and that the recycling of reclaimed waste can be an economically viable operation.

There are other projects, such as the Hercules-Delaware project in the state of Delaware, that has been in operation since August of 1971. There is a Gainesville plant in Florida that was originally constructed in 1967. It is also an economically viable operation.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of waste disposal is not a local problem, it is a national problem. With the steadily increasing volume of waste, it is absolutely essential that government take a serious look at the proposition I have mentioned and implement it at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) is not in the House at this time, because you can recall during—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): I am short, but not that short.

Mr. B. Newman: Oh yes he is.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): He is there.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, you recall that during the question period I asked him, concerning the Elizabeth Gardens—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member want me to return to my place to heckle?

Mr. B. Newman: That is quite all right, the minister can hear from there.

I asked the minister a question concerning the Elizabeth Gardens project in the city of Windsor and he said he would look into the whole condominium housing project in the community.

He has had an interim report submitted by Mr. Smith of his staff. I did meet Mr. Smith and he is a very congenial gentleman. He certainly let me know just exactly what has been done, what ministry has had the opportunity to examine.

In spite of all that and in spite of the fact that the minister is not having a probe but has checked into each of the complaints of each of the occupants in the project, I don't think that is going far enough. With that, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing is—checking complaints, but no checks have ever been implemented as to whether the specifications of the plans have been followed.

The latest information I received was from a Bell Telephone lineman who mentioned he went to drill a hole in one of the basement casement window frames and the pressure on the drill forced the whole frame into the home. That is not an isolated case. That is the second case in which an individual has removed the frame with the application of slight pressure.

I've also received complaints, Mr. Speaker, that the shrubbery and the gardening around the housing project was not up to specifications whatsoever. The trees ordered were far smaller than what were called for in the specifications.

There are so many faults in the project that I think the answer to the problem would be to have a complete probe of the whole operation right from the beginning to the end.

I will not read it into the record but may I bring to the minister's attention that on Thursday, March 29, the Windsor Daily Star had an editorial that was headed "No Ifs Ands Or Buts." To save time, Mr. Speaker, I will read only one paragraph, in all, of the article. It is quite a lengthy one and this is the last paragraph:

> "All in all, the situation is such that a full investigation by impartial government investigators is mandatory. Mr. Grossman should stop hesitating and start it."

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is so much to learn from this—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What kind of hesitation is there in holding back $350,000?

Mr. B. Newman: Holding back the money does not necessarily mean that the inspectors are checking to see if the specifications for the construction have been followed at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If not, they won't get paid. They won't get their money.

Mr. B. Newman: The holdback is simply to see that the project is progressing and nothing else. After it has been completed—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, even though the minister may say that, it would still be worth his while, and it would be to the advantage of housing generally through the province, if he had a complete and thorough investigation of the whole operation of this condominium project. He would find errors in the construction field and he could apply this experience to other projects so that citizens buying homes in a project like this would know the homes are fully guaranteed, and would have a guarantee, say for a year's time, or their money would be cheerfully refunded, we hope, to them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to see that the Premier (Mr. Davis) is in his seat, because the next topic I wanted to discuss and mention very briefly was the issue of daylight saving time.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I thought it was his personality. That would have been interesting.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the problem of daylight saving time is nothing earth-shattering or anything of that sort, but communities have asked that daylight saving time be universal throughout the province. In addition to that, the fact that daylight saving time carries on until the last Sunday in October extends the time a little too long. By that time young children going to school are leaving home in the darkness and coming home in the darkness too, and I don't think

it's right. I think a new look should be taken at daylight saving time by the province. It should probably end on either the first Sunday after Labour Day, or at the latest possibly on the last Sunday in September.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk for a short while concerning a rent supplement scheme. Year after year I have brought to the attention of the government the need for rent supplements, especially to senior citizens. The ministry has implemented such a programme. But let me illustrate to you, Mr. Speaker, the type of programme it has. I will speak for my own community because I am more familiar with it.

Of some 1,300 senior citizens who are looking for geared-to-income housing in the community, there are only 27 rent supplement programmes in the city. There are only 27 accommodations that under the rent supplement programme.

The problem with the rent supplement programme as implemented by the government is that an individual or a builder has to apply to the department to have his accommodations put under the rent supplement scheme. Many of the people living in accommodations today, and especially senior citizens, are satisfied with their accommodations. They don't want to be moved from where they live. The big problem is they cannot afford the rentals. The rentals are not abnormally high, but they are in a range that prevents them from leading the type of life of an individual who is able and fortunate enough to get geared-to-income senior citizens' housing.

Rather than building senior citizens' highrise accommodation, I think the minister could curtail some of this building, if he provided rent supplement to the senior citizens in the accommodations in which they live right now.

The minister would say that the individual owning the accommodation is going to gouge the government as far as rentals are concerned. That type of individual is the exception and not the rule. The minister's staff could come along and check on these senior citizens. He could have his inspectors go around. They would not put the senior citizen who would be paying an abnormal amount of rent for the accommodation on a geared-to-income rent supplement programme. The ministry would build highrise or other accommodation for him.

There are a lot of senior citizens living in accommodations today where the rents are decent and are the type of rent that one would normally expect to pay for that accommodation. But the senior citizen cannot afford that at all, and the government should be supplementing his rentals.

Why should someone who is fortunate enough to get into geared-to-income rental be able to have a higher standard of living than another senior citizen who is in the unfortunate position that he cannot get into a highrise or other senior citizens' accommodation?

The government is discriminating against the individual who cannot find or cannot be placed in Ontario Housing. It can implement a rent subsidy programme for the senior citizen very easily. It would not disrupt the senior citizen. He is living in accommodation and among friends. There is a minimum of social problems as a result of that, whereas under the present scheme of coming along and warehousing a lot of them in a concrete box—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They just love it. Don't call it warehousing.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, some of them just love it; that's absolutely true. But the minister is not taking care of those other senior citizens for whom he cannot build housing accommodation in the foreseeable future. Why should that senior citizen be penalized and the other one be favoured? The government should treat them all alike. It can treat them all alike by providing them with a rent supplement right in the accommodation in which they live.

I don't think the inspectors from the Ontario Housing in the city of Windsor would have any difficulty going to the 1,300 senior citizens who have asked for housing accommodation, looking at the accommodation, finding out the rentals being charged, approaching the landlord and coming to some type of accommodation that would not be gouging, would not be excessive and would accommodate the senior citizen. The ministry wouldn't have to keep building senior citizen accommodations for that type of an individual.

I think there is a better answer than simply providing senior citizens' highrise, or other housing in a hurry. The minister can provide the accommodations over an extended period of time; but at the same time, with the rent supplement, he should be able to accommodate those many senior citizens who are not favoured and cannot get into Ontario Housing senior citizens' accommodations.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when the minister only has 27 subsidized rental units in the city of Windsor, he certainly is not being as vigorous and as active as he should be with the rent supplement scheme. He has 1,200 or 1,300 senior citizens waiting for accommodation; he has some 900 family requests for accommodation; so in all he has some 3,000 families looking for accommodation; and for all of them he has only 27 rent supplement accommodations.

That is just not good enough today, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister can be a little more vigorous. He can have his officials look into the scheme a little closer and come up with a better answer than he has. In the meantime, the minister's development of senior citizens' accommodation can carry on, but he would not have to rush to complete them.

He could possibly spread them throughout the community a little better. It isn't necessarily good to have them all concentrated in one area. I am not saying it is bad, but I am saying it isn't necessarily good. They say there is a better answer; and as I have mentioned earlier for those senior citizens who are satisfied with where they live but can't afford the rental that they have to pay, the rent subsidy programme can be the answer.

The way the programme is operating with this ministry is not the answer as yet. I have talked this over with ministry officials back in the city of Windsor and they certainly do see just exactly what I have mentioned. I would assume that they would just love to go into this in the way I have mentioned, but something seems to prevent them from doing just that back here in Toronto. As I mentioned, the rent subsidy would not only be for senior citizens. It could be for those on various benefit programmes through the Ministry of Community and Social Services, such as the monther's allowance or family benefits and the disabled person's allowance.

While I am on this senior citizen topic, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention that possibly another answer to the senior citizens programme could be a baby bonus in reverse established by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. There the ministry, rather than worrying about building senior citizens' accommodations, would pay a bonus geared-to-income to the children if they would accommodate their parents rather than put them in senior citizens' housing.

If you gave the family a bonus they could probably put on a room or so at the back of their present accommodation and they could take care of mother or dad, or both mother and dad. So this could eliminate a social problem, or minimize a social problem, it could provide accommodation for them and they would be with their children. And I think it would be, financially, a much cheaper operation than the one we have at present.

The task force that goes about the province, Mr. Speaker, has heard numerous individuals making presentations, requesting that the rent supplement style of programme be expanded, be put into operation in a more vigorous fashion. Likewise, I have also heard comments that they do like the family taking care of mother or dad, but the family hesitate to do that. I doubt if they would have the same amount of hesitancy if there was some financial consideration like a reverse style of baby bonus.

Back in my own community, while the two ministers are in their seats—that is the Minister of Revenue and the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle), —we happen to have four different action centres. We have the downtown community citizens organization; the east Windsor citizens organization; the Windsor West citizens organization; and the Ford Ferndale citizens organization. These organizations have action centres.

The downtown group does have accommodation that has been provided by the Ministry of Revenue, the housing branch, in cooperation with Ontario Housing and CMHC, and 7.5 per cent from the city, I understand. They have nice accommodation. The ministry is to be commended for putting this up. It serves a real purpose. It assists both of the ministries there.

In the accommodation they have a programme or a service to the people who live in the area, in addition to people who may live in the adjacent area, not necessarily living in Ontario Housing. The programme is counselling and simply relieving the various individuals of various problems—or attempting to solve problems—or making various government contacts for them. It is a sort of referral service. It is an action centre; a general attempt at problem-solving.

The centres are operating today on a LIP grant. That LIP grant will end, if I am not mistaken, at the end of May and then it is all over with.

The service that is provided in these four action centres is of value to the community. It has assisted Ontario Housing. It has minimized the social problems that were in the

housing project. It has financially helped Ontario Housing. It has likewise helped the Ministry of Community and Social Services. I think between the two of them or one or the other, they should provide a continuing grant.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't have the money.

Mr. B. Newman: Some of the money the minister could save on the repairs—the extra repairs which are going to be put into the Elizabeth Gardens project would take care of all four of the centres.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That's a practical suggestion. The minister just thought he didn't have the money.

Mr. B. Newman: The services these four centres perform for the people, Mr. Speaker, should not die simply because the LIP grant has expired. I think the Ministry of Community and Social Services and the Ministry of Revenue should get their heads together and provide to the organizations a continuing grant so that they can carry on the good work they have been carrying out until now.

To the Minister of Revenue, through you, Mr. Speaker, the programmes are under the guidance of a Mrs. Donna Gamble, who would be familiar to him as she is on the housing task force. He knows how capable she is in that respect, and she is equally capable in co-ordinating the four community centre programmes in the city of Windsor. I think financial assistance to that organization so that it can continue the programme is absolutely essential for the betterment of the community itself; and for the Ministry of Revenue and the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to bring up a point on discrimination. This discrimination does not affect this government; it affects the senior government. However, this government is the government that should probably be looking into it as it is the one that has the Human Rights Code and Commission. When it comes to senior citizens, the single senior citizen under the new allowances will receive $170.14. Now be that man or woman its $170.14. The married couple will receive a total of $324.60. The man gets $170.14, the wife only gets $154.46. So we are discriminating there on account of marital status.

Not only is it discriminating, but that couple could go to legal aid, get legal aid and get separated or divorced. It would cost legal aid a substantial amount of money to process the divorce case and then they, as two single, divorced people, would each be getting $170.14. So the government is discriminating against married people by not providing each one of the married couples with the same amount of allowance.

My suggestion to the minister is that if the federal government will not come along and make the allowance even to both, then he should pick up the tab.

An hon. member: It is only money.

Mr. B. Newman: I refer now to the minister of Community and Social Services. If the Province of British Columbia can provide $200 income to an individual and $400 to a married couple, then the Province of Ontario, the richest province in Canada, could follow BC. It wouldn't take too much effort on this government's part to provide the same amount that the Province of British Columbia is providing to senior citizens.

It is not a big substantial amount as we once thought it was going to be. It would be the equivalent of $75.40 in all, and then they would have a $200 income each, or $400 total amount. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it isn't asking too much in the year of 1973 to guarantee each senior citizen at least $200 a month income.

Mr. Speaker, I had extensive comments to make concerning a whole series of topics, but for the sake of time I'm going to bypass some of them or shorten the length of my comments.

Back in February of this year I put a questionnaire to the good constituents in Windsor-Walkerville and the replies totalled 4,400. I would like to bring to the attention of the government four of the replies that have to do with the government, and I think that some type of action should be taken by the ministries involved. One of the questions was, should the driver's licence—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How many questions were on it?

Mr. B. Newman: I beg pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How many questions were on it?

Mr. B. Newman: Ten questions on the questionnaire. I'm only going to read four.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Read them all.

Mr. B. Newman: I know the minister is very interested, but if he wants to see me after I'm all through—

An hon. member: The member can draw pictures for him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Better put them on the record. Let's have them all. One or two of the other five might say something nice about the government. We'd like to hear it.

Mr. B. Newman: Some of them might be embarrassing to the government and I wouldn't want to do that.

Mrs. Campbell: Most of them aren't here anyway so we couldn't get any reaction.

Mr. B. Newman: One of the questions was: "Should the driver's licence include a recent picture of the driver?" And 76 per cent of those 4,400 who replied said they wanted the picture on. So, to the Ministry of Transportation and Communications—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Got a lot more like that too!

Mr. B. Newman: —here is a suggestion that can be followed. Other states do this, but we in Ontario are not leaders, we are followers; and we are the slow-learner type of followers.

Mrs. Campbell: You can say that again.

Mr. B. Newman: A second question was: "Should Ontario operate its own lottery as do other provinces?"

Eighty-four per cent of the people said we should have a provincial lottery. Mr. Speaker, I think it behooves the government to look into this.

The third question was: "Should election expenses be limited and controlled by law?" Ninety per cent of the people replied that they wanted controls on election expenses; but strict controls, not the type of controls the people across there would like to impose. The government's controls would be on the two opposition parties but not on itself.

The last question would go to the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Education: "Should employees be allowed to negotiate conditions of work?" Of the people replying 74 per cent thought conditions of work should be a negotiable item. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) is as involved as the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) is when he discusses the Reville report and whether teachers should be given the right to negotiate conditions of work.

I won't go into any of the other questions because I think those four were a little more significant. The percentage of those answering and being so emphatic in their opinions was so great I thought I would bring it to the attention of the government, Mr. Speaker.

One of the other topics I wanted to bring up is the needs of elderly people. Elderly people are being neglected and have been neglected for too long a period of time, Mr. Speaker.

When we come to the elderly, we find that not only this government but governments throughout Canada don't pay attention to them to the extent they should. I'm going to read 10 different points under which government could come along and pay a little more attention to them.

One, the elderly are ignored when it comes to speedy relief from destructively high property taxes; this would prevent millions of older people from being literally taxed out of their homes.

Second, guarantees that the elderly may buy automobile insurance at reasonable rates consistent with the individual's ability to drive a car safely. Because the individual is elderly, even though he can drive a car safely the insurance rates are abnormally high.

Third, a suggestion to the government that some sort of inflation-proof bond or debenture be available so that the elderly who have the financial wherewithal would have a safe medium in which to invest some of their funds so that their buying power would not depreciate substantially with inflation.

A fourth should be the development of driver education courses for the elderly just as there are now for high school students; plus there should be cut-rate public transportation universally for elderly people throughout the province, especially travelling during off rush-hours. Also, the development of transportation services should be designed to accommodate the elderly. They shouldn't have the difficulty of having to climb 40 or 50 stairs in the subway when an escalator could provide much easier access to the subway for them.

A fifth point, Mr. Speaker, is there should be an upgrading of nutritional standards for foods most frequently consumed by older persons; there should be disclosure on these food labels of the nutrient content of the can, bottle or package.

Sixth: There should be a hot-meal programme implemented on a province-wide basis. This could be in co-operation with our

present public school system so that the elderly would have a place to go and could help run the programme wherever possible.

Seventh: Adult education programmes could be geared primarily for consumer education and protection against the wide array of gyps, frauds and financial drains to which elderly consumers are now subjected.

An eighth point is there should be mid-career counselling and retraining programmes to help older workers avoid the disasters of occupational obsolescence and chronic joblessness, because there are large numbers of unemployed aged over 45.

The ninth is that there should be legal representation for the elderly individual who has been exploited in the marketplace. There should be special education protection programmes on consumer product safety laws affecting elderly consumers such as unsafe drugs and cosmetics; and better safeguards against misrepresentation and other problems always linked with the purchase of hearing aids, glasses and false teeth.

The tenth is there should be a formal research programme to study the special needs and problems of the elderly consumer, how he acts in the marketplace, the kinds of education protection programmes necessary and the laws he really needs.

I only bring the 10 items, Mr. Speaker. I could speak at much greater length on them, but I hesitate to do so because we know we'd like to get out of here before 4 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other items that I would like to bring up, and very briefly. One is on mobile housing. This government has vacillated on the mobile housing issue for too long a period of time. The member for the riding of Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough), who was responsible for looking into the problem of mobile homes, hesitated to act with the dispatch that he should have —and as a result we find mobile homeowners in an extremely embarrassing position.

Now the mobile home tenants in the Lucier Estates Home Owners Association did present a report to the government task force looking into the housing situation. They made a series of recommendations that I think are worthy of reading into the record so that the government could look at it.

May I make a comment for the record, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Chatham-Kent is completely disinterested in the problems of the mobile homeowners. All he wants to do is sneer and make fun out of the difficulties with which they are confronted. That certainly doesn't speak too well for a member that at one time held the position of number two man in this government. If the rest of the minister are the way he is, Mr. Speaker, this government certainly is a real disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendations are as follows:

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Chatham-Kent): Why doesn't the member just table them?

Mr. B. Newman: All the member is asking me to do is to talk indefinitely, and I can easily do that.

Mr. McKeough: That's what the member is doing.

Mrs. Campbell: Go right ahead!

Mr. B. Newman: Where was the member earlier in the evening when other members spoke for an hour-and-a-half and almost two hours. He wasn't around. All of a sudden he has rested up and he comes in here and now he wants to yap.

Mr. McKeough: I was waiting breathlessly to hear the member.

Mr. B. Newman: Oh yes, that's right.

Mrs. Campbell: Read it in.

Mr. B. Newman: Oh, I intend to do so; whether he makes comments or not.

Mr. McKeough: He will, ad nauseam.

Mr. B. Newman: The recommendations of the Lucier Estates Home Owners Association, a group that have mobile homes in an area south of Windsor, are as follows:

1. We recommend that the Ontario government, along with the federal government, take a long, hard, intensive look into bringing into effect legislation mobile home dwellers desperately need, such as the Landlord and Tenant Act that would give them some type of protection. They want this immediately, not in the long distant future.

2. We recommend that Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. get involved in this by making low cost mortgages available to mobile home owners.

3. We recommend that before a park is to be set up, all plans must be submitted to the government for approval.

4. We recommend that the government either start their own parks or make gov-

ernment grants available to those wanting to provide a decent place for mobile home owners to live.

5. That all distributors in the business of selling these units must be government approved and meet the laws we hope are put into effect regarding the service and sale of mobile homes.

6. We recommend and acknowledge that rules and regulations are a necessity for the general well-being of a mobile home estate, however these rules and regulations should not be forced on the people but put to the majority of the residents to decide what rules they see fit to live under. After all, we are the people who are supposed to be living in a democracy and not a dictatorship.

7. We recommend that we should be entitled to full police protection as all other home owners are in all respects of the law.

8. We recommend that the government take a serious look in regard to rents charged and enforce some type of rent control.

9. We want to be treated as regular home owners, as we are not gypsies or nomads, which is what many people have the impression we are.

10. We would like to ask why the government seems to be dragging its feet in all of the above areas we have listed. It appears to us that at the present time the government seems to think if they ignore us we will go away.

11. We also would like to know what would happen to us if the community decided they didn't want us and put the 60-day trailer limit into effect. Where do we go? What do we do then?

12. What would happen to us, if the owner ever decided to sell his land to another individual or party and they decided they didn't want a mobile home park, but wanted to go into housing or apartments? Where would we go and what would we do?

You can see, Mr. Speaker, that these mobile home tenants are extremely concerned as to what would happen to them. They have received no direction from government. Government implemented a study back in 1971, but since then has been dragging its feet.

The last item I wanted to bring up is the problem of the gasoline retailers. I have discussed this and brought it up on the floor of the House years ago. There has been no action on the part of this government as far as the retail gas dealers of the province are concerned. It looks as if this government, has no intention of alleviating the problems of the gasoline dealers.

The gasoline dealers are in the most embarrassing position in that they have to obey just exactly what the gasoline distributor, the producer, says to them. They have no alternative but either to abide by that or close up shop.

They, have petitioned this government time and time again for some kind of action and are getting nowhere. I would like to read into the record just the few recommendations they have and a few suggestions they make.

They operate a business in which they are not free to set their own hours second they are not free to buy the gasoline they choose. Third, they are compelled to buy designated brands of miscellaneous items at prices that are not always competitive. Fourth, they are not free to advertise their own name; they're compelled to advertise the oil company; Fifth, they are compelled to pay for promotional advertising programmes and contests sponsored by oil companies. Sixth, they are compelled to accept unusual leases and contract charges or abandon the business.

However, the service station operators do happen to have two freedoms. They are: one, the freedom to do everything the oil company suggests: two, the freedom to go broke.

You can see, Mr. Speaker, that the gasoline dealers are confronted with extremely unfair competition, unfair margins, unfair lease agreements, price discrimination and all types of promotional gimmicks. This government, in spite of looking into the problems of franchising, to date has done nothing with the report submitted to it in July, 1971.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, it is now 11:40, p.m. With the time I have available I wish to try in my own way to dispel some, but not all, of the myths that have left an unfair impression of the organized workers of this province and of this country. I, first, wish to paraphrase the following statement as a preface to my main remarks:

> Every week 19 Canadians are killed on the job and, on an average day, 2,240 are injured. The total is even higher if we take

into account those who are self-employed in agriculture, fishing, banking, trapping, and some service industries with fewer than four employees, and so on. The real death toll for 1971 is probably over 1,300. Again, in 1965, seven million man-days were lost on account of occupational accidents, which was four times the loss by strikes and lockouts.

We all are aware of the controversy around the operations of firms providing professional strike-breaking services to struck plants in Ontario. And I want to quote from Mr. T. M. Fielder, president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce:

> Whatever one thinks of some of the conduct of these firms which sell their services to a struck employer, it will be highly unfortunate if a municipal council resolution or a new law out of Queens Park is based on this aspect alone, which is really irrelevant to the fundamental issues.

I also want to quote from a statement by Harold J. Clawson, vice president of the Steel Co. of Canada:

> The Ontario Federation of Labour is now asking various municipal councils to request the provincial government to pass laws prohibiting the use of so-called professional strike-breakers. Some councils have supported this position. I wonder if they know what they are doing. Let's make no mistake about it, what the OF of L wants is not just restrictions on professional strike-breakers, they want the law to prohibit any operation of a place of business during a strike.

Canadian unionists have been made the nation's economic whipping boys. They are blamed for "exhorbitant" wage settlements that allegedly cause inflation, and for strikes that disrupt the economy and inconvenience the public. They have been accused of becoming too powerful, of pursuing their own "selfish" interests, to the detriment of the unorganized workers, the poor, and those on fixed incomes.

This is the way unions are portrayed in the news media. And the effect of this bad public image has been to convince many citizens, perhaps even the majority, that laws should be passed to curb unions' rights, and particularly the right to strike.

There are feelings, with such an anti-labour mood prevailing, that some politicians may be tempted to capitalize on that feeling by enacting or promising to enact legislation to shackle unions and reduce some of their hard-won rights.

At a time when everyone is seeking a scapegoat for our economic troubles, the unions are the likeliest and most vulnerable target. This attitude is becoming prevalent because few people know anything about union history, union structures, union methods. This ignorance is because of the inadequacies of our educational system, which teaches students virtually nothing of value about the labour movement. The textbooks glorify the business tycoons and the politicians of the past.

The one-sided press coverage of labour problems is another cause of labour's bad public image. Although 95 out of every 100 contract negotiations reach a settlement without any overt fuss or incident, the press concentrates on the other five that end in strikes —and especially on the relatively few that develop picket line troubles. The only time the average person reads or hears about unions is when they are on strike, and to him this represents the normal, everyday behaviour.

Organized wage and salary earners are the only group in our society who are obliged to justify and bargain for increased incomes. The manufacturer who wishes to raise his income merely adds another cent or two to the price of his product. The retailer adds his markup. The doctors and lawyers raise their fees. The landlord raises the rent. The banker raises interest rates.

All these increases are made unilaterally and arbitrarily, without reference to any regulation, laws, or other form of control. We are all aware of the collective bargaining procedures under the Labour Relations Act that organized workers must face, almost always in the public eye.

What kind of public image would doctors project if they were compelled to negotiate higher fees with their patients, and, failing agreement, refuse to treat them? Or landlords, if they had to negotiate rental hikes with their tenants, and, failing agreement, lock them out? Or retailers, if they had to negotiate all price increases with the consumer groups, and, failing agreement, refuse to sell them milk, bread, or staple foods? They would soon suffer the same decline in popularity that unions do every time a strike occurs.

It is fashionable these days to condemn strikes as barbaric and obsolete. These criticisms miss the point. Low wages, unstable

working conditions and inadequate benefits are the real barbaric aspects of our economy, but they are far from obsolete. Until they are, the strike will remain as the only real weapon at labour's disposal to improve the worker's status.

Contrary to popular belief, no union is ever eager to stage a strike. Most unions, in fact, measure their success in any one year by the degree to which they have kept strikes to a minimum. When a strike is called, it is only as a last resort—after they have felt that the employer is most unreasonable and that they are left with no alternative.

The fact that only five per cent of labour disputes lead to a strike should be sufficient proof that unions, far from fomenting troubles, spend most of their time settling disputes before the strike stage is reached. But the press, the public and some politicians are not satisfied with a 95 per cent batting average.

Some demand nothing short of perfection in labour relations, even if that means outlawing strikes and settling wage levels by arbitrary methods. Any attempt to impose such a simple solution would, of course, produce chaos instead of better relations. Not only would illegal strikes multiply, but frustrated workers would resort to other perhaps even more damaging forms of protest—absenteeism, malingering, the slowdown and work-to-rule methods. I don't feel anyone would favour these alternatives.

If unions were even one-tenth as powerful as they are thought to be, they should have been able to redistribute the national income to a greater extent than they have so far. In fact, over the past 50 years, despite all the efforts of organized labour, the share of the national income that goes to wages and salaries has increased only a few percentage points. Although most people are better off today, much the same income gap remains between various groups of the population. This state of affairs could hardly exist if unions were now more powerful than the employers. The day to take such a suggestion seriously will be the day when a shop steward has the power to fire his boss.

The myth that union-won wage increases are the chief cause of inflation persists, despite conclusive evidence to the contrary. A report published last year by the influential Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development stated flatly that wage rates in Canada have lagged behind advances in production and profits. The OECD said that the recent strong acceleration of pay rates constituted simply a catching up with the past increases in output and corporate profits, which ran ahead of wages by about three years throughout the 1960s.

Even the Liberal government's now defunct Prices and Incomes Commission, which put most of the blame for inflation on Canada's labour unions, had a change of mind just before being phased out. Its chairman, Dr. John Young, admitted in his last report that "we do not attach particular significance to unions as a contributing force in inflation." This was a complete about-face from his anti-labour speeches during his tenure as commission chairman.

It may be appropriate to quote from another Liberal government document, the 1971 Senate report on growth, employment and price stability, which also exonerated the unions as the major cause of rising prices. Said the report:

> The main reason why unions are characteristically allocated blame for inflation is that they go after income gains for their members so very much in public. Other groups are able to do the same thing more quietly, sometimes almost unnoticed by the public. But collective bargaining is, and probably always will be, one of the noisiest economic processes known to man; and this makes unions especially vulnerable to bing designated as major social and economic scapegoats.

The labour movement is people who are constantly examining their responsibilities to people. The labour movement has assessed and is assessing its role and has opted for social unionism.

There has been, and still is, opposition to involving themselves in activities other than their own immediate and internal affairs. But labour has recognized that brotherhood demands an interest in their communities, their country and its people and their well-being; that the protection of their own hard-won gains demands a say in government where the rules are made and power lies; and that if, they are to remain a social force for good they must identify with the weak, the poor, the unorganized and the unfortunate.

Herein lies the fear of the establishment today, the fear so often expressed by spokesmen for the corporate giants, the chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, media editorials enacted upon by their political cronies in Canada—free enterprise Liberal and Conservative parties. The fear is that someday union members—ordinary working folk of all vocations—will realize their poten-

tial strength, will realize that they could elect a government that could give them a tax cut instead of big business.

They could legislate programmes and expenditures for many things that need to be done—jobs, environmental cleanups; things which directly create jobs—instead of huge handouts of public tax dollars to the corporate giants, in the pious hope that they might use some of it to create a job instead of eliminating jobs.

Their record to date, I think you will agree, has been lousy. This is a fear; this is why unions are under greater attack today than at any time since the battle to organize. It is a much more sophisticated attack that attempts to surround, capture and then enlist those who desperately need union organization and political help, against the one organization—the union movement—that does have a decent batting average on their behalf.

Those who decry organized labour, I'm personally convinced, don't really fear labour alone. The business and corporate world would see it as a workers fraternal club, just as they see the manufacturers' association and chamber of commerce as theirs. They probably don't even mind a few individual unionists getting involved politically, as long as it is with the establishment parties like the Liberal and Conservative, which they can control.

What scares the devil out of them is the thought working people might really challenge their hold on the economy and turn it to a people's society instead of a profits society. The people might organize with and join a political party that is prepared to make substantial changes in the current rules of the economic game they are playing.

This is why the attack on labour today; this is why attempts are made to highlight major contract gains and strikes—to imply that unions are greedy and willing to cause serious disruption to achieve their selfish aims; to loudly proclaim that unions won't cooperate to control wages so that inflation can be licked; that unions sticking up for people create all those bums who sit around because they don't want to work.

We've all heard the charges; the sneaky inferences and the pleas for control and the restraint on the big bad unions who are causing all the little people so much anguish.

Mr. Speaker, they do make mistakes and they should not wear any halo of absolute purity. But let me lay it on the line; there has never been such a bull roar tossed at the working people of Canada in 35 years as there has been in the past two years. It's deliberate and contrived deceit. It's intended to shake their confidence in themselves and in their frustrations; provoke them either into no outside action, or conversely into stupid acts of anarchy which could only aid the campaign of their enemies.

I don't mind urging all of them to take effective action on behalf of all the unfortunate people of this country. To mobilize their real power, their political power in coming elections. They must take heart in ending some of the double standards in our country. Why is labour and the NDP blamed for welfare bums when the huge corporations of this country are the ones getting the handouts from our tax dollars?

Twenty years ago corporations paid 28 per cent of all direct taxes collected by the government, and individuals paid 26.7—fairly equal. In 1973, individuals will pay 49.9 of all direct income taxes, and corporations only 12.2—most of which they will get back in government grants.

Surely this indicates clearly who is calling the shot and who qualifies as a welfare bum. It's not the producer or the unfortunate guy on welfare.

Why should a rich man holding two or more jobs be considered to have diversified holdings, while a worker with two jobs is moonlighting? Why should speculators be allowed to boost property values through phoney sales by $3,000, $4,000, $5,000, $6,000, $10,000 or $15,000 a lot before a house is ever built, when so many people need houses and when it results in prices and rents too high for hundreds of thousands of Canadians?

Why should public initiative be attacked by old parties and business politicians because it interferes with private enterprise? Aren't the private enterprise boys the very ones who are getting the public help from our taxes? Why should our tax dollars subsidize new automated plants for corporations that often result in fewer jobs for workers and more profit for business? What's fair about that?

How far do you think a factory worker would get if he asked for tax deferments and tried to pay no taxes while he fought his attachment in court? We can laugh at that, but isn't it exactly what the big corporations and the wealthy are getting away with, while lower and middle income people are made the scapegoats?

It is clear that labour is ready and willing to sit down as equals and discuss wages and the operation of essential services at the time

of labour disputes. But they should make it equally obvious that the people want jobs and security—legitimate demands—not welfare; that they are ready to crack down on anyone who abuses welfare, corporate as well as individuals.

They should make it clear that what they want is honest tax reform and that they want effective consumer protection, essential health, education and housing services supplied on a cost basis with the speculator and profiteer consigned to the ashcan where they belong.

Give us a fair society, with people as the most important goal, and labour will more than play a responsible role. But let them not kid themselves any longer. If they want equity, justice and opportunity, they are going to have to fight for it! With the responsibility they have, the labour movement should be in the fight for justice for people.

I hope my efforts this evening, Mr. Speaker, will bring somewhat of a better understanding of the issues involved, regarding an important aspect of our social and economic development. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me the opportunity to enter the Throne debate.

The Speech from the Throne covered a rather large area of government involvement in the quality of life of the citizens of Ontario.

As on opposition member, I believe some of the proposals are good and can be accepted by many, but there are some that cannot be accepted without some strong reservation and debate.

I commend the government—even at this late date—on its announcement of a crackdown on the illegal use of drugs in Ontario and its intention to bring in strong measures for the protection of the citizens and the enforcement of programmes to combat drugs related to crime. This is a decision long overdue, for the drug problem in Ontario is at a critical level. I believe, as many citizens do, that both levels of government, provincial and federal, and our courts have been far too lenient in controlling drug abuse in Ontario.

My suggestion the other day, directed to the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr), that the government place bounties on drug pushers is nothing new. I have been told that other countries use a similar method of controlling drug pushers. I believe, as others do, that a drug pusher is one of the lowest creatures present in our society, the lowest form of an animal, and should be treated as such. The government has had bounties placed on animals such as the wolves; they had a price on their heads, and they almost became extinct. At one time wolves were considered a menace to our survival and to society as a whole. Drug pushers are killers. The province should put a price on the head of every drug pusher if we are to control drug abuse in Ontario.

The introduction of offtrack betting services in Ontario will no doubt bring in additional revenues to the province, and I suggest once again that the municipalities should share in that revenue through a special municipal tax programme that would provide additional income to the municipalities.

As the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) has stated, there was nothing mentioned in the Throne Speech concerning labour, except for one matter that leaves the impression that all labour in Ontario is dishonest, or labour is a poor citizen and is unworthy. Often statements by the government single out labour as an evil to our society; a poor attitude for the government to take. As to the remarks that an inquiry into organized crime in labour would be established in this session, we in the Liberal Party have asked the government to broaden its terms of reference to cover all organized crime in Ontario, an inquiry similar to one the Province of Quebec has initiated. No doubt organized crime in Ontario and Quebec are related.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply concerned by the statement dealing with provincial growth of goods and services and the predicted increase to six per cent this year, as compared to an estimate of 5.5 per cent gain in 1972. The gross national product in Canada rose by 10.6 per cent in 1972, the largest advance in six years, reaching a total of almost $103 billion, value of all goods and services produced in Canada.

What a ridiculous way to measure our wealth in this country. The fantastic growth of wealth has put more money and profit into the hands of the banks and trust companies, adding further to inflation.

We Canadians perhaps have the highest lending rates compared to many countries. Just this week the Bank of Canada has taken steps to tighten up on lending, but then who suffers? The banks' best customers will receive the bank loans, small businesses and home buyers will find it harder to get loans

and will be forced then to pay higher interest rates. The same conditions that existed in 1969 cannot be accepted or tolerated by the general public.

Action must be taken by the federal government and even the provinces to apply pressure to reduce the rates so that the average citizen can afford to purchase a home at a reasonable interest rate.

I have heard so much of the federal Conservative Party wanting to bring in price and wage controls, but never once including profits. This measure of price and wage control was used in the United States with little success, if any. Inflation is on the rampage in the United States and is present in Canada. With the accelerating boom in the economy, we in Ontario and Canada have failed to provide the necessary jobs for a healthy economy. There is not sufficient employment available and the right of every Canadian to share in that prosperity has been denied.

I quote from the Throne Speech:

> . . . the average unemployment rate has declined from 5.2 per cent in 1971 to 4.8 per cent in 1972, and a record of 140,000 new jobs were created. . . . unemployment in Ontario was 4.1 per cent in February of this year compared with 4.6 in February, 1972.

Yes, no doubt these are true; unemployment has declined, but not far enough. It has been said that in a healthy economy the level of unemployment should be around the three per cent level. The federal government and the provinces have many cost sharing schemes to create new employment on an ad hoc basis. This has certainly reduced unemployment in the early months of 1973 to 4.1 per cent with such programmes as initiative grants and others.

I refer to an article printed in the Evening Tribune, Thursday, Jan. 4, 1973:

> The Niagara Parks Commission received a grant of $27,144 which will provide jobs for 20 labourers or 232 man weeks-work. The MP for Niagara Falls said that this grant is to aid in the area's high winter unemployment problems. Work to be done will include improvement of parkland, the Niagara shoreline, cleaning of ditches and culverts and other improvement jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this grant could create five permanent jobs for one year. No doubt the Niagara Parks Commission can well afford paying the total cost of this project. It is rather regrettable that a government agency such as the Niagara Parks Commission should have to bow to a federal government loan to do this work, particularly as the Niagara Parks Commission has the funds there to do it itself.

If both the federal government and the province can provide the capital for such programmes for a short period of three months of employment for many, and this government can come into this House and use the unemployment figures of 4.1 per cent, telling the public we have a healthy economy with full employment, this statement by the government is shameful. It is a precedent that has been followed year after year. It is a misleading statement that cannot be accepted or tolerated any longer by those citizens of this province who suffer under unemployment.

The people in Ontario want job security and believe that this is a right and the government must provide the leadership in creating that goal. We have seen many instances where industries have closed down with government doing little, if anything. I can recall the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) speaking here about a year or so ago with regard to the closing of the Dunlop Rubber plant in Toronto. I think much of it must have been caused by Hydro not purchasing their goods from a source close by, and perhaps the government should rap the knuckles of Ontario Hydro.

In the Canada-Japan Newsletter dated December, 1972, I noted that about 6,421 metric tons of preheater and superheater tubes were purchased in Japan. This is another matter that I cannot accept at this time, when there are industries here in Canada, particularly in Ontario, such as Babcock Wilcox at Galt and Combustion Enineering in Montreal, that are capable of manufacturing these tubes.

I can recall working for a company in the city of Port Colborne about 10 or 15 years ago, the former E. B. McGee Ltd., which used to fabricate preheater tubes for Ontario Hydro. At that time, I recall, Ontario Hydro had a government inspector there; and after every stage in the fabricating process he measured the material with a micrometer to see that it didn't distort too much in its roundness. The measurements were checked and the material was machined. I just wonder if Ontario Hydro has sent inspectors over to Japan to see what type of work it is going to get.

But the point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe full employment could have been provided for about 36 men here in Canada or in Ontario. I think it is

ridiculous that Ontario Hydro has the right to leave this country to purchase goods that can be produced here.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): What about them hiring American firms to do their construction work?

Mr. Haggerty: I would like to bring to the attention of the House that I think the government should rap Ontario Hydro's knuckles very hard on this matter.

In other debates in the Legislature I have suggested measures I thought would create steady employment for many. If we are committed to the theme, "Keep Ontario Beautiful," then the government must employ environmental personnel on a full-time basis. I was very interested in the comments of the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) tonight, dealing with waste disposal; what he suggested would create jobs too, and I think this is a good idea.

The recycling of our waste, such as old automobiles and the millions of tons of metal scrap that clutter up our communities, as well as many other waste materials, can bring in revenue to offset some of the cost of employing environmental personnel.

I welcome the announcement that the government will introduce legislation which will ensure the preservation of the Niagara Escarpment. We in the opposition have been critical of the government for not having taken action earlier. I have always disagreed with the present government agencies in purchasing land in the Niagara Peninsula. At present, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority is spending almost its entire budget in purchasing different site areas along the Niagara Escarpment. This should be a completely provincial project; all the costs should be borne by the province and not financed on a percentage assessment basis, as it applies now to the property owners in the Niagara region.

I also welcome the announcement that the Ontario government has given consideration to purchasing additional parklands in the St. Johns area, a very beautiful location in Niagara region. But I am rather disappointed with the Conservative government for not living up to one of its previous commitments, to purchase parklands west of Point Albino, in the town of Fort Erie. This announcement came by way of my provincial colleague from Welland, I believe, back in September 1968. Then followed further press releases stating that the government was considering the purchase of mini-parks along the lakeshore in the town of Fort Erie.

I regret that the government has not lived up to its previous commitment, for the time is now for the purchase of that parkland. Citizens in the region require a site for a new park; additional recreation area is a must. Beach access is needed, as well as land to be used by recreation vehicles such as snowmobiles, dune buggies and so forth. The citizens in the region have the energy to burn in their leisure time, and this is an opportunity for the government to fill that need.

The other consideration that the government must initiate is a programme for the construction of a new tourist information centre at the entrance to or in the vicinity of the Peace Bridge at Fort Erie, Ontario. The town of Fort Erie is one of the largest ports of entry into Canada. Thousands of tourists enter Canada through Buffalo, N.Y., to Fort Erie. I understand that after the completion of the road construction by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications sufficient land is available for a tourist centre just off the Queen Elizabeth Way, west of the Peace Bridge.

I have discussed this matter with a number of customs and immigration officers who would be most happy to see the completion of a new tourist centre. The officers inform me that it would speed up the flow of traffic. Often they lose time and hold up traffic in trying to direct or inform the tourist of the places of interest in the Province of Ontario.

I am sure that the minister responsible has received communications and information from the Fort Erie Chamber of Commerce suggesting the location of the new site for the centre. They have offered their services in providing personnel, so that the centre can be open all year, which would be a great advantage to the tourist industry of this province. Consideration should be given to this centre. I am sure it is one of top priority and the need is now.

There should be public washroom facilities in the centre. Consideration should also be given to including accommodation for a bus waiting room. I have been informed that the present bus service from Fort Erie and Buffalo to Toronto will be improved. There will be a bus leaving Fort Erie almost on an hourly basis. With the subsidies that the government provides in other communities in Ontario—for example, GO buses which are being paid for by every taxpayer in the

province—surely consideration can be given to this request for a new tourist centre with waiting rooms for bus passengers.

Mr. Speaker, as for the decision of the government to take action for the preservation of physical resources in regard to land use, perhaps it is a little too late to start thinking of preserving our land. The wasteful uses of fast growing urban areas have reduced the rich, tillable soil and much of it has already disappeared through development core centres. One would almost believe by the action and statements made in the Throne Speech that we are living in Communist Russia.

One would question the government at this move. Would not only farmland but all land under the control of the government be an agricultural land reserve? I believe that a method of control must be found to protect our valuable farmlands for generations to come.

But are we going to ask the farmer to sacrifice his only asset? There must be a guarantee of compensation, and the government must assure him of a decent living. The government moving in this direction surely will implement a programme of sufficient funds to purchase farmlands.

The terms of reference of the select committee dealing with the Ontario Municipal Board did not include planning. I have noted, as other members of the committee found, that the greatest amount of public interest and the largest portion of its time were focused on questions about Ontario Municipal Board approvals concerning planning procedures. The committee recommended further investigation into the subject matter. I make reference to recommendation XXVII, which says:

> The Legislature should appoint a committee to undertake a comprehensive review of the planning process in Ontario, or the government should provide some alternate method of conducting such a review.

I would hope that the government accepts this recommendation. In the discussion sessions that the committee dealt with at its hearings in Ontario, Winnipeg and Vancouver, one can conclude that a new Planning Act is needed in Ontario to include the retention of the basic rights of landowners in Ontario for the public good. If it is the desire of the government to move in this direction in preserving our prime agricultural lands for the public good, then the public must purchase the land. It is a matter for both provincial and federal government to share in that programme.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario must provide other measures to ensure a viable agricultural industry. I am interested in the report, Planning for Agriculture in Southern Ontario. There must be a policy directed to the need to decide the future agricultural use of the Niagara food belt and other tender fruit growing areas in Ontario. I quote from the report.

> In order to provide the increased amount of food demanded in 1991 by a larger and richer population, the output of food must rise in Ontario. With the predicted increase in population of two per cent per year and a possible total increase to some 11.5 million or more by the year 1991, most policy makers are concerned with the amount of land needed by agriculture. The output for food must rise in Ontario or there must be larger purchases of food from other countries or our sales to other markets must be reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a fair warning that the government must now decide on which course to follow—growing our food, or depending upon other markets perhaps at a price the consumer cannot afford. We have all seen the spiralling food costs that are present now. This province, and Canada as a whole, has little if any food surplus. The selling of all our grain—exporting most of it —has created a shortage of feed grain right in our own backyard. The demand is great and the price is high and who pays? The long-suffering consumer.

To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, Canada has no food bank or supply of food, such as canned goods, that we can turn to in case of a national emergency. We cannot even cope with the adverse weather conditions that prevail in the Province of Ontario, reducing farm productivity in the year 1972.

The idea of a food bank reserve to be set up in the Province of Ontario in the form of a Crown corporation or a holding company, I believe has potential. It would act as a guarantee for the fruit grower as a means of disposing of his surplus crop and as an insurance policy for the people of Ontario in case of shortage due to crop failure or in the case of a national disaster in the province —as an example, floods and drought.

Surplus crops are a constant worry to the farmer, not knowing if he will be able to sell them or just lose his investment by letting a surplus go to waste. In 1971, the fruit

grower was faced with large surplus crops due to the lack of labour and processing facilities during the peak harvest.

If the government had a food bank set up with suitable storage facilities, such as a fast-frozen food plant, it could relieve some of the farmer's burden by buying up his surplus. This alone would create employment.

The harvest season for fruit runs for a short period and if the growers do not sell their crops by then the fruit just rots. For example, in 1971 the growers had an abundant crop.

When there is an over supply of fruit on the market, the government could step in and remove some of the excess fruit off the market and store it until such time as there is a shortage. It then could inject its supply into the market to help regulate the price of goods.

I have discussed this idea with persons who are more knowledgeable than myself and they have suggested that the plan has merit.

A food bank is being tried in the United States in the Mount Morency area by the sour cherry industry. The United States federal government takes the sour cherries off the market where they are in surplus, processes them and then releases them into the market when the market is able to absorb them. This was set up after consultation and agreement with the growers and processors.

Mr. Keith Matthie, secretary manager for the Ontario Crop Growers Marketing Board and secretary manager of the Ontario Tender Fruit Marketing Board, says it's a worthwhile plan in that it is helping an important industry and would be beneficial when the need arises for price regulation or as a result of a natural disaster. If the government has a supply to put into the market when there has been a poor season in the Niagara fruit belt, it could stop foreign processors from charging high prices.

I think this is one of the matters confronting the consumers today in the Province of Ontario—the cost of goods coming in from the United States and perhaps other countries, such as Australia.

The United States also has a grain bank. The government has set up a programme where surplus grains are stored until such a time when they are needed and can be absorbed into the market. The government decides how much grain will be stored at one time and when and how much will be released.

In the area of grain storage, Dr. D. N. Huntley, in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, stated that starch food like grains can be dried to a level of 10 to 15 per cent moisture content; then they can be stored indefinitely as long as they are kept out of contact with insects.

Also included for indefinite storage are wheats, corn, barley and oats. He also agrees that it should be under government control and, like Mr. Matthie, he feels that it is a good mechanism for price regulation and a good tool to maintain a balance between supply and demand.

Someone should take the initiative in dealing with the problems that face the farmers in the Niagara fruit belt and other areas in the Province of Ontario—particularly Norfolk county and Essex county, I believe—in particular with regard to surplus crops. I suggest it should be the government of Ontario. If no action is taken by the government we can expect higher increases in food products and the consumer must pay for that cost.

Mr. Speaker, it will cost money but it will be government money well spent. It will provide farmers with better marketing, more favourable and stable food costs and a benefit to the consumer. The programme will create new employment but most important it will provide security in food supply to our consumers and be a benefit to all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the amendment put forth by my leader on March 26. I look to the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) to carry that battle further.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before involving myself in the issues that I want to discuss, I want to express to you some concerns that I've had over the last few days about the onerous job the Speaker has to undertake in the Legislature. I want to convey to you, sir, the feeling I have that, in spite of occasional disagreements we might have, the job which you do is done fairly, impartially—I believe it—and I think that if we, and I include myself, conducted ourselves a little more prudently the job of the Speaker would perhaps be quite a bit easier.

I want, though, to say that it's not entirely the fault of the opposition. There are occasions—one might even be tempted to say many occasions—when it it is the remarks of the ministers of the Crown which provoke many of us to the utterances which we occasionally hear in the Legislature. I want to say to you, sir—though you are not here—that in spite of the heated exchanges which we have on occasion, the feeling of this party

in general is that you do an excellent job and we are delighted to support you in most instances.

Since February, 1971—since the beginning of the Davis regime—things have not been all that good. I can't help thinking, in looking back over the last two years, that there have been a number of occasions when the Premier (Mr. Davis) must wonder whether the job he inherited was really the job he anticipated getting or whether the job he got was really worth getting.

There have been occasions over the last two years when the antics of his own government and his own government members must have left him with a feeling of despair and a feeling of loneliness. I think at times he must have worried about the outcome of the public's view of his government.

We have seen in the last two years the departure of two of his most able opponents in the leadership race. We've seen the hon. Allan Lawrence make his way to Ottawa where he now claims that he ought to have the right to know and he claims it rather loudly. The statements we hear from Allan Lawrence now that he is in Ottawa are considerably different from the statements we heard from the same gentleman when he was here in the Legislature representing St. George.

He now seems to have a much more inquiring mind. He now seems to have a much more liberal attitude.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): The member should be careful how he phrases that.

Mr. Deans: He now seems to recognize that government's responsibility goes a little further than he thought it did while he sat in the government benches. I'm sure that in fact the move to Ottawa was not unwelcome to the Premier. I'm sure he got a little tired of peeking over his shoulder at the member for St. George to make sure he wasn't at that point slipping a knife between his ribs.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I don't think he worried about that. He had a pretty big bodyguard.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was the least of my worries.

Mr. Singer: Right.

Mr. Deans: We also saw the demise of the second closest. We saw the demise of the hon. member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough).

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't count on it.

Mr. Deans: I am not counting on it, but I can't help thinking that the position he now has, one of mute testimony to the government's failures, is probably more adequate and more apt than the one which he had before, in which he appeared to be getting the government into more and more hot water the more he spoke.

We also saw the disappearance of Mr. MacNaughton, who I suspect was much stronger in the cabinet than perhaps many of us on this side of the Legislature recognized from time to time. In fact, I suspect that one of the great difficulties the Premier is going to have over the next two or three years will be replacing Mr. MacNaughton.

I think that during the time he was here, while he may not have appeared to wield a very big stick at times, he obviously did, because there's been nothing but chaos in the department since he left. I think his successor leaves a lot to be desired in his deportment and the way in which he carries out his responsibilities in the department which he presently has.

I can't help remembering the good old days—and that sounds kind of funny for someone of 5½ years' experience. I think back on the days of the former Premier when the very word "garbage" immediately brought to mind the present Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr). Or before the orders of the day when we could hardly wait for the now Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) to get up and proclaim whatever day of freedom it happened to be in some obscure little part of the world. We always waited for that testimony, which we got on every single day before the orders of the day when the now Solicitor General was the Provincial Secretary.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Will the member name one "obscure part of the world."

Mr. Deans: Many of the places were very obscure. We waited with bated breath—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let him name one obscure part of the world.

Mr. Deans: —for him to rise to his feet and inform us of the liberation day—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Here we go again!

Mr. Deans: —in whatever part of the world he happened to have read about at that particular moment.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Will the member name one obscure place? Let him ask his friends to the left.

Mr. Deans: Lots of us wondered at times whether he was making those places up. We often used to wonder whether he was simply conjuring them up in his mind as he went along.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let him name one.

Mr. Deans: On occasion we found it amusing, but always interesting.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That's the line the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) used to use, but he wised up.

Mr. Deans: I must say that in spite of the fact that we were, perhaps, amused by him from time to time, we miss those little things.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I thought he was asleep.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: I would like to ask the Premier to give that responsibility back to the Solicitor General so that he can take part in the proceedings of the House again; so that he can involve himself in the day-to-day activities; so that he has something useful to do with his time instead of sitting reading.

I can even remember that very funny day in the Legislature when the now Solicitor General got up to defend the new policy, of the Liquor Licence Board I believe it was. He was pointing out that yes, indeed, they were considering moving to plastic bottles for liquor, even though in fact there had never been any such suggestion made! But he couldn't think of an appropriate answer to the question because he hadn't heard the question.

Or the day when he was sitting here—whatever he was doing, I am not too sure—somebody leaned back and said: "You'd better answer that." He got to his feet and he'd forgotten the question period was over.

We miss those little exchanges in the House which always made the place more pleasant and more human. If possible, I'd like to see the minister get involved again; it would be entertaining, to say the least.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That's not a caucus view!

Mr. MacDonald: We have great flexibility in our personal views.

Mr. Deans: This new government has had a lot of problems over the last two years, particularly over the last 1½ years. We have seen the members flounder a bit; we've seen them make fools of themselves a bit. I often wonder just what the public really thinks about the government of Ontario.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): The last election showed what the people thought.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): That was a year and a half ago.

Mr. Deans: I wonder if the public really remembers what has gone on in the Province of Ontario over the course of the last 1½ years. I want to help the public recollect some of the things that have, in fact, happened. In the process, I suppose, those of the members who are interested can share some of these little things with me.

I wonder how many of the public remember, for example, the exchange in the House over the Premier's flight down to the United States with his family; and his standing in his place and saying, well, that was the job of the Premier. After all, he was on duty 24 hours a day. It was his prerogative to take his family anywhere he pleased and to do it at public expense.

Do they remember the Provincial Secretary for Resources and Development (Mr. Lawrence) and his flight? And I'm still waiting to hear the results of the provincial secretary's trip to Cuba. I'm interested to find out exactly what in fact the provincial secretary found in Cuba, other than that the Cuban officials cut sugar cane on their week off.

In fact, I think the public, in looking over those two tiny things, might begin to wonder whether this government is as concerned about finances and expenditures as it says it is.

Perhaps they can remember—I'm sure everyone in the House can remember—the $6,000 automobile ordered by the Attorney General (Mr. Bales). It was invoiced in March 1971 but wasn't received until April 1971. In fact, it wasn't even invoiced properly and he didn't get it until June, 1971. In fact, the Attorney General's department seemed to be doing a bit of fancy footwork in trying to get the appropriation stretched over the extra period of time in order to use it up.

Or does the public recall the falsified certificates in the purchase of 11 cars for the OPP in March 1968, which didn't get paid for until April? Again, there was the invoicing problem of trying to make the appropriation stretch further than it really ought to have stretched, reflecting the tendency within the government to try to spend whatever they had in their appropriation, regardless of whether it was necessary or not.

Do they remember, in fact, all of the episodes that occurred during the very interesting investigation conducted by the public accounts committee?

I often wonder, as I think back over the last two years, whether the public can remember the hon. member for Kent, when he was in the Department of Municipal Affairs, spending about $38,000 just to refurnish his office?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): The member for Chatham-Kent—Chatham-Kent!

An hon. member: How many dollars?

Mr. Deans: Thirty-eight thousand dollars.

An hon. member: It was $58,000.

Mr. Deans: Well, $58,000. That came out later. But the problem was not so much that he spent the money, which in itself was wrong, but that he didn't even have it charged to the proper departments; he didn't even charge it to the proper appropriations; and he ended up getting caught by the public accounts.

One wonders whether, in the whole process of government, there isn't just a tiny wee hint of graft—not a lot—in the way in which tenders are handled within the government? There was the purchase by the Department of Municipal Affairs of 35,000 binders in December 1970. It was authorized to make the purchase from one company, Office Specialty Ltd., but for some reason or another, perhaps because of a little far-out connection between one of the staff of the department and a gentleman who worked for Cambrian Stationery, at the last moment the whole thing was switched over to Cambrian Stationery, and the $95,000 was spent there instead of with the lowest tenderer.

Would the public be interested in recalling the four senior executives of the Department of Municipal Affairs who took a trip to New York at Olivetti's expense, and subsequently purchased the entire stock of the Olivetti warehouse here for about $100,000? In fact, they bought $254,000 worth of stock, but at that point they bought $100,000 worth from the warehouse, which they didn't even need and had no use for. I wonder if the public can recall that exchange in the Legislature, or the other things that have occurred in the mishandling of public funds.

I think the public might have a rather jaundiced view of the actions of the government if these things were to be brought to their attention again just so that they would be up to date on what is going on.

I wouldn't want to resurrect these kind of things too often, but I think it only fair that once in a while you remind the public of the kind of government that is in the Province of Ontario; and wonder whether maybe the Premier is even yet a little embarrassed over the involvement of the Attorney General and his friends in the purchase of the farmland out there by the Pickering site? Whether or not there is still a little tinge of embarrassment in the government that here was a minister of the Crown sitting in on the decision-making of the government in terms of what ought to be done in the area of Pickering, in the development of a new municipality, and here is this selfsame gentleman who has entered into a partnership of a sort and purchased rather extensive tracts of land for future retirement purposes?

Now the Attorney General, of course, did not act the same way as the member for Chatham-Kent when he was found out. The Attorney General donated the money to charity, as I recall. But that is really not the question. The question is whether or not you can have confidence in a government that doesn't see what is wrong with that kind of an operation. Or in the case of the member for Chatham-Kent, whether the public might be interested in thinking through again the whole episode which brought about his removal from the second or the third seat over to the last seat in the row, simply because he got involved in the approval of the plans—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He got caught.

Mr. Deans: Yes, he not only got caught, he got involved in the approval of plans which in fact returned to him some personal gain.

Nobody suggests for a moment that he did this intentionally, but the fact of the matter is that a minister of the Crown has to be trusted implicitly. There can be no hint of this kind of undertaking by any minister of the Crown, and the fact of the matter is

there should be no hint of it. Any minister who does engage in matters which reflect badly on the government has an obligation, not to make a donation to charity, not to simply move over to another seat, but to resign, to resign permanently, so that there will be no opportunity for the public to take a view of the government that is other than the most honourable view possible.

Or perhaps we might consider the provincial Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) in the provision of grants for himself. Members recall his decision to allocate to himself grants which, by our own admission are available to other people in the Province of Ontario; but one wonders whether it is right for any minister to ask any grant to himself, whether it is proper for any minister to do that kind of thing?

Or whether the public might have second thoughts about the appropriateness of the government's receipt of some $50,000 from Fidinam; whether in fact there isn't something wrong with a government that enters into contracts with a company and ends up receiving substantial donations from that company which, at least on the surface, appear to have been considered to be payment for favours rendered; whether the public might not wonder whether this is the kind of government they want governing them in the Province of Ontario?

I can't help thinking, and I was just thinking about it a little earlier this evening; I thought of my colleague, the member for York South, and the long time he spent in trying to bring to light the whole episode of the Melchers case and what really happened in the Melchers case; where the money finally came from that James McDowell received in the final analysis. I wonder what exactly did happen in the final analysis in that particular case, which had dragged on, waiting for some considerable time to go to court?

When you look at the government record—and this is only looking at the personal record of the government; this has nothing to do with the legislation which it has introduced, which I want to deal with in a minute or two—when you look at the government record you can't help wondering whether the people of Ontario have misplaced their trust; whether in fact the people in whom they have placed their trust have warranted that kind of trust?

Whether, for example, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) is right in hiring Mr. T. S. Jones, the vice-president of Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills Ltd., and Dryden Paper Co., as the chairman of the minister's new committee; whether that is an appropriate appointment at this time, recognizing the record of that company in the whole area of mercury pollution?

Or whether the government's attitude toward the reacquisition of the sand dunes which they gave away—which they gave away—whether the government's attitude toward the reacquisition is adequate?

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): That is not so!

Mr. Lewis: Certainly it's so!

Mr. Deans: Whether it's proper to assess the value of those sand dunes at other than the value which was placed on them by the government and the company involved at the time that the sale was made?

Mr. Lewis: What about the profit made from it since? Why should we pay them any money on the profit they've made—all the profit they've made?

Mr. Deans: Surely if those sand dunes were worth a dollar a year for 75 years when they were allocated to that company, they're worth only a dollar a year now. And surely we, in the Province of Ontario, have the right to claim back from that company whatever was lost by way of sand taken out, minus whatever costs they put into it. And surely we have no need to go through this ridiculous charade of the Expropriation Act in order to determine a fair price, when in fact a fair price was determined some years ago in the matter of the signing of the lease.

Surely there is a fair price already established—that price was recognized by that company and this government. And a dollar a year is a fair price—and that's the compensation that should be paid.

Or whether the people—looking at those things and perhaps looking a little further—have a kind of confidence in the government when they consider the goings on in the Workmen's Compensation Board and the inquiry that took place; and the minister's necessity to appoint a committee to investigate the entire operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board? Whether the public, in looking at that together with the other things, doesn't have some serious reservations about this government's right to continue in office?

Whether the people of the province don't have some serious reservations about this government's commitment to providing the kind of solid, trustworthy government that

you need to have in a province like this? There was a lot said at the Workmen's Compensation Board hearings, and much of it was not substantiated—but there are certain things that came through loud and clear.

One was that there was certainly an assessment against one of the major automobile manufacturers which was dropped by the Workmen's Compensation Board. And the investigation showed conclusively that there was no appreciable change in the safety conditions of the plant; that the internal operations of the Workmen's Compensation Board were slipshod; that there had been a deal arranged for the purchase of a car by the person making the final decision.

I expected, and I think every member of this caucus expected, that this government would have acted to remove that person from office since his competence was obviously in question; not only in question, but he had in fact been proven incompetent.

And yet, what happened? Absolutely nothing! Or was there any reprimand? Was there any reprimand about the attendance of one Bruce Jarvis Legge, the Commander of the Central Militia in the area, the past president of the Royal Canadian Military Institute and of the Empire Club of Canada, when he was accused of spending far too much time on military matters away from the Compensation Board and when the investigation proved conclusively that he had failed to sit in on WCB matters an adequate number of times? Was there any action taken by this government in that regard? No! Absolutely nothing! There was nothing done.

Even though the investigation had been conducted, and even though that investigation showed that the chairman of the board had not been attending to his duties full time, but he had in fact been devoting a considerable period of his time to matters other than those matters which required his full time attention at the Workmen's Compensation Board—primarily, military matters.

And I suggest that this reflects on this government, and this government's right to govern. All of these things reflect on it, because it shows an inability of this government to understand what it is that worries the people out there. What it is that worries the Workmen's Compensation Board recipient when he can't get a hearing, or when he can't get an answer; and the chairman of the board is tripping along in Australia, or tripping along in Japan, or having a nice time down in the southern states; or maybe just simply out on a military exercise making sure, in fact, that he isn't around the board to do the job that he's being paid to do.

And then we go from that to the whole matter of the Ministry of Health and the recent episodes in the Ministry of Health.

You can't help wondering about the adequacy of the present minister (Mr. Potter), when you take a look at the kind of allegations made by Dr. Kinloch; when you consider what was said by Dr. Kinloch and never refuted by this government about the reasons why he was fired; and when you consider the sense of commitment that Dr. Kinloch had shown in the department in terms of coming to grips with the escalating costs of medical services in the Province of Ontario. Yet we have the minister still sitting in his place and Dr. Kinloch far gone—removed entirely.

Here is a civil servant who had the public interest at heart, who wasn't afraid to come out and to make the kinds of statements that every civil servant in the Province of Ontario should be making when he knows that the matters of this province are not being properly dealt with. Yet we find the minister dealing so harshly with this employee, and this employee who is a senior civil servant being removed from his office.

We thought in the first instance that maybe the Kinloch affair was the first and the last, but now we find that the status of Dr. McNally is in question. Here is another civil servant who has worked day and night to establish the kind of ambulance service in the Province of Ontario that is acceptable and accepted throughout the province. He has gained the respect of the many diverse ambulance services which were available and were doing in some instances a good job and in some instances somewhat less of a good job. He has been able to weld together the kind of overall protection, at least through southern Ontario at this point, that was so necessary.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health for some reason which he fails to explain to the House, decides to remove him over all of the objections of all of the ambulance operators.

You seriously wonder whether, if the public reviewed those things, if they thought about the goings on in the Ministry of Health, if they went back through the land deals of the Attorney General and the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, if they considered the Fidinam affair, if they went back through all of the inadequacies in handling appropriations of the government departments, if

they went through the hints of unfair practices in terms of dealing with tenders, if they took a look at all of these problems and all of the others that have emerged over the last two years since the Premier won the leadership of the Conservative Party, they really would have the kind of confidence in this government that the government of the Province of Ontario must have in order to pursue the policies that have to be pursued?

I can't help thinking that the scandals and near scandals that occurred in this government would be sufficient to rock the faith of any Conservative. I don't mind telling you in the confines of this chamber that I have had quite a number of Conservatives come to me and say to me: "You know I don't vote NDP"—this is them speaking—"but Ian I just don't trust that government any more."

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): In the peninsula!

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): But the member's first name, Ian?

Mr. Deans: They come to me and say that with scandal after scandal, with the mismanagement of public funds, with the inability of this government to respond to the needs of the people of the Province of Ontario—

Mr. Laughren: And their failure in the north.

Mr. Deans: —they just don't trust them any more.

An hon. member: Did they write the member's speech?

Mr. Deans: They say they're beginning to feel a sense of alienation from the government. The one they had under John Robarts was at least approachable. They are beginning now to think that maybe they can't get to the government any more to talk about their problems. Maybe there's not the kind of openness there used to be. These are Conservatives speaking. These are Conservatives speaking in Beamsville—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Where?

Mr. Deans: —and in Grimsby and Smithville.

Mr. Lewis: In Beamsville, in Smithville, in Grimsby; in Lincoln in short.

Mr. Deans: These are Conservatives speaking in St. Catharines.

Mr. Lewis: Mostly in Lincoln.

Mr. Deans: It's just incredible where you get these voices from. I travel a long distance out to Hamilton West and I hear people saying to me: "Boy, we thought that fellow there that we elected—what's his name was going to do a good job. But you know something, since he got appointed to the cabinet he's forgotten us. We have to call you, Ian, to get things done."

An hon. member: Tell us more about the rest.

Mr. Deans: They say he has just become like the rest of the cabinet ministers. They just don't seem to care any more.

That's the attitude that's beginning to be felt throughout the Province of Ontario. These aren't New Democrats; my goodness, no! These people are dyed-in-the-wool Conservatives.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member can count on his right hand the NDP supporters in Beamsville.

Mr. Lewis: I met with 50 farmers in Beamsville on Sunday who don't like the member for Lincoln very much as a member of that cabinet. They are all up in arms, all 50.

Hon. Mr. Welch: All members of the same family?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Foulds: Shades of William Lyon Mackenzie.

Mr. Lewis: It's all coming crumbling down, the little dynasty.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Scarborough West doesn't like its member too much.

Mr. Deans: These are Conservatives. If I were to tell the minister the names of the people I am thinking about he would be shocked. I won't do that. But I'm telling him that if I were to tell him, if I were to name the Conservatives in the peninsula who have come to me and said: "That's it, no more. I won't vote for them ever again."

Mr. Lewis: That's right. One of them starts with a "W".

An hon. member: Time after time!

Mr. Deans: One of them starts with an "R". There is no question that the people

in the Province of Ontario have had it. They are fed up. I have got to tell the members that, it is not all that bad. The Premier still draws big crowds. I have got to give him credit. Let me say, when did members last see—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Wait a minute! When did members last see so many old age pensioners on the front steps of the Parliament Buildings? When did they last see so many Workmen's Compensation Board recipients on the front steps of the Parliament Buildings? When did they last see so many mothers' allowance recipients on the front steps of the Parliament Buildings? This Premier draws big crowds!

He draws big crowds to Queen's Park and they are all coming down here to complain about the selfsame thing. They are coming to complain about this government's inability to understand the problems of the people of the Province of Ontario. They are coming down to complain of the unresponsiveness, the egotistical attitude and the absolute detachment of the government from the day-to-day problems of the people.

I can remember during the days of John Robarts—I have got to give him credit—one never saw John Robarts drawing those kinds of crowds.

An hon. member: The streets were safe.

Mr. Deans: One could walk outside any time. We never needed the OPP here.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The demonstration the other day looked like nothing.

Mr. Deans: I have to tell the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that if he set out two years ago to involve the public in government, he has succeeded. They are more involved on the front steps of the Parliament Buildings than they have ever been in the history of the government of the Province of Ontario. There are more people here in the Parliament Buildings of the Province of Ontario at any given time than there has ever been, and they are all here to complain. They are all here to complain, every single one! I'll tell members the kinds of things they are here to complain about.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): If the NDP take over, they will have guards at the door.

Mr. Martel: They are there now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: We will use a screening device to keep the minister out.

Mr. Deans: I want to tell the House I am glad the Minister of Revenue raised that, because it was a point I had almost forgotten. The other thing that always worried me when those poor old people had to trudge down here in the middle of the winter to beg the Premier to give them a hand, was what did we have? We had hundreds of OPP standing outside, keeping them out!

Let the members think about it. Do they know the government had Ontario Provincial Police standing on the front steps of the Parliament Buildings keeping those poor old people out in the cold?

Mr. Foulds: One of them was Norris Whitney.

Mr. Deans: One can't help wondering—but anyway one might excuse the government for some of these things. One might excuse the scandals. One might excuse them for the mismanagement. One might excuse them for refusing to be open and responsive. One might excuse them for failing to meet the people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for Wentworth will never make it that way.

Mr. Deans: One might—but I am going to tell members there are certain things that the government cannot be excused over.

There is no excuse for the lack of action on the part of this government in dealing with escalating costs in the Province of Ontario. There is no excuse.

There is no reason this government couldn't have taken action to counteract escalating costs in the Province of Ontario. For years we have been asking the government of this province to bring in some kind of price review. We have asked over and over again, and the fact of the matter is that the government has sat back and done absolutely nothing.

Not only have they refused to deal with the inadequate income levels of the old age pensioners; not only have they refused to deal with the inadequate income levels of the Workmen's Compensation Board recipients; not only have they refused to deal with the inadequate income levels of the mother's

allowance recipients, the general welfare assistance recipients; not only have they refused to bring the minimum wage up to a standard that will allow the people in the Province of Ontario to live with dignity; but they have then refused to deal with the escalating cost which is causing the tremendous price squeeze on those people.

I don't honestly know what the government has done in the last two years. I have been looking through all of the headlines and all of the proposed actions of the government of the Province of Ontario, and I can truthfully say that in the areas which most concern the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, there has been absolutely no action.

A lot of headlines. A lot of vague, veiled promises. But no action.

We in this province have been suffering considerably from the increased cost of living. The increased cost of living has forced many of those on fixed incomes to have to do without the necessities of life simply in order to survive. They have had to cut back on food. They have had to live in inadequate shelter, simply because this government has failed to recognize its responsibilities in providing for those on fixed incomes.

What has been done by the government to even investigate the rising costs?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Nothing!

Mr. Deans: What has been done by this government to even try to bring into line the exorbitant profits that are being made in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Cassidy: Nothing!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): They don't care!

Mr. Deans: What has been done by this government to even try to reapportion the tax burden in a more adequate and sensible way?

Some hon. members: Nothing!

Mr. Deans: And when you take a look you can't help feeling, as you read the headlines in the newspapers: "After-Tax Corporate Profits Up More Than 24 per cent in a Year." And yet the Workmen's Compensation Board pension recipients can't get an increase. Or they give a totally inadequate increase to the mother's allowance recipients; or they raise the minimum wage to $1.85.

Mr. Martel: That was a disgraceful exhibition.

Mr. Deans: Weston's profits were up 23 per cent. But what has the government done for the people of the Province of Ontario? What have they done to try to recapture some of this wealth that is obviously around the province and could be used to ease the burden on many of the people on fixed incomes? When you take a look at Dominion Stores—and it is interesting, because Dominion Stores are doing a lot of advertising these days—you find that year after year they are showing profits before taxes in excess of $20 million, year after year.

Mr. Singer: The day of the automobile is over.

Mr. Deans: And you find that the costs in the food areas, the costs in the health and personal care areas, in the recreation areas, are escalating to a point where the people of this province cannot afford to buy what they require on the fixed incomes that are established by this government. What about the cost of housing? My colleague from High Park (Mr. Shulman) raised only last week the inexcusable increases in the cost of housing in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Where is that colleague?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is he going to be in for the vote?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): He is delivering.

Mr. Deans: What has this government done to try to provide low cost housing? I don't mean housing for rent. I am talking about housing that is available for people to purchase. What has been done by this government?

Mr. Singer: Nothing; resign!

Mr. Deans: What has been done by this government, in actual fact, to provide the kind of low cost housing, even for people in the middle income groups? We have reached the point in the Province of Ontario where even at $10,000 a year it is impossible for a young couple starting out to even dream of owning a home.

You take a look at the number of homes that have been built in the Province of Ontario and you find the grand headlines of the 1971 budget, which showed some millions of dollars going to be spent on housing, have all gone puff into the air; that in fact

the claims of this government in the period immediately prior to the last election, when they were desperately seeking votes in the Province of Ontario, never materialized. The housing needs in Metropolitan Toronto and in other centres across this province have escalated to the point where this government has failed to even live up to its promises and has created in those areas of the province the kind of housing shortages which are forcing people to live in ghettoes. This is what is happening in the Province of Ontario.

And what is Ontario Housing Corp.'s answer to this? It goes out and builds the kind of barrack-like housing developments that in themselves create more problems than they solve. It goes out and develops the barrack-like, row-upon-row of housing developments that can be identified as Ontario Housing low-income housing from 10 miles away. And it raises the ire of every single citizen who lives in that area because those people know from bitter experience that you can't crowd that many people into one small area and expect the area to grow normally without providing additional services and this government has failed to provide those services.

What's happened in the area of senior citizen housing? The government claims that it has done more in senior citizen housing than any other province—probably more than all the other provinces combined. The unfortunate part is that it has more senior citizens; it has more people in the Province of Ontario. And it has more wealth in the Province of Ontario and it ought to be able to develop the kind of housing programmes right across this province that will ensure that no senior citizen need be paying $100 out of their income of $130 simply to survive—paying that much for rent.

This government could have implemented in years gone by an income supplement programme for senior citizens until such time as they were able to build the housing required; but it failed. And it failed not because it wasn't possible; it failed because of a lack of desire, because of a lack of concern—and that is what worries the people of the province. That's why the people of Lincoln, who previously voted Conservative, are now telling me they are not voting Conservative again.

That's why the people in Lincoln who previously voted for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development are telling me they no longer have faith in the government. It has nothing to do with the Provincial Secretary personally; they no longer have faith in the government.

They don't feel the government is responsive to their need. They don't feel that the government is prepared to go out on a limb a little bit and to try to provide some kind of basic income level for the senior citizens of the province—the people who built the province, the people who by their effort have provided this province with whatever it has today.

Then you turn from those people who were standing on the steps of the Parliament Building not a month ago and you consider the numbers of mother's allowance recipients who wandered through the halls immediately prior to Christmas and who were asking, begging, for an increase prior to Christmas. I think there is nothing more degrading than to have women forced to come into this Parliament Building and get down on their knees before the Premier of Ontario and beg him, beg him to assist them over Christmas.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What a Christmas that was.

Mr. Renwick: The Premier has got powerful support tonight.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How is the Premier coming along with his introductory remarks?

Mr. Deans: And what happened in that instance is well known to the government.

Mr. Renwick: It is a devastating attack on the government; only the Premier can withstand it.

Mr. Deans: It wasn't a matter of providing more income for those people, it was simply that the government by its change in its rental rebate programme had eliminated a portion of their income immediately prior to Christmas; money they had been counting on and that they needed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I remember that.

Mr. Deans: This government knew that full well. It's not the fact of the money; it's the fact that this government having had this brought to its attention was totally inadequate; they failed to comprehend the kind of hardship involved. It finally forced those people to have the kind of Christmas that Scrooge in "A Christmas Carol" is depicted as forcing on his people.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That never happened when the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) was Treasurer.

Mr. Renwick: No sir, that was a sunshine budget.

Mr. Deans: I can tell the House the people of this province were not happy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They didn't have deficits in those days.

Mr. Deans: And then, in January, the government finally decided to grant an increase, and I'm going to tell the House what an increase it was.

I don't know how the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle) had the nerve to stand up in the Legislature and announce that as being an increase—recognizing that it had been more than two years since the previous increase, that what he had given wasn't even enough to meet the increase in the cost of living, and that what this government had done was to say to those people: "You no longer count in the stream of things in the Province of Ontario. If you can't make it on your own, don't come to us. We can't help you."

Oh, they can help other people with grants. They can make all kinds of $50 million mistakes in the Ministry of Health. They can make all kinds of errors in the way in which they calculate their appropriations. But they can't help the people in the Province of Ontario who need help the most.

It is not as if the government didn't know these things were going on; that no one had brought them to its attention and maybe it could be excused. The fact of the matter is we had people in this province—let me just tell the members about a lady; let me tell them about a lady who, after she had paid her rent, purchased food and had paid for hydro and the essentials in her home, without any spending money, without anything to provide for her children in addition to the necessities, out of her budget had a grand total left of $36 a year to provide for all the additional things that every member of this Legislature likes to provide for his or her family.

People like her came to the government and said: "We're being left with 10 or 15 cents on a daily basis and we can't allow our children to involve themselves in the normal day-to-day activities that every other child in their school enjoys—such as when the school is travelling to see the Premier smiling, or when the school is travelling to the Science Centre to see the Science Centre or coming down here to see the museum; my child can't go because I can't afford the $1.50 or the $2 required. My child comes home and says: 'Look, I would like to play hockey with the rest of the kids on the street'; but that child can't play because I only have 15 or 20 cents left over out of the budget that was established by the Province of Ontario and I can't provide even the necessities in order for the kid to take part." Then it begins to hurt.

There is no provision in Community and Social Services that can take care of those kinds of things. There is no opportunity for those women who have suffered considerably.

The Premier may say that, for some of them, they were partly responsible for the situation that they were in. But the one thing that we must never forget is that if they were responsible or the husbands were responsible, the one group of people who were not responsible in any sense is the children in the family.

If for no other reason than to provide for them, we have to make sure that there is an adequate income coming into every household in the Province of Ontario to ensure that those children will be able to grow up with at least the normal things that every child should be able to enjoy in the most affluent society in this hemisphere.

This is what worries me, because when these people come to this government, when these people come and document their case—lay it out before the government; show what kinds of incomes they have; show what their fixed costs are and show what they're forced to deprive their children of—the response is absolutely negative. When the government does deal with it, when it finally gets around to dealing with it, it gives the kinds of increases which in fact are an insult to the people involved.

These things are a worry to some of us. Maybe the government members don't care about those kinds of things.

Mr. Renwick: The Premier is worried; I can tell.

Mr. Deans: Maybe the government members don't really care whether or not these people are taken care of. But I happen to feel, as one individual, that I'm prepared to share a little bit more of whatever I've got in order to make sure that there are no children in this province who are being deprived in any sense of anything that can be provided. No cost factor involved is too great to make sure that those children can have at least the same as the other children in the block.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Would the member give up his trips to Nassau?

Mr. Deans: Yes. I'd gladly give it up. Does that answer the question? And I have given up a lot more—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Like the member for High Park.

Mr. Deans: But one can't help wondering, because the government's attitudes toward old age pensioners, workmen's compensation recipients, recipients of mother's allowances and the disabled in the province are vastly different from the government's attitude toward the corporations.

The government's attitude toward the corporations probably is best exemplified by the last budget of the Province of Ontario, which contained some substantial increases in the cost of liquor and beer in the Province of Ontario.

An hon. member: And cigarettes.

Mr. Deans: What worries me—and I don't care about the increase in the cost of liquor and beer—is that this government didn't tell the people of the province that one-third of the increase in the cost was being directed right back to the manufacturers; that this government was using the taxes of the Province of Ontario to increase the already exorbitant profits of the liquor and beer manufacturers in the Province; that the government was so tied in with these enterprises in the Province of Ontario that its attitude toward them was vastly different from its attitude toward the people of the province.

It seems that while others were standing on the front steps of the Parliament Buildings, begging for an audience with the Premier—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On their knees!

Mr. Deans: —the heads of the various distilleries and breweries didn't have to stand on the front steps.

An hon. member: Oh no!

An hon. member: They snuck in the back door.

Mr. Deans: They didn't have to worry. They knew that all they had to do was pick up the phone and say: "Bill, it's time for an increase. You can hide it, Bill. You don't have to worry. All you have to do is increase the taxes. You'll get two-thirds, we'll get one-third and that will help us along. If you do that—well, Fidinam gave you $50,000—and you never can tell. Just do that for us and we'll be okay."

Mr. Renwick: The days of G. Howard Ferguson are back.

Mr. Deans: I can't help thinking that's how it happens, because I can see no evidence to the contrary. There was no justification for not having changed the arrangement between the distillers and the brewers and the people of the Province of Ontario.

There was no reason for increasing the cost in order to increase the profits of an extremely profitable enterprise in the Province of Ontario. There was no justification.

This government shows its biases by the way it deals with different sectors of the economy, and this particular bias shows that it is prepared to take whatever steps are necessary to shore up the corporate profits while refusing to deal adequately with the incomes of the province.

Then, of course, we have come through a series of meetings over regional government. We have come to a point in this Legislature where it's pretty hard to know who to believe. It's pretty difficult for me to know who it is among the three dealing with regional government—the Premier, the Treasurer (Mr. White) and the parliamentary assistant—that I'm supposed to believe when they are talking about Hamilton, Wentworth and Burlington in regional government.

This is another example of the way in which the government fails to understand the anxieties and concerns of the people of the Province of Ontario. Here we have about half a million people in a geographic area that is going to have its entire future reformed. And here we have people who are asking the Province of Ontario what it is they intend to do; they send their representatives to Queen's Park to meet the Treasurer, who says to them: "What would you say if we had a delay? Would you be able to work it out to come up with something that would be workable?" Immediately, to a man, the corporation of the city of Hamilton said: "Yes." We have reached an impasse in that area brought about by this government's stupidity.

With the kind of shoddy material that the government provided in January of this year to the people of the Hamilton-Wentworth area on the proposal for regional government, how could it expect that there would be any unanimity in the area at all.

Mr. Haggerty: We know they don't want regional government.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: How can it expect unanimity? We have the people coming in.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: No matter how the member feels we are supposed to sit here and listen.

Mr. Deans: They say to the government, "Here are three proposals. We have three alternatives available to us."

Mr. Haggerty: It is the city of Hamilton, isn't it?

Mr. Deans: The city of Hamilton says, "First of all—"

Mr. Haggerty: Are you really—

Mr. Deans: "—we want two-tier with Burlington included." I am going to talk about that in a moment.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I think the member shouldn't.

Mr. Deans: The county of Wentworth says, "We want two-tier with Burlington included." Burlington says, "No." The Steele commission report, after having studied the matter fully—and I am not going to read all of these—

Mr. Singer: Read them!

Mr. Cassidy: Read a few of them.

Mr. Deans: I may. After having gone through all—

Mr. Cassidy: Give them some of their own medicine.

Mr. Deans: —of these documents over the course of four years—

Mr. Cassidy: They blew it. They blew it for political reasons; and that's all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Go and read the Plunkett report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: After having gone through all of these documents—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Has the member for Ottawa Centre read it?

Mr. Cassidy: Sure, I have. Two weeks ago.

Mr. Deans: Yes, I have read the Plunkett report.

Mr. Cassidy: All of the documents.

Mr. Deans: The Plunkett report, by the way, suggested a Peel and Halton region.

Mr. Foulds: A digest—

Mr. Deans: A Peel and Halton region—

Hon. Mr. Davis: With Burlington included!

Mr. Deans: —And the government didn't even follow that report. What I want to know is why did the government engage—

Mr. Cassidy: The government didn't follow the Plunkett report.

Mr. Renwick: Has the member read the recommendations?

Mr. Deans: Yes, I've read the recommendations.

Mr. Renwick: We have them all here.

Mr. Deans: We have on the one hand the Plunkett report saying Peel and Halton ought to go together; but no, that's not good enough for this government. We have on the other hand the Steele commission report saying that Wentworth, Hamilton and Burlington should go together. That's not good enough for this government! What is it that people have to do? What kind of reports do people—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That isn't what it said.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: —have to provide in order to convince this government that there is a need to establish a bigger region than the region which it is currently putting forward?

Let me get back to what I was going to say.

We have Hamilton saying they would accept two-tier with Burlington included. We have Wentworth saying they will accept two-tier with Burlington included. We have Hamilton saying that, as a second alternative, they will accept single-tier with all of Wentworth. We have Wentworth county saying that as the third alternative, they will accept two-tier with all of Hamilton provided there are arrangements made about adequate representation.

The only other thing they are unanimous about is that they would prefer not to proceed if the government cannot come down with something that can be workable and acceptable to both parties.

It is evident that the government is not going to get consensus on single-tier; and it is evident that it is not going to get consensus on two-tier unless Burlington is included. It is evident from the remarks of the hon. Treasurer last Friday that Burlington isn't going with Hamilton in spite of all of the evidence which is conclusively in favour of it being a part of the region.

The only alternative left, assuming the things which the government says are true—that it requires some kind of consensus in the area; that it requires participation in a more eager sense and doesn't want to drag people kicking and screaming into regional government—the only thing left open to the government is to agree to withhold the introduction of regional government for a short period of time until it can review another alternative. That alternative at this particular point is called the Winnipeg plan.

That may not be workable but there is one thing for sure: Neither of the plans which have been proposed by this government for the area is acceptable. There is no unanimity of thought; there is no opportunity for consensus. At this particular point in time to proceed would be going against what the Treasurer has said; what the Treasurer's predecessor said; and what his predecessor said about community acceptance.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about what the parliamentary assistant said?

Mr. Deans: We had the Treasurer. He sat down with Hamilton and he told them: "It seems as if it's going to be tough to get consensus. It looks as if we won't get one."

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was that the meeting they asked the member to attend?

Mr. Deans: That was the meeting that I asked to attend because I was told it was on.

He said: "What would you say if we gave you, say, two years? Do you think you could sort it out?" They agreed. He put the same thing—if I read the press reports correctly—to Wentworth county, and they said that provided there was no annexation in the interim period, they also could agree to a period in which they might be able to work out some alternative programme. Yet when the question was asked of the Premier, whether or not he would consider such a delay, he said "no".

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deans: Now, there's something drastically wrong with the way in which this government operates.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just don't want any misunderstanding. If the hon. member—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Wait, wait!

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would just like the hon. member to be accurate. That is not, in fact, what was said. I will just leave it very simply at that.

Mr. Foulds: That is not a point of order. If the hon. member disagrees, he can say so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a point of order. I have been misquoted.

Mr. Cassidy: All right, so there will be a delay. Now is the Premier's chance so there will be a delay.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: That is one of those non points of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Read it. Read exactly what was said.

Mr. Deans: I am going to be quite frank with the Premier, I'm eager to have him tell us whether or not he is going to accept it, because at this particular point in time the people of the city of Hamilton are planning to travel to Winnipeg to see how their programme works, and I understand that the parliamentary assistant is planning to travel to Winnipeg to see how it works.

Mr. Lewis: Aha, aha, to Mecca itself!

Mr. Deans: I even offered to go along and introduce him so that he wouldn't feel lonely, just to show how much I feel for the situation that he has been thrust into.

But I am going to tell the House that what was said by the Treasurer is vastly different from what was inferred by the Premier when he was asked—vastly different. On top of that, it is considerably different from the press reports of the Premier's statements in Brantford.

It is very difficult for the people in the area to have any sense of what's likely to occur. There is no justification for keeping a veil of secrecy around the plans. If the government doesn't intend to have any kind of delay in the implementation; say so, just say

so. But, if the government feels that it is going to delay it, then say so again. It should say that it will delay it for a short period of time.

We all understand regional government is going to come into the area, and we all agree with the government that there is a need to have a form of regional government. But one of the most important criteria, as established by the hon. member from Chatham-Kent was community acceptance. And there is no community acceptance in the area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Certainly sounds like the member for Chatham-Kent.

Mr. Deans: There is no community acceptance. Now if the government is not going to put Burlington in with the Hamilton-Wentworth region—and I am going to tell the House that there is adequate reason to believe that it should be in; there is within this report, and just for the matter of statistics—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They don't like people who say that.

Mr. Deans: The report shows that 80 per cent of the people who live in Burlington and who work—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member doesn't listen to the people in Burlington.

Mr. Deans: Wait a minute—80 per cent of the people who live in Burlington and who are employed, are employed in the Hamilton-Wentworth-Burlington area. Say 38 per cent of the total work force of Burlington are employed in Burlington; that 42 per cent of the total work force of Burlington are employed in Hamilton—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, that puts a new light on it.

Mr. Deans: —and that only 20 per cent of the total work force of Burlington are employed east of Burlington, and that includes Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Bullbrook: That Provincial Secretary for Justice has a great deal of influence. He really does.

Mr. Deans: And, beyond that, beyond that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member know how many people in Mississauga are employed in Metropolitan Toronto? It is the same rationale.

Mr. Deans: It doesn't matter. Does the Premier want the rest of it? Does he want the numbers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sorry. I have read it very carefully.

Mr. Deans: He read it carefully, but what was the point of involving these people in drafting this kind of a report, of going in depth into all of the patterns of involvement of all of the people in the Hamilton-Wentworth-Burlington region, if the government, for the sake of political expediency, is simply going to throw it all out the window?

Can it possibly justify setting up something called a region in the county of Halton? Does it honestly believe that the county of Halton meets any of the criteria established either by the Smith committee or by this government?

Mr. Cassidy: Not one, no.

Mr. Deans: Does it honestly believe that the county of Halton in any way provides the kind of criteria that were established by the member for Chatham-Kent or by Charles MacNaughton? Does it believe for one minute that the kinds of things that were set out as being essential for regional government development can be found in the county of Halton?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sure it can!

Mr. Deans: Oh come on! Does the Premier say that in honesty? Does he think that it makes any sense to have two totally inadequate regions which will be under severe economic pressure from the large areas beside them between Metropolitan Toronto and Hamilton-Wentworth?

Hon. Mr. Davis: So then there are two cities, Hamilton and Toronto. Is that what the member wants?

Mr. Deans: No, that is not what I am suggesting. What I am saying is that there is a great deal more orientation between Oakville and Mississauga; that Oakville in fact could well go into a region which would be sufficiently large when put together with Mississauga, and when put together with Brampton and Streetsville, that you could have a viable region between Metropolitan—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Caledon, Albion, Bolton?

Mr. Deans: I am not going through all the names. But if you establish one viable,

large region between Metropolitan Toronto and metropolitan Burlington—if that is what you want to call it, I don't care—so that they would have a sufficiently large area at one end of the lake, the Hamilton-Wentworth-Burlington area to counterbalance the growth of Metropolitan Toronto; while having a buffer zone between which would in itself be self sufficient; that is how regional government should have been established.

There is nothing in the Halton county area that has changed as a result of the decision which the Premier handed down on that evening, in January at Mohawk College. What the Premier has in fact done is he has just simply said that the county council structure as it presently exists will continue with minor modifications, and that the county of Halton and the county of Peel will continue as they have always done. But in the meantime he has completely disregarded all of the concerns and all of the needs of the people for growth and for development in the whole Hamilton area; and that is the basic problem that confronts him.

Whether the Premier believes it or not—and he can sit and nod or smile or shake his head no, I don't really care—the fact of the matter is there isn't enough viability in the Halton region to sustain it against the kind of economic pressures from the other areas.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear; and that is the point!

Mr. Deans: And there isn't sufficient viability in the Peel region to sustain it against the pressures of Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member has got to be kidding.

Mr. Deans: I am not kidding; I am not kidding at all. The Premier can't sit there and tell me that the area of Peel—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The government just turned it over to the developers and made it an extension of Metro; that is what the Premier's regional government has done. He has just walked right into this and it is crumbling around his ears and he can't pull himself out of it. He can't even make an announcement of what his intentions are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is that in Peel and Halton?

Mr. Lewis: Yes. Because the Premier is going to have to succumb on that too.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Wentworth has the floor. Please proceed.

Mr. Deans: All I say to the Premier is this, that with the kinds of pressure that develops in an area the size of Metropolitan Toronto, you have to have a tremendous diversity of economic opportunity in the area immediately adjacent to it; and you can't have that with Peel only. And you can't have an area like Burlington and Halton sufficiently viable when weighed up against the tremendous pressures which will be exerted by the Hamilton-Wentworth region.

Now why doesn't the government use common sense. Why doesn't it take the Burlington-Halton region and take out of it—I am not absolutely sure about the northern portion; I recognize that there may be some problems there—but why doesn't the government combine the area of Burlington-Halton to the Oakville line with the Hamilton-Wentworth region, and create a region sufficiently large to counterbalance the Metropolitan Toronto area?

In that region the government is providing every possible thing that could be required in order to make the Hamilton-Wentworth area viable. And I don't care whether the politicians in Burlington have threatened the Provincial Secretary for Justice or not; I don't care whether George Harrington has threatened him—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier needs a counterbalancing force to the provincial secretary.

Mr. Deans: The fact is that what the government is doing is going to be destructive. The government has moved from what was at one time an acceptable progressive concept of larger areas of administration for purposes of future growth, to a simple transferral to existing county boundaries and the transferral of a few of the responsibilities to the county council level. Well it was said some years ago, and it's worth repeating, that the county council system is out of date.

Mr. Haggerty: The member doesn't mean that?

Mr. Deans: It didn't work well before, and it isn't going to work any better simply because you transfer some of the responsibilities.

Mr. Haggerty: The member doesn't mean that?

Mr. Deans: I want to turn to one final subject before I close, because it too is a

clear indication of this government's inability to deal adequately with the problems that confront the people, just as the problem of regional government is and just as the other questions that I've raised are. I want to talk to you for a moment about this government sitting for 20 years with a report—

Mr. Bullbrook: Ah, the lake levels!

Mr. Deans: Absolutely!

Mr. Bullbrook: Twenty years! The greatest inertia the government ever saw.

Mr. Deans: Sitting for 20 years with a report which, had the recommendations been implemented, would have saved us all of the grief that we've had over the last few months.

Mr. Haggerty: The member was on the municipal council.

Mr. Deans: Now, I want to tell you—I'm going to read parts of it, so you might as well relax—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: I'm going to tell you to begin with—just to set the mood, Mr. Speaker—that about four weeks ago I wrote to the Premier—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why doesn't the member just table the report?

Mr. Deans: —and I said to him—I'm not quoting exactly—that there was—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: I'm going to tell the members that in a minute, too!

I wrote to the Premier and I said to him, "All of the information that I have from the inland waters people indicates that we're going to have severe flooding in the area that I represent. Who in your government is responsible for this aspect of government policy so that I can pursue it?"

Well, I waited two weeks. Then I thought, well, maybe I'd better drop him another note, maybe he didn't get the last one. So I wrote him another and I said to him: "Look, Mr. Premier, I'm awfully sorry to have to write you again. And while it doesn't really affect me directly, I've got some constituents standing up to their knees in water and they would like to hear from you. Who in your government should we contact about this matter?" And I still wait for an answer. I still haven't got one.

Now this, to begin with, is an indication of the—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Join the club!

Mr. Deans: —arrogance and high-handedness of the Premier's office. But ah well, he's a busy man. Maybe he can't answer me.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Well, he's got only 76 people working for him.

An hon. member: He's got 96.

Mr. Deans: But anyway, we then turn away from that, because every one of us who lives on Lake Ontario or on many of the other waterways in the Province of Ontario, was aware that the lake levels were rising, that the rising of the lake levels was going to result inevitably in flooding, that there had been considerable erosion over the last 12 to 18 months, that the people had been holding meetings continuously. I attended a meeting last September at the Beacon Hotel at which my friend from Lincoln was present.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Why doesn't the member go to church and ask God?

Mr. Deans: And that was one—that wasn't even the first of the meetings—that was one of a number of meetings which had been held during last summer to explain to the government that those people were concerned for their properties and that they wondered if there was any action likely to be taken by the government.

Mrs. Campbell: They've got their nerve!

Mr. Deans: Well, they went on. The government was made aware that lake levels were going to reach a point where flooding was going to take place. Nothing happened!

They were told that at the spring breakup there were going to be difficulties. Nothing happened! They were informed that there were going to be severe problems with the first spring storm. Nothing happened!

They were repeatedly told, time after time, by members of the Legislature, by citizens and by the inland waters people who were monitoring the lake levels, that there were likely to be severe problems arise in the lake areas and that it might not be a bad idea to think up a little programme that might be useful in trying to combat this. And nothing happened!

Okay. It all occurred. The lake levels rose just as it was predicted. The spring storms came, just as they were predicted, and then we were faced with the havoc and the wreck.

I don't know whether the Premier has been down by the lake—I don't know whether he has stood beside the people who have lived on that lake for a number of years, many of them living in homes that are not great palatial places. I'm not talking about the fancy mansions on the lakefront, I'm talking about the people who are living in normal, everyday houses; frame houses. People who've lived there for years and who stood and watched while everything they had worked for and everything they had saved for was being broken up, was being flooded out. And when they asked and begged for help it wasn't forthcoming.

Now the policy that the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development brought in is totally inadequate. It's not that the money the government is offering is totally inadequate, it's the way in which those people have to get the money that's totally inadequate.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. Deans: There is no way that a municipality can move quickly enough and can set up the kinds of committees required. Recognizing that the local municipal councellors are part-time, there's no way they can turn all of their attention—and that's what's needed at a time like this—to resolving the difficulties.

When the minister announced the 80-20 formula that was going to be available to municipalities for diking and for emergency repair work, I immediately asked him two questions. The first was this: Would he send out a letter to each municipality that he believes will be involved and inform them how they can get the money and what the money is to be used for?

I asked that 10 days ago. Do you know when the letter went out, Mr. Speaker? Do you know? This afternoon. The letter went out this afternoon to the municipalities. I am going to tell you that's pretty slipshod. That's not nearly good enough.

When the people were standing down by the lake yesterday, saying to their local council: "What can we do?" The local council said: "We don't know because we haven't received any word from Queen's Park." That was 10 days ago they were asked to do this.

The second thing I asked was this. I said: "Look, if the minister is going to make an arrangement for an 80-20 split, what possible difference can it make whether that 20 per cent is put up by the municipality or whether it is put up by the individual? If its for emergency repairs, diking, roadway, whatever it is, it shouldn't matter."

And it shouldn't matter. Does the government realize that the kinds of costs that it is now talking about on a dollar for dollar arrangement for repairs to properties that are damaged will be considerably higher after the next spring storm, which will occur within the next week, than the cost the government would have incurred had it made the money available on the 80-20 basis to build the kinds of dikes that are necessary simply to hold back the flood?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): The member knows that's not true. Look at it in his own area. He knows what happened in his area; he knows what happened in my area.

Mr. Deans: With that interjection I will continue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is right.

Mr. Deans: The Premier should just listen for a moment, because I don't think he is right.

There are two basic problems. One is the problem of erosion. That's for people who are living higher up on the bank and who in fact are having their homes undermined. That's a very difficult problem to solve and I admit that, but it can be solved, at least partially, at this point.

An hon. member: By moving the houses.

Mr. Deans: Not even by moving the houses.

Mr. Haggerty: They should never have built there in the first place.

Mr. Deans: We'll come to that in a moment too. That problem could be resolved.

But the other and more basic problem for most of the people I am talking about is simply a flooding problem. And what was required in those low areas where it was just a matter of the lake coming in was to build the kinds of thick dikes that would hold the lake back, and to do it before the damage occurred. And that's all I asked for.

All I asked the government to do was to make available sufficient funds so that we could hire some of the unemployed for $1.85, if that's all you could get, so that they could go down with sand and bags and build the kinds of retaining wall or the kinds of dikes that would hold back the flooding. And do you know something? The government failed again.

It failed to recognize the needs of the people of the Province of Ontario. It completely failed to understand that just that action alone would have saved it money in the long run and would have shown the concern of the government of Ontario for the people of the province.

This is why the people in Lincoln are walking around saying that they are not going to vote for the Conservative government again. This is why these rather influential Tories are talking about shafting the Premier and getting him out of here. I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. Newman: Look, 17,000 sandbags were washed away yesterday and the member knows it.

Mr. Singer: Why did the member for Wentworth wash away all those sandbags?

Mr. W. Newman: Yes, they were washed away. Check it out.

Mr. Deans: Now I want to tell you something, Mr. Speaker. I want to just tell you about Mr. Walter Giles, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Natural Resources, in a quote from today's Globe and Mail. He says he placed some of the blame on lakefront municipalities that have over the years approved building subdivisions on property that should have been designated as floodland.

I am going to transfer that blame because that blame belongs to this government. That blame belongs to them, not to those municipalities. I don't know whether they have read this report, but I am going to suggest to the government to take a look at it, because in the summary of recommendations in this report, it talks about exactly the problem that man was talking about. I will read them all because they are all important, and none of them has been done.

Recommendation No. 1 says there should be a study of the lake currents, so that appropriate action can be taken and so that agreements can be entered into to protect certain areas. It says that there should be changes in the dredging and the beach operations, so that there wouldn't be the taking away of much of the sand, which in fact itself acts as a safeguard against the kind of erosion and the kind of damage that have occurred.

No. 6 says [and I quote]:

> Wherever on the shoreline of the Great Lakes in Ontario land is subject to such erosion or inundation as in the judgement of the Ministry of Planning and Development makes it unsuitable for private development, the minister be empowered to restrict or prohibit the use of such land until suitable protective works have been installed.

That was a recommendation made in 1953, and that was a recommendation which this government should have followed. That is a recommendation which, I am sure, those people who are currently studying today's problem will make again. That is a recommendation which, had the government followed it, would have been of great benefit to many of the people who are currently there, because they wouldn't have been able to build there.

Mr. W. Newman: How many?

Mr. Deans: There would have been an adequate opportunity to assess whether or not there had been protective measures taken. Another recommendation was:

> Whenever on the shoreline of the Great Lakes in Ontario the use of land is restricted or prohibited because of the threat of erosion or inundation, the municipality, or the valley conservation authority if such has been established in the area in which such land is situated, be empowered to acquire these lands for park, recreation or protective purposes; and that power be given to municipalities and authority to expropriate such lands; and that suitable legislation be provided.

Not only do they need suitable legislation, they need money. There is no point in saying they can buy land. There is no point in saying they can expropriate the land, because they don't have the kind of funding at the municipal level to do that kind of thing.

What we needed was a little bit of action by this government over the last 20 years. But even more than that, recognizing the immediacy of the problem, we needed a little bit of action by this government over the last two years.

There are a lot of places where the blame can be placed and I am placing the immediate blame for some of it—a big portion of the flooding—squarely on the Premier's doorstep, because he had adequate warning. It would have been possible with a very limited expenditure to provide protection for a great many of the people who needed it.

The protection that is being asked for isn't a matter of protecting private property. Where I am talking about I was standing up to my knees in water until 1 o'clock yester-

day morning, and I was up again at 4 o'clock trying to get additional help for people so they could sandbag the place. I am telling the government that the protection that it is being asked to provide is protection against the future erosion of the Queen Elizabeth Way, because that's what's going to happen.

There are places along that lakefront where there have been 15 and 20 feet of property taken away just in this one series of storms. If the government doesn't take some action now it will be forced in the future to take action simply to protect the highway. If it continues to erode at the rate it is eroding today that's the next thing that will be under pressure.

The government has a choice. It can either protect the property that presently exists, or it can wait until it goes into a dollar-for-dollar arrangement with the local people to rebuild or to relocate or to provide for damage to their properties; or it can take the steps now to try to stop it where it presently is.

Mr. Laughren: Get the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) to be a one-man task force.

Mr. Deans: I suggest to the government that the last choice is a much more acceptable way to deal with this kind of a problem than either of the other two. I am not going to read this report into the record, obviously, but I want to tell the government that this is good light bedtime reading for them. For goodness sake, we don't need any more studies of Lake Ontario. That study there in itself provides all of the information needed in order to do the job that has to be done but which should be done between now and the month of July when the lake will have risen by another 18 inches at least.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Chatham-Kent): Oh come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a little hyperbole.

Mr. Deans: All I suggest to my colleagues who are saying, "Come off it," is that on their way home to Welland they drop into the Canada Centre for Inland Waters and check the charts. I looked at the charts; and I am saying that with normal precipitation between now and the end of July, and without any real heat, which they are not predicting, there is a good possibility of an 18-inch increase in the lake level.

I am suggesting that if we don't do diking in those lower areas now, we will inevitably spend many millions of dollars more than we now are prepared to pay those people in compensation. Don't take the risk of doing that. For goodness' sake, go and help them.

The provincial secretary said to me: "You can't hold back Lake Ontario." I want to remind him that they have held back the ocean in Holland for years. And if we can't hold back Lake Ontario, then there is something wrong with the engineering expertise in this government and in this province.

Mr. W. Newman: It's a little different situation.

Mr. Lewis: I hope the members opposite have absorbed this presentation during the last half hour, because it speaks to the problem very eloquently.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member suggesting the other half was not relevant?

Mr. Lewis: No, I am not. I am suggesting the Premier really listen to this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would agree.

Mr. Deans: What's wrong with this government is simply that it's not listening. And it is not only not listening to the people who are standing on the steps of the Parliament Buildings, it is not even listening to the people who supported it. That is what is going to cause the government a great deal of grief in the future; the very people upon whom it will be calling for support in the near future are the people who are crying the loudest at this point.

Frankly, I don't want to see the government back there. But by the same token I am not sufficiently selfish to deny those people what they need simply to get this government out of office. I would much prefer that it provided for them and stayed forever, than that it didn't meet their needs and was defeated. And that perhaps is my own personal view.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the mood that I think I have established—I hope I have—I want to say to you that this government has in fact failed in many different areas to meet the needs that were established over the last two years. This government has failed miserably to provide any kind of leadership in the Province of Ontario.

Other than by headline and by vague reference, this government has failed to deal with

the problems that affect the majority of people in the Province of Ontario. The Throne Speech contains little in the way of innovative programmes and is very much a restatement of the government's policies. It is a restatement that includes, just in passing again, a promise that it is going to save the Niagara Escarpment. This statement in fact was made by the Hon. John Robarts in 1970, and in years prior to that by his predecessors. The fact that the government has said once again that it is going to take steps to save the Escarpment is in fact contained in a statement made by the Hon. John Robarts on May 6, 1970; so it isn't new. He didn't do it then; the Premier hasn't done it since; and I predict he won't do it now.

Mr. Lewis: He certainly won't!

Mr. Deans: That is what's wrong with this government. It doesn't seem to understand that people are getting sick and tired of promises with no action. For that reason I was pleased to second the amendment to the amendment made by my leader, which we believe will provide a greater opportunity in the Province of Ontario for the people who most desperately need assistance, guidance, leadership and financing; in other words, the people who rely to a great extent on the wisdom of the government for their day-to-day operations. We believe that what we have offered is a much more sensible approach to dealing with these problems than what the government has done.

Mr. W. Newman: That was pretty weak.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Before I get into the thrust of my remarks let me, through you, address a comment to the Premier (Mr. Davis). I wonder if the Premier would agree with me that any intelligently-run organization—and I would hope that he would think the Legislature is an intelligently-run organization—would not knock itself out by forcing a sitting to 10 minutes to 2 o'clock in the morning, having started the session earlier at 2 o'clock in the afternoon and having gone through all the shenanigans about committees and non-committees and so on.

So, not by any way of plea or anything else but merely as a word of sanity, could I ask the Premier, through you, sir, if I move the adjournment, would he and his party vote in favour of that motion? The Premier sits and smiles and says "no." All right, fine, let the record—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I had some discussions with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) myself. There were discussions earlier; there was an understanding that this debate would take place tonight and would be concluded and part of this was done to accommodate the members of the opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was!

Mr. Singer: So be it, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am certainly in favour of finishing tonight.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I suggest that the way the business of this House is ordered, by the Premier's direction and in his presence, is a matter of ridiculous nonsense and that all of the people of Ontario should be aware of it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I suggest to you, sir, that there was no reason this House could not have sat last evening to carry on with the Throne debate as was suggested. I suggest there is absolutely no reason the government of Ontario should expect 117 members to sit here until 2 o'clock or 2:30 or 3 o'clock in the morning—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Or 4:30.

Mr. Singer: —having commenced their work in the early hours of the day before, and expect any intelligent debate to take place and any intelligent response to come from the government.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Sit down.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, one must conclude that, in view of the method by which the government carries on, it is waging a programme of attrition and duress against the opposition whereby it wants to stifle, at every possible opportunity, reasonable debate in reasonable hours and in a reasonable manner.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Let me say, sir. The best indication of that approach is the appointment of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) as the leader of the House. We had a great debate over the dinner hour on whether his action was venal or just stupid; whether he was able to tell us from day to day and understood what the business of the House was going to be, or whether he was, in fact, playing games. Listen as I might, since this hon. gentleman has been appointed House leader I have never yet been able to figure out from his controverted and convoluted answers to questions about what the order of business might be, what it is actually going to be.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): He knows where we are going. We know where we are going.

Mr. Singer: All right. Mr. Speaker, could I draw to the attention of the hon. member who last interjected that the people of Huron know where the government is going; and the people of St. George know where it is going!

An hon. member: Right down the drain!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Might I ask you, sir—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, might I rise on a point of order?

Mr. Singer: Oh, rise on a point of order.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He wants to tell the member whether he was venal or stupid.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would like to raise the point, Mr. Speaker, that last evening at 6 o'clock there was a very minimal number of speakers on the list. It could have been accommodated very easily today.

An hon. member: No, that was this afternoon on the estimates.

An hon. member: What is the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It's in regard to the business of the House. I want to say further that at 10:30 tonight it was not the government that asked that the business be continued. We didn't interfere. Had we interfered, we possibly might have had the vote then. We are now accommodating the opposition. Let there be no mistake about that.

An hon. member: At 10:30, we might have had the vote?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Singer: Has he got a point of order? We will be here a long time, I guess, if this is going to go on. A long time.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the hon. member for Port Arthur would repeat what he was attempting to say. I couldn't hear a word.

Mr. Foulds: According to standing rule 3, extension of House business beyond 10:30 must be made by government motion. There was no government motion at 10:30.

Mr. Speaker: But there was unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Go back to Port Arthur.

Mr. Singer: I had hoped, when the hon. Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet rose in his place he would tell us whether he was being a little stupid, but unfortunately that was not his point of order.

What puzzles me, is the kind of nonsense that went on in this House today in contravention of the rules in relation to the estimates of the Justice department. What puzzles me is that notwithstanding the very clear provision of rule 86(d) which provides that the estimates committee cannot sit until after the budget has been introduced, we have this document, which is a very comprehensive document, tabled in the House two days ago—it's two days ago now—which covers expenditures of large sums of money, and that the hon. House leader waited until 6 o'clock to tell those members who were in the House at that point that it was his intention to attempt to proceed with the estimates of the Justice galaxy the following afternoon.

I think that is absoluteily and completely unreasonable, arbitrary and stupid, if not venal.

Mr. Lewis: No, no. That was venal.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Irresponsible.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is not correct and the member knows it.

Mr. Singer: And irresponsible, as my colleague from York Centre said.

Now, having done all that, Mr. Speaker; having encouraged the kind of ruckus that took place early this afternoon; having known —I'm not offended; the House leader knew I was not going to be here from the hours of 2 to about 4:30. I told him in the presence of his leader and he heard me yesterday afternoon. He knows I'm a Justice critic for our party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He also heard the member say we would finish tonight.

An hon. member: It's not tonight; it's tomorrow morning.

Mr. Singer: He attempted to bull this thing through this afternoon. Finally—well, I don't know what great wisdom descended upon his mind or whether he read the rules of the House, but he finally gave way a bit and called off the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr). But that wasn't enough, because downstairs another show was going on. The hon. member for St. George, in her great wisdom—

Mrs. Campbell: St. David.

Mr. Singer: St. David, I'm sorry.

Mrs. Campbell: I'm St. George.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener), in her great wisdom, attempted to carry on estimates of the Attorney General down below while this debate was supposedly taking place upstairs.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Singer: Now, I think that is absolutely inexcusable and indefensible, and I think it's high time that the Premier took a hand and brought some order and intelligence to this House. That's not the end, Mr. Speaker, that's not the end.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member is wrong and he knows it.

An hon. member: They couldn't run a hot dog stand, those people over there.

Mr. Lewis: In St. David's case, it was neither venal nor stupid, just vapid.

Mr. Singer: I accept the interjection from the hon. leader of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, that's not the end of it. After I returned to the House this afternoon, I went and spoke to the Provincial Secretary for Justice and said: "Could you tell me what is now going to happen? Is it true, as I have had indicated to me by some of my colleagues, that Friday, upstairs, we're going to have you performing, and downstairs the Solicitor General?" He said: "Yes." I then went to the House leader and said: "Is it true what the Provincial Secretary for Justice tells me?" He said: "Oh no."

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whence we get our advice as to what the order of business is going to be.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If the member listened he would know.

Mr. Singer: Surely, in the presence of the Premier, who has sat here for several hours tonight—which is unusual for him—he can bring some order and intelligence and common sense to the workings of this House.

Surely, it would make sense that when the government brings a package before us of Justice estimates, over which its ministers have laboured many hours, as well as its civil servants, that it can at least extend the courtesy to the members of the opposition that we have a reasonable time to examine what is going on, so that the critics who deal with these subjects can deal with them one by one as they come along, and not play the stupid games directed apparently by the hon. House leader or by the Provincial Secretary for Justice. I don't know who figures these things out that apparently something's going to go on up here in relation to Justice; something is going to go on ordered by the hon. member for St. David; that they are going to split the opposition and ram these estimates through without any opportunity—

Mr. W. Newman: But it won't help the member anyway. He won't know what to do anyway.

Mr. Singer: —for the opposition members to properly present reasoned and sensible and logical criticism.

Mr. Foulds: The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) has crawled out of the depths of his reservoir.

Mr. Singer: Now I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is part and parcel of what is going on. When I look over this new seating plan and I note the responsibility that is assigned to the hon. member for Grey South and that is described in this seating plan as that of Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, I feel sorry for all of the people of Ontario if he manages the Management

Board of Cabinet or chairs it in a way in which he has tried to run the affairs of the House.

Mr. W. Newman: Thank God we have got him.

Mr. Singer: It's complete and absolute chaos.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Best House leader they have ever had.

Mr. Singer: And I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come that the leader, the Premier of the province, should take hold of his colleagues and bring some common sense, some orderliness—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Doesn't sound like the member at all.

Mr. Singer: —and some sanity to the performance in this House.

Mr. Lawlor: Resign.

Mr. Singer: And there is no sanity at all, Mr. Speaker, when we are forced to carry on an important debate like this at 2 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. W. Newman: Why doesn't the member carry on and stop talking?

An hon. member: Carry it on without talking.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why doesn't the member shut up when he is talking?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Quit playing cheap politics.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Last week it was worthy of the House leader.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Thank you.

Mr. Lawlor: The member for Downsview is very seldom right, but this time he is.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ontario South is not untypical of the arrogant, overbearing, intolerant approach taken by so many government members—not all of them, but so many of them.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But he can't touch the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: The fact is that despite trying to attach a label to itself as the government that listens, it doesn't want to listen, it doesn't want to hear a debate, it doesn't want to conduct its business in reasonable and logical fashion, in fairness, within reasonable hours. It doesn't want to hear the kind of criticism that comes forward—but no amount of bulldozing is going to wipe away the message sent to it by the voters of Huron and by the voters of St. George.

Mr. W. Newman: Why doesn't the member say something?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Downsview will have everybody sore.

Mr. Singer: Now look, Mr. Speaker, who they ran in those two ridings. Look who they ran. A fellow named Roy McMurtry. Roy McMurtry, tipped by the papers as an obvious cabinet minister and a potential new leader. The big blue machine was going to put him through.

Well, the big blue machine emerged as the big black and blue machine when the whole thing was over. And they didn't put him through anywhere except out of politics.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Through the wringer.

Mr. Singer: And in Huron, who would have expected that that good, comfortable Tory stronghold—30 years in the Tory party; Charlie MacNaughton had held it; no one would ever challenge anything Charlie had said—was ever going to desert the Tory government?

But what happened? They got a fellow-executive assistant I think to Charlie MacNaughton. Did the Premier take him back in government employ since he lost, or is he through too?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not yet.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Not yet! Has Hansard got that? Not yet!

Mr. Singer: Southcott was his name and he was the knight in shining armour. He mounted a white charger and rode around Huron saying: "I might move back if I'm elected." Well, the government didn't think that was too arrogant, but the people of Huron thought it was too arrogant—

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Singer: —and so they sent us the new member from Huron.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Where is he?

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): Why isn't he here?

Mr. Singer: And I may say, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that you have had the opportunity with me of listening to the maiden speeches of the hon. member for St. George and of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Riddell), who took part in this debate; and I'm sure you will agree with me that those were two outstanding speeches and as good as has ever been delivered in this House. And I tell you, sir, that I don't think there can be any doubt that as soon as this government is prepared either to call a general election or to create another by-election opportunity, that the same kind of candidate is going to appear for the Liberal Party and the same kind of result is going to occur.

An hon. member: Which one of the members is ready to try?

Mr. W. Newman: Why doesn't the member for Downsview resign and call a by-election?

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Speaker, lest my good friends on my left feel a little left out, let me say this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: —that since the by-elections have come and gone, one should have a very careful look at the results achieved by the NDP.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: In Huron, I think, they got 10 per cent of the vote, in St. George, 20 per cent of the vote. Their great promises, sounded by the press, of how well they could organize and how strong their candidates were, fell to nothing.

Mr. Stokes: Both those ridings were Tory and they haven't changed.

Mr. Singer: It's had an effect, Mr. Speaker, on their morale.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: We see, hardly as often as we see the Premier—

Mr. Stokes: Both of them were Tory. They haven't changed.

Mr. Singer: —the leader of the NDP. He doesn't seem to like the House in the new atmosphere. We seldom see, Mr. Speaker, too many members occupying the NDP benches. We seldom hear their contributions to debate.

Mr. Foulds: Just 19, not too many.

Mr. Singer: I wonder what has happened to the long, strong voice of the bureau chief of the Globe and Mail who, after three or four days here, wrote such an intelligent assessment of what goes on in this Legislature.

Mr. Stokes: There are more NDP members here right now than there are Liberals. The member can count them.

Mr. Singer: It took him only a few days to realize that the Premier was great; that the NDP were the opposition and that we were absolutely nothing. Well, he has deserted that kind of talk and he feels content now—

Mr. W. Newman: After this he will change his mind.

Mr. Singer: —psychopath that he is, to write regular pieces extolling the wonders of the Premier; extolling the other day the wonders of the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough). I would be the last one—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Hurrah.

Mr. Singer: —to decry the merits or ability of the member for Chatham-Kent, but I just wonder where that bureau chief of the Globe and Mail is—

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. Singer: —when debates like this go on. There isn't a single Globe and Mail reporter up there now. Where was he when the very important debate went on—

Mr. W. Newman: He has gone.

Mr. Foulds: He left when the member for Downsview started talking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: —where all of them were when the important debate went on relating to the Ministry of Government Services.

Mr. Lewis: The galleries were full when the member started.

Mr. Singer: I am sure they were—and I have driven them all out! I am sorry but this is my penchant. I drive the press out constantly. Perhaps either the bureau chief—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It was that earlier speech he made.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: —of the Globe who can only write about the Premier and the member for Chatham-Kent or some of his associates, could have the opportunity in due course to read the Hansard transcript and perhaps wonder why they don't cover other things that go on in this House.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on! Don't be so sensitive.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Why they don't comment, for instance, about the ordering of the business.

Mr. W. Newman: Why should they waste their time?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): They work unending hours.

Mr. Singer: Why they didn't comment, for instance, about what I thought was one of the best debates I've heard in this House—the debate on the Ministry of Government Services bill. Why they didn't comment on the vote on the end of that debate. I thought it was unusual, Mr. Speaker, that after that debate—it was a good hard debate and points were made on all sides—the government was able to muster only 37 of its 76 members to bring them in to vote.

Mr. Reid: There has been some lousy writing.

Mr. Singer: I thought that was a very interesting thing. Those people who write in that paper extol the wonders and the wisdoms of the government, but they didn't bring that to the attention of the public?

Mr. Reid: Something has to be said.

Mr. Singer: Now, I could go on at some considerable length.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They knew the true story, that is why.

Mr. Singer: Oh, yes, they knew the true story. That is right.

An hon. member: This is unbelievable!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I didn't speak to them.

Mr. Singer: They got it from the hon. member for Grey South who, in his orderly and logical fashion, explained to them what is important that goes on in this House and what is unimportant. I am certain no member of the press writes a word for his newspaper unless he first consults the hon. member for Grey South.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am very sure!

Mr. Singer: Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Reid: That's why they are such lousy writers.

Mr. Singer: If there were, as the hon. member for Scarborough West points out, some more people occupying those seats, I did have a lot more remarks about the press and its approach. I wonder, for instance, why the Star has as columnists such eminent and impartial people as Walter Pitman.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Impartial!

Mr. Singer: Why the Sun, for instance, deals with the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), as a columnist—

Mr. Lewis: What is the member talking about? Does he mean that a newspaper can't hire a columnist of a particular political persuasion?

Mr. Singer: No, I'm not saying they can't hire any columnist they want, but in the great cry of impartiality that they have—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The writers in the Star supported the member on Spadina.

Mr. Singer: —one has to wonder out loud, Mr. Speaker, why the three Toronto papers, in any event, when they turn to the various columnists that they do hire, seem to hire people who have pretty substantial political biases.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, most columnists do.

Mr. Foulds: Take it down.

Mr. Singer: All right, there is Pitman, NDP, and Fraser Kelly, who is something less than unflattering to the government, as it is.

The Globe really doesn't need anybody. It has its bureau leader who is a sufficient apologist for the government at all times. Last Saturday there were two columns; the Premier on the front page, and the Premier on page 8.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The Sun, Mr. Speaker, has Douglas Fisher, Lubor Zink—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member has a persecution complex tonight.

Mr. Singer: —the hon. member for High Park, and Peter Worthington, who wrote a wonderful column not too long ago saying, "What is really wrong with Senator McCarthy?" Now that kind of impartial journalism—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Lewis: Does the member want Norman Webster to write something about him? Is that what this is all about?

Mr. Singer: No, I don't think so, I don't think he's going to write anything nice about me. But I thought maybe he could spend enough time in this House to have some idea of what is going on so he could write about the affairs of the House.

Mr. Lewis: It speaks for the sanity of the press gallery that they are not here; it says something about us that we are.

Mr. W. Newman: Would the member for Downsview like to hold the reins while I shovel for a while?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it's going to be a long night and I have lots of patience. If the hon. members over there want to interject let them feel free. If the hon. member from Ontario South wants to get up and make a small speech, please do. I've got lots of time and lots of patience, since obviously we are going on. The quickest way to let me conclude my remarks will be to let me finish without interruption.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, order.

Mr. Singer: If the hon. members don't see any point in that then let them go on and interrupt. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a personal remark or two about an event that is pending within the Liberal Party. And when I say it is a personal remark I may be speaking—

Mr. W. Newman: He is running for leader, that's it.

An hon. member: Federally or provincially?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Who would have imagined he would announce it at 2 o'clock in the morning!

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): He is supporting the member for St. George.

Mr. Singer: I may be speaking, Mr. Speaker, for many members of our caucus, and I may be speaking for many members of the Liberal Party of Ontario, and many people who will be delegates at the leadership convention. But what I do want to say is this, sir, I believe—and I think I am speaking for many, many people—that the leadership given to our party by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon) in the years that he has been our leader, and the representation in the years that he has been the member for Brant, have been outstanding and worthy of the highest commendation by all the people of Ontario.

We have had, Mr. Speaker, many discussions—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is trying to close the door on the member for Brant!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Lawlor: Is the member going to run or not?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes or no?

Mr. Singer: Just be patient and the members will see what I am going to do in a minute.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Hurry up and drop the other shoe.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, we have had many discussions among ourselves about some indications that the hon. member for Brant has made in relation to his political future, and let me say, again very personally, that I would like him to stay on, and I think most of the members of the Liberal Party would like him to stay on as leader. And notwithstanding anything else that may be said about that subject, it is my opinion, sir, that this is the time of the the hon. member for Brant, and that at the next election, if the hon.

member for Brant continues to lead the Liberal Party he will then be the Premier of the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we won't go that far!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): There doesn't seem such general agreement on that!

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get to another phase of the remarks that I intended to make.

Mr. W. Newman: Be careful—the member for St. George is going to get after the member for Downsview pretty soon!

Mr. Singer: We have heard a great deal about the government that listens. We have heard a great deal about dialogue and communication with the public. The other day, in some reading I was doing, I came across this quotation:

> The time is now come in which every Englishman expects to be informed of his national affairs, and in which he has a right to have that expectation gratified. For whatever may be urged by ministers, or those whom vanity or interest makes the followers of ministers, concerning the necessity of confidence in our governors and the presumption of prying with profane eyes into the recesses of policy, it is evident that this reverence can be claimed by counsels yet unexecuted and projects suspended in deliberation; but when a design has ended in miscarriage or success, when every eye and every ear is witness to general discontent or general satisfaction, it is then a proper time to disentangle confusion and to illustrate obscurity; to show by what causes every event was produced and in what efforts it is likely to terminate; to lay down with distinct particularity what rumour always huddles in general exclamation or perplexes in ingested narrative; to show when happiness or calamity is derived and whence it may be expected; and honestly to lay before the people what inquiry can gather of the past and conjecture can estimate of the future.

Mr. Lewis: Pithy and succinct.

Mr. Singer: Well, thank you very much, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, it was of some significance that these remarks were made by Dr. Samuel Johnson some 200 years ago and were addressed to the Parliament of England. I think they are most applicable and pertinent to what goes on in this House.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that the parliamentary tradition which we apparently have arrived at, notwithstanding the inane nonsense that comes now from the secretary who is falling asleep, is supposedly to involve an exchange of information and supposedly to involve a responsibility on the part of government to give information about facts, such as Dr. Johnson outlined, and not to avoid, constantly and continuously, legitimate requests for information, which this government persists in doing.

Let me give you some examples. There have been many, many requests by my leader that the proposals made in relation to the Hydro building be tabled in the House so they can be examined. Those have never, in fact, been answered. They are still not tabled as of 2:20 o'clock, a.m., on April 11.

How many times, Mr. Speaker, have we asked, as the result of our own investigations and further spurred on as a result of the revelations made by the auditor, for details about the log books of the government's fleet of airplanes? Yet they are still not tabled. We are promised from time to time that a statement will be forthcoming. We have never had a succinct answer. We get an obscure reference from the minister that he said something a year or two ago which says, "If you will only direct me to specific information, I will give you a reply."

That same kind of technique is used by the Minister of Revenue. I asked him in an exchange of correspondence, as I read in the House last December, for access to the minutes of the Ontario Housing Corp., so that I could satisfy myself as to certain information that had come to my attention before making charges in public based solely on rumour. Again that information is not coming. What, in fact, both those ministers have been saying—the Minister of Revenue and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier)—is, "If you can zero in and tell us one single incident that is suspicious, we might give you our predigested analysis of the question that you are asking." But, Mr. Speaker, where it has come to our attention that we have some concern, surely it makes good common sense that the Minister of Natural Resources or the Minister of Revenue would make available those documents rather than hide them. Because every time this government hides another piece of information, every time it refuses to answer a question, that much more is it denying this Parliament its rights. That

much more is it classing itself as arrogant and uncaring and not a government that talks to people or listens to people.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) for details about the inquiry into the intelligence operation of the Ontario Police Commission, and other than a very brief statement, he will give us no details. He won't tell us why Mr. Thurston suddenly departed from this regime and has gone up to Ottawa, at Ontario government expense, to serve in an innocuous job for the Law Reform Commission of Canada. He refuses to discuss the activities of Gary Ralph —his sudden appearance in the Ontario Police Commission and his sudden departure.

Again, Mr. Speaker, those matters having come and gone and the government having taken action and found something wrong—because Thurston didn't leave because he was a great fellow and Ralph didn't leave because he was a great fellow; they both left under a cloud—surely, Mr. Speaker, the time has come that the government level with us and level with the people of Ontario and tell us what is going on.

I asked the Solicitor General, a couple of weeks ago now, about certain incidents that took place in the Ottawa police force and other than his giving his promise to look into it, no answer has in fact been forthcoming. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we in this Legislature and the people of Ottawa and the people of Ontario are entitled to that kind of an answer.

I have asked the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker, about the observance by the Metropolitan Toronto police of section 160 of the Canadian Criminal Code when they descended and seized certain books, which the Provincial Secretary for Justice said that the police had labelled as obscene. I'm not quite sure of the manner in which he arrived at that conclusion.

I don't know if the Solicitor General has looked at section 160 and the various subsections that are there, but if he has, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure he would agree with me that there are four or five steps that must be taken. I think it is a matter of urgent public importance that the answers be given as to whether or not the Metropolitan Toronto police have observed the law.

Now, do we get any answer from the Solicitor General? No, we don't get any answer from the Solicitor General.

I asked the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) a couple of weeks ago—

Mr. W. Newman: Don't worry, we'll vote for the member for leader.

Mr. Singer: I asked the Minister of Health the other day, Mr. Speaker, if he would make available to us a report called "Comparative Information Relating to Health Costs in Ontario and Other Jurisdictions," which came out of his ministry in November, 1972. His answer was "Yes," and that was the last that was heard of it. He has never come forward and made that publication available to us, although he promised that he would in the House. He must know that that document, which contains very valuable information in connection with the whole provision of health services and their costs is in the possession of many members of the working press.

So the minister gets rid of that one by saying, "Sure I'll make it available," but he never follows it up. Nor do any of them, Mr. Speaker.

And this goes on and on and on, and culminates in the ultimate nonsense that is taking place right here tonight, when at 2:30 in the morning we are still debating the Throne debate. No logical and sensible group of men and women would ever allow themselves to get into this position, unless by the arbitrary and senseless direction of the Premier who wants to thrust his great power upon the opposition, just to prove who is the boss.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be worth a minute or two, wondering about what has happened to the great government reorganization.

The secretaries of the various departments: We have the Provincial Secretary for Justice and just what he does, I have no idea.

Mrs. Campbell: Does he know?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I would love him to rise in his place, Mr. Speaker, and tell us about law reform. What has he done recently? What has he done ever since he took over that position, to introduce of his own initiative any single piece of law reform to the Province of Ontario? I would like him to tell us, Mr. Speaker, why he can't familiarize himself with a matter that he initiated the day he was pounding the table and saying, "I'm not going to be the policeman. We're going to sue for $25 million." Why couldn't he bother to inform himself about as simple a thing as whether or not there had been a statement of claim or a statement of defence in the Dow action?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what he does, and why he is asking in the estimates for a very large sum of money to keep him doing nothing.

With all the fields available for law reform—divorce, bail, family courts and so on—I wonder why we haven't heard one single word from the Provincial Secretary for Justice as to what kind of thinking is going on. There is a Law Reform Commission that makes reports, but nothing is ever referred to by the Provincial Secretary for Justice in relation to any of those suggestions. Nor have we seen one single bit of initiative since he took over that job.

I think the Provincial Secretary has some ability, but I think he is being absolutely wasted; he has been hived off into a corner where he has no responsibility. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, he carried with him a gentleman who I think is one of the ablest civil servants in the employ of the government of Ontario, the former Deputy Attorney General, who is now Deputy Provincial Secretary for Justice. And in case anyone gets the idea that Mr. Dick has been complaining to me, that is absolutely untrue. But I think it is a terrible waste of the talent of that very able man; he is parked away in a little office down here with absolutely nothing to do and has no responsibility, and the people of Ontario don't get the benefit of his knowledge, experience and intelligence. Is that any way to run a government?

Mr. Speaker, I wonder also about my hon. friend from Carleton East. He is the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Mr. W. Newman: He knows what's going on.

Mr. Singer: Now I have a very close personal friendship with the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, and I have a very high respect for him. But I think it is a crying shame that he also has been hived off. One would have thought, in looking at the words "resources development," that perhaps some responsibility could have been assigned to this hon. minister in relation to energy—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): One would have thought so; I agree with that. They had to find something for him to do.

Mr. Singer: —and in relation to the problems that the Premier is experiencing with his friend, the Premier of Alberta. But no, we are not allowed to hear a single word from the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development about the discussions that are going on in Ontario and in Alberta.

But let me go back to my friend, the Provincial Secretary for Justice. He tried to make some kind of a fist about the constitutional issue. But there was no one here in the House; and he fubbed it, as he does with most things, because he's got no real responsibility. Why shouldn't a man with the capability and intelligence of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development have been given that kind of responsibility?

When this House wants to talk about a very serious crisis that faces this province and the whole of Canada, Mr. Speaker, why should it be forced to wait for the occasional presence of the Premier? And I say "occasional" advisedly and deliberately. He isn't here very often.

The hon. member for Chatham-Kent has been muzzled. By the rules of the House he is not allowed to be questioned; and if he was questioned, which I am sure you wouldn't allow, Mr. Speaker, he wouldn't be allowed to answer us. He sits there, and I suppose he's doing a great job—Webster said so—but we don't get to know about it unless we get some kind of an inkling on the occasional attendance of the Premier. Again, Mr. Speaker, that's no way to run a government or a province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What questions has the hon. member asked about energy?

Mr. Singer: Again, this is flaunting the power of government in the face of the opposition and in the face of all the people of Ontario.

Mr. W. Newman: The member's lucky the parliamentary assistant can't talk, or he'd be in big trouble.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Lean back, Bill. Lean back.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, one wonders why, when we raised this question a little earlier, the Premier found it a great surprise that the hon. member for Chatham-Kent was not allowed to be questioned and to give answers. If the Premier was so shocked and surprised, why has he not done something about it in the few days since he has become aware of the situation?

Is the hon. member for Chatham-Kent going to be the spokesman for natural gas or isn't he? If he's going to be the spokesman, why don't they let him speak in the House? Or why don't they use the abundant

talent of the hon. member for Carleton East (Mr. Lawrence)?

Mr. W. Newman: The member for Downsview is the gas spokesman!

Mr. Singer: Why don't they let him do something instead of worrying himself into a tizzy about the various things he tries to do and don't turn out to be very much, because he isn't given any responsibility?

Then there's the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch). He's billed next in this great debate and probably we'll get out of here by 3 or 3:30. He is going to make his rah-rah McMaster University speech that he has made on many occasions. Everything is going to be great, and the Liberals are bad and the NDP are worse, and everybody loves the Premier. We have heard that speech from him many times over the past several years.

But what, Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member for Lincoln do? What are his responsibilities? What great policy statements does he get up and make? What kind of thinking is he doing? What is there in his activities that justifies the kind of expenditure that his office is engaged in? What, Mr. Speaker, is the excuse for parking talent like that, and talent like that—and a little more questionable over there—in corners where you can't use them? Put those fellows to work.

Mr. Speaker, it is really a disgraceful thing the way the Premier has gathered unto himself power. He doesn't consult with his people. He doesn't talk to them at all. The day he announced that great decision which created his image—he was going to stop Spadina—it was as big a surprise to his colleagues as it was to many other people in the House. It wasn't discussed in their cabinet and it wasn't discussed in their caucus.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the member talking about?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who is he kidding?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, that is the way it was run. It was fascinating to watch, the day the Premier turned over and said there would be disclosure of election donations. He had neglected to inform his own members, who were about to engage in debate in the House, that he had changed his mind. So we had the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson), who had a speech prepared. The hon. member for Algoma wasn't given quite enough notice to be able to change his speech, so he made a speech against what the Premier had said a few hours earlier.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): I spoke my own mind.

Mr. Singer: We had the hon. member for York West (Mr. MacBeth), who is a little more adaptable and a little quicker. He had a great ringing speech to support the Premier's previous decision. He took out all the nasty things that he was going to say and tried to adopt his speech. He didn't do it very well, even though he is a man of substantial talent.

But this is the way this government is run, Mr. Speaker. The Premier runs it, not out of his hip pocket but out of his office, with the largest staff that any Premier has ever had—over 100 people with the largest budget any Premier has ever had for his own personal service.

With all of those people running around, I wonder why, if the Premier is convinced that all of the innate wisdom of this government lies only with him, why doesn't he just stay in here and tell us from time to time what is going on? When he leaves his colleagues to answer for him; when he leaves the Provincial Secretary for Justice to explain something about the constitutionality of the actions in Alberta; when he leaves the hon. Minister of Health here to try to explain what happened to the $55 million, or even the provincial Treasurer (Mr. White) who tells us it wasn't lost, it is just postponed, one has to wonder really about the kind of capability that goes on.

Mr. W. Newman: The member is talking himself out of the leadership.

Mr. Singer: I was going to say a word or two toward the provincial Treasurer. When I listen to him, I get impressed with the Peter principle. The Peter principle, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is that a man is promoted to one step beyond his ability, and I am afraid that is what's happened to the hon. provincial Treasurer.

An hon. member: He went three beyond his capabilities.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): I hope they don't make the member for Downsview a judge.

Mr. Singer: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, for some reason best known to those people who wrote the COGP report, and for some reason that apparently continues to be implemented

by the Premier, they have given to the member for London South two of the greatest responsibilities that this government has. One is to do the budgeting, and he is doing that very badly; he is doing his explanations very badly. The other, uniquely enough, is the responsibility for municipal affairs.

I had a look in the Parliamentary Guide today to see what great municipal experience the hon. member for London South had. Notwithstanding the great municipal experience that so many of the Premier's members had, the member for London South has never served for one minute on any other elected body than this one.

Mr. Speaker, with all of the municipal problems besetting the people of the Province of Ontario, out of the lesson that should have been learned in Huron, surely the municipal affairs of the province are important enough that their direction and guidance and the expression of government principle should be reflected by one minister who hopefully has had a little elected municipal experience? One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes), a very successful mayor, could have been given a position right then—

Mr. Reid: And a good Liberal!

Mr. Singer: —as Minister of Municipal Affairs. One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, when they were branching out into this kind of experiment that the Premier would have looked for someone with a little knowledge and a little experience in what they were doing. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, as you review this front bench, one must come to the conclusion that where he has people of ability the Premier parks them in little cubbyholes where they can't operate. Where he doesn't want a minister who is going to bother him, he puts him in a portfolio with a big name on it, and really the Premier runs it when he is around to give directions.

Mr. Reid: How many Treasurers have we had lately?

Mr. Singer: And this again, Mr. Speaker, is no way to run a government.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): How did the member for Downsview make the front benches?

Mr. Singer: I'm glad the hon. member for Scarborough Centre interjected because I was hoping to say something about him.

I listened to him the other night, Mr. Speaker, on the CBC television free time broadcast, and I was most impressed, as was my colleague from York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens), with his very sage pronouncement that the day of the automobile has gone.

Mr. Drea: Everybody knows that.

Mr. Singer: I thought that was very impressive, particularly, Mr. Speaker, since earlier that afternoon I had gone around several car dealers trying to buy a car for myself, and at least two of them I waited for about 20 minutes trying to get a salesman even to speak to me. I didn't get the impression from the various dealers I visited that the day of the automobile had gone. They were just so busy and their business was so successful that I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the hon. member from Scarborough begins to think before he talks.

I happened to read the New York Times financial section on Sunday, and I read a two-page article there that indicated—with graphs and charts and so on that might appeal even to the member for Scarborough Centre—quite clearly that the automobile industry is in the midst of its biggest and greatest boom in its history. So I have tried to correlate the advanced thinking of the member for Scarborough Centre that the day of the automobile has gone with what is actually happening.

I tried to correlate that with the destruction that the Premier has wrought on portions of Metropolitan Toronto in the northwest sector. I am not going to make the Spadina speech at this time, I'll make it again later, but I say it is absolute and deliberate destruction.

I wondered too, where the member for Scarborough Centre came off in suggesting that Ontario had a new idea, that it was going to do its own research and experimentation in Ontario—and guess who the researchers are? Kraus-Maffei from Germany and Hawker Siddeley from England. The one that was closest to Ontario—Ford—dropped out. The member for Scarborough Centre really has to stretch a point to say, with the great conviction he displayed on television, that that really indicates that we are doing something in Ontario and for Ontario.

Even when you begin to analyse the kiddy-car ride at the exhibition which might be under way at the end of 1974; even when you analyse those fascinating diagrams that the Minister of Transportation and Communications released in connection with dial-a-bus;

and when you stop wondering about how dial-a-buses are going to get from where they start out on to Bathurst St., out on to Dufferin St., out on to Keele St., and take anybody anywhere—where are they going to take them? They are going to take them to another bus that is going to fight its way down Bathurst St. What kind of real answer is it going to be? Dial-a-bus is apparently going to start—maybe—in November. And if it can't start in November, 1974, maybe it will start in April, 1975.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Premier, having ruined the ability to communicate in a reasonable way by road transportation and by a system of rapid transportation, really feels that he has done anything for the people of Metropolitan Toronto in this image-creating effort that he indulged in on the eve of the last election. I don't think he did.

Mr. Speaker, look at the mess in Health. We can go on about that at great length and I know that my colleagues will.

I do want to talk for a moment or two about the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) and some of the very fascinating comments that he has delivered himself of over the past few days. I mentioned in the question period a few days ago, or tried to elicit the information, why the minister thought he was getting a snow job from the board of education of the borough of North York. He said it was because they had meetings and told the people their view of what was going on in their education budget. I asked the minister why he hadn't sent his own people to those meetings. He said it really wasn't seemly that civil servants arrive and appear and talk at those meetings.

Somehow, Mr. Speaker, some 7,000 people came to those 15 meetings in the borough of North York. Those 7,000 people didn't come beacuse they loved the hon. Minister of Education. They came because they were very unhappy with the hon. Minister of Education. You know I've listened to the hon. Minister of Education on television for the last three nights as he has attempted to explain away what he is attempting to do, and when all else has gone he says, "Well, nobody really gave me any information, you know". He uses that "you know." I don't know why he uses that "you know" phrase every other sentence but that is the way he puts it.

Let me read to you some of the views of a trustee of the board of education of the borough of North York which I think should be a part of the record. I think that the Minister of Education should begin to study what is going on and not try to explain away these things by saying, "It was a snow job. Nobody had an opportunity to talk. Nobody has given me the kind of figures." Listen to what this trustee says:

> The present ceilings on school board spending are part of a three-year programme of restriction by the provincial Department of Education to reduce the spending of local school boards. [He gives some of the history of it.] This year the boards in Metro find that the imposed ceilings cannot be set without seriously undermining the quality of education built up over two decades. Metro, as a whole, must reduce its budget by $25 million. North York must reduce its budget by $6 million. The shortage prevails after government has allowed us an increase of three per cent in our elementary per pupil cost and two per cent in our secondary per pupil cost.

He goes on to talk about the cuts that have already been made by cutting back on non-instructional areas, the instructional staff cuts that have already been made, the effect on maintenance, and that sort of thing. He outlines at very substantial length:

> —the services that have been built up with government approval, with approval of the Premier and his predecessor John Robarts, because when they were Ministers of Education in their respective time the sky was the limit. Nothing was too good for our students. Suddenly almost overnight down comes the axe.

And the Minister of Education says he has no facts and figures. Well, the facts and figures are there. He knows that they are there and he knows what has happened.

I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure most people can appreciate the fact, that there are only so many provincial dollars to go around. I can appreciate that the educational share of the total provincial budget, which we will hear about on Thursday—today—in a few hours—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Tomorrow. Today is Wednesday.

Mr. Singer: Today is Wednesday. I've lost track.

All right, the educational share can only be spread so far. But what puzzles me, Mr. Speaker, is in an area—

Mr. Bullbrook: Why does the government do this? It is their fault. Why do we sit so late?

Mr. Singer: –like the borough of North York, if the trustees feel it is–

Mr. Bullbrook: They do it all the time. Remember we talked about it.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): We could have sat last night.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): The member for Sarnia wants to say something.

Mr. Singer: –important and necessary to levy over and above what the Minister of Education tells them, why they are denied that privilege. If those democratically elected trustees who have their responsibility to keep up a certain grade and level and calibre of education, if they believe that they should be able to levy more money and collect it from the taxpayers who presumably are going to support them, why should the minister want to interfere with that democratic right?

I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there be a larger share of the provincial education budget directed to North York or to Metropolitan Toronto. The government gives us only 33 per cent now. But why limit the tax-collecting ability? Why interfere with the municipal autonomy?

Has the government not learned a lesson from Huron? Why does it keep on telling the elected officials of boards of education and the elected officials of municipalities that they can't do this and they can't do that because big daddy knows best? Why does the Minister of Education convene meetings to discuss these things and invite only Tories?

Is that a government that listens? Is that a government that's concerned? Does all of the wisdom of the Province of Ontario reside in the backbench Tories who come from Metropolitan Toronto?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I'm sure there are lots of "hear, hears" about that but I don't think anybody believes it. It indicates the arrogance and the lack of desire to listen and the lack of concern about the democratic process that this government has.

Mr. Speaker, I've got many, many more pages. The hour is late enough for me. I am going to conclude my remarks at this point with the urgent suggestion to the Premier that he pay some attention to some of the criticisms–not necessarily mine–to some of the criticisms that have been made in this debate.

When we make a plea for an orderly running of the House, for a reasonable communication of information, for reasonably prompt answers to our questions, which are important in the public mind, for responsible ministers who will take their place in this House day after day and answer our questions which not only are we entitled to ask, but it's our duty to ask.

Mrs. Campbell: They don't know that.

Mr. Singer: Why does the government play games with us? Why does it have that clown, the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, playing this continual game with us about ordering the business of the House–because it's disorder and the only reason we're here until 10 to 3 is because this whole House is in disorder. The only reason we had the fuss about the Justice estimates is because the whole House is in disorder.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members of the House to support the amendment moved by my hon. leader, and since the amendment to the amendment is put first, we will support the amendment to the amendment.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, in winding up the debate for the government this evening, or rather this morning, I will not detain the House unduly.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): The minister can sit down now.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Splendid speech.

Hon. Mr. Welch: But there are one or two observations which, of course, I would like to make in connection with the conduct of of this debate. Indeed, it becomes very obvious to anyone on this side of the House, as they have listened to the contributions to this debate from the opposition side of the House–

Mrs. Campbell: When? They haven't been here.

Hon. Mr. Welch: –or indeed have read the debates in Hansard–

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I'm glad he added that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: –that there are very few positive contributions that have been made with respect to the alternatives. Indeed, as one has listened to the windup debate this evening–

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): He obviously hasn't read any of the debates.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —one could really come to the conclusion that there is a great—

Mr. Renwick: That is a ridiculous statement and he knows it.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That is a pious pontification. The minister never read any of the speeches, except he heard some on the intercom.

Mr. Renwick: Has the minister listened to the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren)?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, I'm going to be—

Mr. Renwick: No, he didn't; nor the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds).

Mr. Bullbrook: During the speeches here there wasn't a minister in the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: May I say to the foggy-voiced member who has just spoken, I'm going to be making reference to the member for Nickel Belt.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Renwick: Nor the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes). Stop that nonsense. Don't make a fool of this House. What a fatuous remark.

Mr. Bullbrook: What a charade the minister puts on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

An hon. member: Oh boy. They've all been into the booze.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: It decries the minister and his government.

Mr. Bullbrook: He doesn't even do the credit to the House to sit here and listen.

Mr. Renwick: That is cheap. From the minister as a member of this government that is rotten.

Mr. Bullbrook: Has he read every speech?

Mr. Reid: Nothing else to do.

An hon. member: He said he did.

Mr. Bullbrook: And he says he read every speech. That is a lie to the House, an absolute lie to the House.

An hon. member: Seventy-five per cent.

Mr. Bullbrook: And he said he read every speech.

Mr. Renwick: Did you read all the speeches from this House?

An hon. member: He said he did.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the minister is lying when he says he has read every speech and that there was no possible contribution by the members.

Some hon. members: Withdraw.

Mr. Renwick: I'm not going to listen to that crap any more.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, all hon. members know that it's—

An hon. member: Do you know what he said to you right now?

Mr. Bullbrook: He shouldn't say it. He didn't sit here except for three speeches.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: He lied to the House that he read the rest.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member for Sarnia come to attention, please. Order.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'm not going to come to attention. What do you think this is—a military camp?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The member will regret that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. members know full well that they may not call another hon. member a liar or accuse him of lying. I think it's only fair to request that they withdraw their statements.

I don't believe that any hon. member—

Mr. Bullbrook: Speaking then if I may—

An hon. member: Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: No, you may not while I am on my feet.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, you asked me to withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I'll get up now and speak to you—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will please remain silent while I am on my feet.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Speaker: Now I suggest to the hon. members who accused another hon. minister of lying they should withdraw the comments, because this is certainly not permitted in any Parliament.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right. Let me say this if I may.

An hon. member: Oh no!

Mr. Bullbrook: I could say this, that the Provincial Secretary for Social Development—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order. I have directed him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, may I say to you, sir, that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will please withdraw the remark.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say to you, sir?

Mr. Speaker: No! The hon. member will please withdraw the remark for the last time.

An hon. member: Let's be fair about this.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, sir, would you permit me—

Mr. Speaker: No, I will not permit any comment on it. The Speaker's comments are not debatable.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I direct the hon. member for the last time to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Bullbrook: Having regard to the position that you occupy, Mr. Speaker, and the respect that I have for it, I withdraw my remark.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his co-operation. Now the hon. member for Riverdale, who also made the same allegation.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly withdraw my remarks. I would just hope that the Provincial Secretary for Social Development—whatever he is—would at some point after the session is over, in fact read the statements that are made by my colleagues—the member for Port Arthur—

An hon. member: All of them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Renwick: —the member for Nickel Belt, and then correct his statement in this House that there were no statements of consequence made by the hon. members in this assembly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: It is undermining the—

An hon. member: The member is undermining his leader. His leader is embarrassed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please be seated?

Mr. Renwick: It is a shocking—

Mr. Speaker: For the last time, will the hon. member please be seated?

Mr. Renwick: It is a shocking remark.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon member please be seated?

The hon. minister.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): I listened to those speeches and I say, hear, hear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I listened to Thunder Bay; I listened to Wentworth (Mr. Deans).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and I say to the member for Lincoln, hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Solicitor General please remain silent?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): The minister hasn't got enough intelligence to know a good speech. He hasn't got enough intelligence.

An hon. member: Call him a liar.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: He has read all the speeches?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): We wouldn't be into this if the government ran the House correctly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, having simply gone through my introductory sentence, I will now get on with the speech.

Mr. Bullbrook: And having read all the speeches.

Mr. Reid: I hope there is a little more thought to the rest of it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I don't want any more of that nonsense about imputing any motives —and I'll show the members before this speech is over with—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —just exactly what I have read.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now just wait. Just sit back and wait and see.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Provincial Secretary read every speech?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member's comments and—

Mr. Bullbrook: The Provincial Secretary read every speech?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —his behaviour are not becoming—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

May I remind the hon. members of the provisions of rule 10, which provide that I may adjourn the House without motion at any time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I should retract that? Will the hon. minister proceed?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Bring some intelligence to the government if they can't bring their own.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He wouldn't dare. The Speaker wouldn't dare carry out a threat like that. Mr. Speaker hasn't got the guts to see that through.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: You are backing off already; you are intimidated.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, you will have recalled that one of my earlier remarks this evening had to do with the bankruptcy of positive ideas and alternatives that were placed before this House during the course of this debate.

Mr. MacDonald: Which one?

Mr. Cassidy: The first or the second?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I want to underline that.

Mr. Renwick: Pardon? Come on, call it off.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do at this time want to make at least one exception, to which the member for Riverdale very correctly draws my attention.

Mr. Lewis: That's exactly right.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If he had allowed me to proceed, as I hope he will now, I will make some reference to that now—

Mr. Renwick: I doubt very much whether I will.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —though I had planned to do it a little later on in the course of these remarks.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the minister needn't be quite so coy about it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: One of the exceptions, of course, was the contribution to the Speech from the Throne made by—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is just being coy now.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —the hon. member for Nickel Belt. As the members who were here or who have read the speech will recall, he raised the issue during the course of his address—

Mr. MacDonald: Where has the minister been for the last three hours?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —of the need for some programme of guidelines for a firmer equality of opportunity for women in the world of employment.

Mr. Lewis: He was stronger than that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would like, on the basis of the comments which the hon. member made at that time—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister didn't get a very good précis of it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —to make some comments with respect to a government response in this connection.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Welch: During the Throne Speech debate last week—

Mr. Bullbrook: Is this the 4X again?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —the issue was raised about what this government is or isn't doing to equalize employment opportunity for women in this province.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister knows about 4X, doesn't he?

Hon. Mr. Welch: This was another instance where the member's leader, I assume, having read the speech himself in that connection—

Mr. Lewis: I was here when it was delivered.

Interjections by hon members.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister was not here nor were the rest of the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —then came into the House to ask a series of questions with respect to that particular programme.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Let the members opposite hop along and sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: They haven't been here when we've talked about it.

Mr. Cassidy: Tell the minister he should be in the House to listen.

Mr. Renwick: The minister is on a sticky wicket tonight.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Surely the leader of the NDP knew, as had been said by me several times, that a very complete study was under way within our secretariat, a study which—

Mr. Renwick: He didn't know.

Mr. Cassidy: A muddy study.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —has produced new government policies with a great deal more teeth and meaning than the distasteful quota system indirectly advocated by the opposition last week.

Mr. Renwick: The minister is really on the defensive tonight.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order about the quotas.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

An hon. member: Which one of their leaders was the minister speaking about?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, the quota system was advocated directly by the provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Renwick: Not by this party.

Mr. Lewis: This party said to the government that it wanted no quota system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mrs. Campbell: The minister wasn't in the House.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can only hope that the member's voice will wear out soon, and then we'll make some progress.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): The government is sensitive, vulnerable and guilty and it knows it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This study within our secretariat, soon to be published detailing government policy, is a full and a complete report. It is detailed—

Mr. Cassidy: The royal commission reported four years ago.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —and it is definitive enough to demand its presentation on a special occasion so that it can indeed elicit the type of full discussion and debate that will be necessary.

Mr. Cassidy: Which will then be interred.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The policy is the result of a year's work by the secretariat—

Mr. Renwick: A year's work!

Hon. Mr. Welch: —and involves a lot more than just—

Mr. Renwick: The result of a year's work. The party has been governing for 30 years.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —counting female names in departments or asking ministers with respect to the composition of boards.

I want to remind the House, as the members will know—the member for Nickel Belt,

of course, will know because of his research in connection with his contribution to the debate on the Speech from the Throne—there were 167 recommendations in the report of the royal commission on the status of women. We have spent several months studying these particular recommendations in detail and relating them to the many existing policies and programmes of this particular government. As will be detailed when the full policy paper is announced later this month, many of the recommendations in the royal commission report have been achieved already.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is now one—

Mr. Laughren: Why not the two resolutions? Just two?

Hon. Mr. Welch: They have been achieved within provincial programmes and policies.

Mr. Lewis: The minister appointed the task force on early childhood education. Would he like to tell us its composition?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Lewis: It didn't help, though, did it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Just give me time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: It didn't help the members a bit, did it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Having said that, let me say that tonight, as part of this particular discussion, I think we should perhaps indicate some of the solid proposals which will be incorporated as part of the larger policy paper dealing with the status of women.

The member for Nickel Belt, commenting on the report on the status of women, suggested government grants to get more women into certain fields of employment. But I would suggest to him, through you, Mr. Speaker, that this really doesn't deal with some of the basic problems, especially as they might even relate to the civil service of this particular province.

Among our findings, in studying the recommendations of the royal commission report and how to apply these particular recommendations in Ontario, was that we needed better machinery in the Ontario government to co-ordinate provincial policies and programmes affecting women and to improve opportunities for women in the government service. An equal opportunity programme for women will, in fact, be established in the Ontario public service. Ministers, deputy ministers and government agencies will be asked to expedite the application of detailed directives on equalizing employment opportunities for women in the provincial civil service.

Mr. Renwick: We are talking about equality for women, not equal opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The full details of this particular plan will be contained, Mr. Speaker, in our policy paper to which I have already made reference. One aim clearly will be to oversee recruitment literature, to see, of course, that in keeping with the comments already made, it is, in fact, encouraging the development of this particular programme.

Mr. Speaker, to further monitor this programme the Management Board of Cabinet will create a senior position to be known as co-ordinator of women's programmes, and this person will serve as a member of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Renwick: Oh great.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh no!

Hon. Mr. Welch: Without such co-ordination in any new programme, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there could be duplication, poor priority setting and a very weakened impact. Today, women's needs are really very general and therefore ought not to be put within the control of any one particular minister. I hope that you would agree as well that an agency of civil servants alone to co-ordinate the new programme wouldn't really meet the expressed desire for citizen involvement which the various women's groups have in fact been making.

Cabinet has also determined, Mr. Speaker, that a permanent body to be known as the Status of Women Council will be appointed, comprising both members of the public and people from various government ministries. The public appointees to the Status of Women Council, which will be announced shortly, will be carefully selected and appointed for definite terms to convey the interests and concerns of the public. Of course a permanent member of this council will be the co-ordinator of women's programmes for the Ontario public service.

The council will be chaired by a person drawn from the public representation. The aim of this particular council will be to advise on implementing the policies which we will outline in the policy paper to which I

have made reference. They will also co-ordinate government programmes for women, being the link between the residents of the province and the government, and their meetings with specific groups will seek out more detailed opinion. The council, of course, will act as a catalyst and indeed will provide an opportunity for this type of dialogue.

Mr. Lewis: The minister knows the request is for equality, not segregation. There's a difference. There's a difference, you know.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I make reference to that at this particular point as some type of a positive response to what I thought was a very positive contribution to the Throne debate from the member for Nickel Belt. We will have an opportunity of discussing this policy in some detail once we have all this information before us.

The hon. member for Downsview, Mr. Speaker, has made some reference to the reorganization of the government—

Mr. Cassidy: What about those other questions about women?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —and, of course, I would understand because of his seniority in this House and his long standing as a member of this House that he would have ample opportunity, in the course of the estimates discussions, to ask all of us who have these new responsibilities in the policy fields specific questions with respect to our activities and our functions and the discharge of our responsibilities. The Legislature will be asked to vote money for the various secretariats—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is what worries us.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would assume that if the hon. member is really interested in finding out something about the new structure of government he will ask very pointed and very detailed questions of the policy ministers when their estimates are before the House. It might be very interesting indeed if, in fact, he took that much interest in the reorganization rather than making the vast generalizations he makes about this. Perhaps, during the course of such a discussion, we might finally use this as an opportunity to explain to him the restructuring of the government as set out in committee report No. 3. Indeed, he might be that much better informed.

Mr. Singer: I have read the reports, but what does the minister do?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Perhaps when the estimates of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development are before the House we will have an opportunity to go into that in some detail. The member will see the difference between an operating minister and a policy minister. Indeed, the hon. member will know, too, as a member of this House that not all of his work is necessarily done while he occupies his particular seat in the Legislature.

Mr. Singer: We would like to hear the odd statement of policy from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Welch: There are other responsibilities in connection with this riding.

Mr. Singer: We would like to hear from the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr) on law reform.

Hon. Mr. Welch: In connection with some other remarks which have been made by the hon. members there has been a great deal of interest shown in the policy field with which I am connected. Indeed, the motions that have been introduced by both the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) and the member for Scarborough West have made some reference to health costs which have some interest with respect to that policy field.

This is really not the occasion to go into all the details because we have had ample opportunity to discuss this in the question period and in other contributions that have been made to this particular subject.

Mr. Singer: That is some discussion in the question period. We get no answers.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) will announce the control mechanisms for health costs when the results of current studies of health costs and services are assessed and are put into operational terms.

I think it is fair enough to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the government is concerned about the rising health costs which hit the medical consumer; which hit the premium payer; and, of course, which hit the taxpayer of this province. Through guidelines for hospital spending and bed capacity scales, we are trying, as the members of this House know, to control health costs where they can be most humanely controlled.

I would suggest to the hon. members that, in all fairness, we don't want to be drawn into the excesses of the health care systems

of either the United Kingdom or the United States. The British have relative freedom from worry about direct personal health expenses but I would remind the members of this House that they don't have the free choice of physicians and specialists.

Americans have very lavish hospitals and they have top quality doctors, if they can pay for them. But any study of the situation in the United States will point out to members that decent United States health insurance schemes are virtually unavailable to one-third of the population—the poor and the disadvantaged—because of the cost.

Mr. Renwick: Come on, we don't buy it. We are a grown-up country on our own!

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member's conduct is most unbecoming to him!

Mr. Renwick: We are an independent country with our own decisions to make.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is right. Let's just pick it up from there.

Mr. Renwick: That is right, and let's make them.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Renwick: Let's not have any more of this nonsense of comparisons between the United Kingdom and the United States. This is Canada and the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, would, in fact, give one moment's consideration to the matter of putting things in perspective he would understand why members are invited to make the comparisons.

Mr. Renwick: The comparisons are totally invalid and the minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Any study of what is going on in the jurisdiction to the south of us makes us very pleased that this particular—

Mr. Renwick: The comparisons are totally invalid and the minister knows it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Welch: —government and its predecessor governments, assisted by all members of this House, have been able to build a hospital plan that we can be very proud of. Let's not overlook that!

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the hon. minister would complete his remarks without replying to the interjections.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I thought that was the thrust of the debate to which the member for Downsview referred.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Go back to the script.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If I may make some remarks not related to the interjection—

Mr. Speaker: Well, the debate across the floor of the House is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, may I share this with you then, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: If you will, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The point is that today, when we have all this preoccupation with rising health costs, I hope we keep in mind the accomplishments of this government and its predecessor governments which have resulted from the co-operative effort in this House, in building a hospital system in this province that makes it possible for all of our people to have access to this type of care.

Mr. Renwick: Because of the pressure from this party!

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Do all of our people have access?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: We can look to other jurisdictions not very far from us, where thousands of people are personally bankrupt because they can't pay their charges—

Mr. Cassidy: How many people in this province lack necessities because of family health plans?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —and hundreds of people are sent home from hospitals because they can't pay their deposit. We don't have that in Ontario, because we have built a solid system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Let's not have any more of this colonial mentality.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This is why the Minister of Health, and all of us in the Social Development policy field—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —have stressed the deinstitutionalization of health care to let people be cared for more efficiently and, indeed, often more humanely and intimately—

Mr. Reid: Well, isn't that nice!

Hon. Mr. Welch: —and certainly at less cost, by using home care and nursing home programmes.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, poppycock!

Hon. Mr. Welch: Of course, we've got to keep in mind—

Mr. Lewis: It doesn't mean anything.

Mr. Renwick: It's preposterous!

Hon. Mr. Welch: —that we are looking at alternatives to the present system; but in doing so let's not forget the positive work that has been accomplished on the part of the people of this particular party. The very basic fact to remember is that the government support money, which was to relieve individuals of the burden of extraordinary medical costs, had to be dedicated first toward the highest costs—the intensive-care hospital costs.

Inevitably there was a disincentive, if you just think about it for a moment, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you are; there was a disinclination for the public to use lower-cost services as long as the higher-cost facilities were available.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think the Minister of Health would agree that an imbalance developed, and quite naturally we're focussing our attention on that imbalance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Another thing we should face, Mr. Speaker—and I know that you're just waiting on the edge of your seat for this next one—is that this system of public financial support for a full health service is still relatively new.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may speak through me; he needn't speak to me.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, Mr. Speaker, the last time I did that I got in trouble because I was then getting involved with an interjection.

Mr. Speaker: That's a different thing.

Mr. Singer: Oh, the minister has such a tough time!

Mr. Reid: He thinks he's back at McMaster.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): At least he's fair.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, underlying our moves to control health and hospital costs are the aims of guaranteeing opportunity of access to effective health care for all of our people, while ensuring a decent and a competent medical service, and avoiding the risk of personal bankruptcy or excessive premiums or taxes. And I repeat, for emphasis, that our health care system competes with the best anywhere.

Mr. Lewis: Of course!

Mr. Cassidy: Then why is there so much wrong with it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: It applies a moderating hand to both doctors' and hospitals' costs at a time when both such costs are getting beyond people's reach in much of the western world, at least where such services are available. I'm quite satisfied that in the development of these particular guidelines, the Minister of Health will be able to satisfy this House with respect to those controls.

Mr. Singer: That doesn't wash any more.

Mr. Lewis: But development of the guidelines will be a meagre advance of the programme.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is really bombing tonight.

Mr. Lewis: He's not bombing; but since he became the policy minister something's happened to him.

An hon. member: Drop the bomb on them!

Mr. Reid: He tries using his brain and it won't work.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I thought we might take a look at the two motions that are before us—

Mr. Singer: Yes. Good luck.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —and perhaps on that basis proceed to invite the House to divide and support the government, to which some reference has been made. I was particularly interested to hear the hon. member for Wentworth say, "I wonder what the public really thinks about the government of Ontario." I guess the hon. member for Wentworth has a very short memory because I think not too long ago—

Mr. Reid: How about March 15?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —the people of this particular province showed exactly what they thought about the government of this province, and they only have to take a look at what is here to establish that fact.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The ides of March.

An hon. member: That's my line.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, you can't have a by-election unless there's a vacancy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: What the government should be saying is what it means. It should be saying, "We are in trouble and we are going to try to bail ourselves out."

Hon. Mr. Welch: This government is not in trouble.

Mr. Deans: Sure it's in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I want to tell the House that one of the greatest insurance policies this government and this party has to remain in office for almost an indefinite period of time is the members opposite, and their philosophy, and the lack of effective opposition over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: And that's just the second and the third reason. The first reason is the leadership of the Premier. When you put these three things together, and you have a party that is both progressive and conservative and is responsive to the needs of the people, I tell the House we'll take the opposition anywhere, anytime.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, I think the government should resign!

Mr. Singer: I bet the minister would wow them at McMaster.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Oh, it goes over big in Smithville still.

Mr. Lewis: Right, right, and it is not bad at the St. Catharines high school.

An hon. member: And right here.

Hon. Mr. Welch: And if people like the hon. member for Downsview really went out and saw what Ontario was like outside of that particular riding, he would see why this party is in power: good solid people—

An hon. member: He just confines himself to the Spadina Expressway.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Let's take a look at these two motions that are before us.

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the minister remember the ides of Charlie MacNaughton?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Pardon?

Mr. Bullbrook: The ides of Charlie MacNaughton.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Look, I wouldn't put too much strength on a couple of by-elections. Let's not get carried away with a couple of by-elections.

Mr. Singer: Tell us about Roy McMurtry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I want to take this opportunity of welcoming the two new members into the House. I think it was a great day when they walked in and indeed the contributions—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I can hardly hear myself speak.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: At least we allowed the opposition to listen to themselves, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: There's no end to the benefits that the government bestows.

Mrs. Campbell: This government has changed all its policies in accordance with what we said in the campaigns.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. George is certainly a great expert on change, there's no question about that. I want to suggest to you, Mr.

Speaker, that when this party changes any of its particular points of view it's in response to sensitivity with respect to people. It's not a case of opportunism just to get votes.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: After all, if the members really study the philosophy of this particular party they will find that it's a philosophy that is very responsive to the changing needs of the people of this particular province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, if I could get back to the two motions that are at present before us. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has put a motion before us which has four general areas of interest and concern. I want to talk to them.

Mr. Bullbrook: Did the minister have time to read it with all of the other speeches that he read?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, I did. Actually, Mr. Speaker, as you will know, on this reorganization—

Mr. Bullbrook: He read all these speeches?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —we have a great deal of time.

Mr. Bullbrook: He read all the other speeches? He never lies to the House?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Is the member trying to suggest that I am lying to the House? Is he trying to suggest that I am lying to the House?

Mr. Singer: No, he wouldn't suggest anything like that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Certainly it is a lie. He knows it is a lie.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): At the very most it is hyperbole.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition made some reference in his motion to the financing of our health programme, and I have already made some reference to that during the course of these particular remarks. He has made some comments with respect—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —to the public hospitals, and used the word "redundancy" during the course of that particular motion. I would like to remind him, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't know of any hospitals in this province that have been declared redundant.

Mr. Singer: No, he sent the Minister of Health to Huron to tell them that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, if the member wants to make some reference to that, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Riddell) during his maiden speech, which I thought was, from the standpoint of its delivery—and I want to be very careful of what I say—a valid first contribution, said something during the course of his particular remarks which the member for Downsview just reminded me of.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I am glad of that. I wouldn't want the minister to forget these things.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He said that he was accused, and his party was accused, of creating issues that didn't exist. I will remind you of one of those issues that didn't exist. Forty-eight hours before election day when the Liberal caucus was all gathered around in Goderich—

Mr. Singer: Yes. Remind me.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —it had the lack of principle to announce to the people of that riding that this minister was going to close down all kinds of community hospitals in Huron.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: That is a lie.

Hon. Mr. Welch: And that was just typical of the sort of desperate tactics that the Liberals used to actually distort the facts during the campaign.

Mr. Deans: If the minister wants to talk about a distortion of facts he should talk to the Treasurer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Every television station and radio station talked about it. I invited them to return to deny that we were going to close down community hospitals.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No.

Mr. Singer: Oh, no. He doesn't want to hear the facts. Brave fellow.

Mr. Reid: What happened to the cut and thrust?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Then there is some reference made, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): He is a sore loser.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those fellows opposite are sore winners.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: We were gentlemen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, he denied it.

Mr. Singer: The press walked out on him.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Does the member know why?

Mr. Singer: He wouldn't answer.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Minister of Health had to call a press conference to deny that silly story that the Liberal caucus brought into the riding of Huron, and the member knows that.

Mr. Reid: The Tories should have had the member running around passing out government cheques.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Absolutely irresponsible. We could list them all, so that when we talk about creating issues that didn't exist let me say there were plenty of them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If we don't have some order I am going to adjourn the House for half an hour.

Mr. MacDonald: That should have been done hours ago.

Hon. Mr. Welch: And finally, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the motion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, some reference was made during the course of that motion to fiscal extravagance and mismanagement and strong words such as this and—

Mr. Reid: Has the minister read the auditor's report?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —and all I want to point out to you is if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is as accurate with respect to that particular accusation as he was with respect to predicting the provincial deficit, then of course I would remind the House that he was out about 100 per cent with respect to his calculations there, although we have had some evidence of his inability to use arithmetic and no wonder he pleads for a math curriculum.

Mr. Reid: Tell us about the auditor's report. Discuss the auditor's report.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Bullbrook: Is he going to talk about the auditor's report tonight?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: They used to tell us there was nothing wrong over there. No, nothing wrong. Eighty points of criticism by the auditor.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The hon. member for Scarborough West, of course, during the course of his particular motion exceeds the Leader of the Opposition by about six particular points. The answers to these, of course, perhaps could be summarized this way: He talks in terms of the increase with respect to the pensions for the elderly, and I would suggest to him that since his father is running the government of Canada he might have a word with him by telephone and suggest that something might be done about that.

Mr. Lewis: Well, he has helped to increase pensions for people in Ontario more than the the provincial secretary.

Mr. Bullbrook: He is worse than the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He talks of housing and I think that this government has amply demonstrated—and the Minister of Revenue has during the course of the last several days made the records quite clear—with respect to what positive steps this government has taken on housing.

Mr. Cassidy: That is nonsense.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What about resource policies?

Mr. Lewis: That is the worst programme.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This is an interesting one. In the course of that particular motion he talks about—listen to this. He talks in that motion, Mr. Speaker, about "its failure," and he is referring to us when he says this:

> —its failure to exercise its stewardship over the resources of Ontario and to ensure the maximum return to the people through public ownership, control and intervention.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the leader of the NDP is asking us to do when he uses words like that? He is asking us to reverse the results of the election of the fall of 1971; because the people of Ontario gave him their answer at that time.

Mr. Lewis: The Provincial Secretary heard the member for Sudbury East deny it.

Mr. Renwick: If he had heard the speech he would have told us about it.

Mr. Cassidy: Did he read the speech of the member for Nickel Belt?

Hon. Mr. Welch: And on we go through these particular points, Mr. Speaker, which have led me, after very careful study, to have absolute confidence in the Progressive Conservative Party of this province, led by the hon. Premier; and I am going to vote against both of these particular amendments.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am going to support the main motion and I invite all members of the House at 3:29 a.m. to join me in saving this government and therefore allowing it the opportunity to continue to serve the people of this particular province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The Throne Speech debate now being concluded, I shall call for the vote as follows:

Mrs. Scrivener moves, seconded by Mr. Turner, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

> To the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, PC, CD, QC, LLD, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario.
>
> May it please Your Honour: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. R. F. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Singer that the following words be added to the motion:

> This House condemns the government:
>
> 1. For its failure to bring order and efficiency to the financing of our health insurance programmes.
>
> 2. For its costly lack of planning in providing hospital and other public facilities at great expense, which are now by ministerial decision declared to be redundant.
>
> 3. For proceeding with the imposition of high cost, democratically remote regional governments without pausing for an assessment of the usefulness and cost of the ones already in operation.
>
> 4. For fiscal extravagance, mismanagement and lack of financial control leading the Treasurer to threaten higher income taxes, that would cancel the federal tax reduction initiative so necessary to bolster our economy.

Mr. Lewis moves, seconded by Mr. Deans, that this House further condemns the government:

> 1. For its failure even to recognize that soaring prices are making it difficult for families and pensioners to make ends meet and maintain good nutrition.
>
> 2. For its failure to bring our pensioners up to a minimum income of $200 a month.
>
> 3. For its failure to deal adequately with the exorbitant increases in housing costs in the Province of Ontario.
>
> 4. For its failure to provide adequate public low-cost housing.
>
> 5. For its willingness to subsidize private speculative development with public funds in the building of houses.
>
> 6. For its failure to develop an integrated energy policy which would ensure adequate supplies for Ontario residents and industry at reasonable prices.
>
> 7. For its failure to exercise its stewardship over the resources of Ontario and to ensure the maximum return to the people through public ownership, control and intervention.
>
> 8. For its failure to reorganize the delivery of health services to the people so as to ensure accessibility to comprehensive health care at a reasonable cost.
>
> 9. For its failure to provide an adequate financial base for regional government to enable them to obtain true autonomy and carry out their functions.

10. For its failure to correct the imbalance in development between the Metropolitan Toronto region and the rest of the province by creating a provincial plan for Ontario; and as a first step by decentralizing the new Hydro headquarters and the new provincial office complex to another region of Ontario.

Mr. W. Newman: Thank God for the free enterprise system.

Mr. Reid: God bless mommy, daddy and the Premier.

Mr. Bullbrook: God bless the Premier, Jerry Moog and Fort Lauderdale.

Interjections by hon. members.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Lewis, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Bounsall	Allan
Braithwaite	Apps
Bullbrook	Auld
Campbell	Bales
Cassidy	Beckett
Davidson	Belanger
Deacon	Bennett
Deans	Bernier
Dukszta	Birch
Edighoffer	Brunelle
Foulds	Carton
Gaunt	Clement
Germa	Davis
Gisborn	Downer
Good	Drea
Haggerty	Dymond
Laughren	Evans
Lawlor	Ewen
Lewis	Gilbertson
MacDonald	Grossman
Martel	Guindon
Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)	Handleman
Nixon (Brant)	Havrot
Paterson	Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)
Reid	Hodgson (York North)
Renwick	Irvine
Riddell	Jessiman
Ruston	Kerr
Singer	Lane
Smith (Nipissing)	Lawrence
Spence	Leluk
Stokes	MacBeth
Worton	McIlveen
Young—34.	McKeough
	Meen
	Miller
	Morningstar
	Morrow
	Newman (Ontario South)
	Nixon (Dovercourt)
	Nuttall
	Potter
	Rhodes
	Rollins
	Root
	Rowe
	Scrivener
	Smith (Simcoe East)
	Snow
	Stewart
	Taylor
	Timbrell
	Turner
	Villeneuve
	Walker
	Wardle
	Welch
	Wells
	White
	Winkler
	Wiseman
	Yakabuski
	Yaremko—63.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 34, the "nays" 63.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

We now vote on the amendment moved by Mr. R. F. Nixon. Is it agreeable that the same vote be accepted?

I declare the amendment lost.

The vote, now, is on the motion made by Mrs. Scrivener. Will we take the same vote on that?

Hon. Mr. White: Let's make it unanimous.

Mr. Speaker: Same vote as recorded reversed?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think the hon. member for Downsview had better resign.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendments lost. I declare the motion carried.

Resolved: That a humble address be presented to the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour hath addressed to us.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, before the motion for adjournment, could the House leader advise us if it is the intention of the House that we proceed with the private bills committee at 10 o'clock this morning, some six hours from now?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, as I have said on other occasions, when the committees are constituted I endeavour not to interfere with their business, and I'm informed that the counsel has been informed and requested to be present this morning.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the House leader another question? Does he really think it's fair to the members of this House that this kind of procedure be carried on?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I can only repeat what I said before, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:40 o'clock, a.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Conclusion of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Martel, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Deans, Mr. Singer, Mr. Welch 773

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 869

No. 20



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 12, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have as guests with us today, in both galleries, students from Sir Mackenzie Bowell Public School of Belleville. At 3 o'clock this afternoon we will be joined by students from Barbados hosted by the Kitchener-Waterloo Collegiate and Vocational School.

Statements by the ministry.

TORONTO DOWNTOWN HOUSING

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the hon. members will be aware of the situation with respect to Ontario Housing Corp. and the city of Toronto regarding the Sherbourne-Dundas block and will appreciate that speed was imperative because of the unusual circumstances involved.

We are pleased to advise the members that last Monday, April 9, negotiations were completed for an agreement between the city and OHC. The agreement was approved at a specially convened meeting of the OHC board of directors last Tuesday, April 10; Management Board of Cabinet approved it on the same date, and the cabinet gave approval yesterday. City council approved it at 2 o'clock this morning and Mayor Crombie, I'm pleased to say, signed the memorandum of agreement this morning at 11 o'clock.

At the same time I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to express my thanks to Mayor Crombie, his staff and city council for the dispatch with which they proceeded; also, I would like to give credit to the staff of OHC, which on some nights worked almost all night to get this thing prepared.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Especially Ald. Jaffary.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It's nice that Mayor Crombie bailed the government out on that one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's statements like that which really delay things.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING IN PICKERING

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement I would like to make in connection with the Pickering hearings of the Environmental Hearing Board. I would like to read a letter which I received from the chairman a short time ago, dated April 12.

> Some controversy has recently arisen with respect to the statement of Mr. Thomas A. Beckett, solicitor for the Group Against Garbage, and the affidavit of Miss Barbara Murray filed with the hearing board on April 11, 1973.
>
> My own recollection of the conversation with Miss Murray is that on Wednesday, April 4, 1973, shortly after the conclusion of that day's proceedings before the board, a young lady, whom I do not recall having met on any previous occasion, introduced herself to me as Barbara Murray from Harriston. She did tell me that she had been part of the group known as DDT (Derail Dumps Today) formed in the township of Minto to oppose the establishment of a Metropolitan Toronto landfill site in that township.
>
> In response to some remarks which she made about these matters, I told her that each hearing was different, and that the function of the board was merely to hold a hearing and to report thereon to the executive director, who considers the application after he has received and considered the report of the board.
>
> In order to illustrate considerations which might arise during a hearing, I told her that the township of Minto was located inland on a height of land at the headwaters of three small streams, and that this was one difference between a possible site in Minto township and the proposed sites in Pickering and Port Hope, were located close to Lake Ontario, a large body of water, since the discharge of treated waste must be related to the volume of water into which it may eventually be discharged.
>
> I did not tell Miss Murray that the

Minto proposal would never be approved. No application for approval of a landfill site in Minto township has ever, to my knowledge, been filed by Metropolitan Toronto, and there has never accordingly been any Minto proposal to be considered. I did not tell Miss Murray that Lake Ontario was of sufficient size and oxygen content to handle the bacteria in the treated leachate effluent piped to it or that the Port Hope and Pickering sites met this requirement and were acceptable to me and should be approved. Nor did I tell Miss Murray that I would recommend approval of the Metropolitan Toronto application.

My conversation with Miss Murray was very brief, lasting only a very few minutes and the—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Very brief! It takes four pages to summarize that conversation.

Hon. Mr. Auld: To continue:

—the information which I gave her was intended simply as an illustration of one of the many matters which could arise during a hearing.

The function of the hearing board as defined by statute is merely to conduct a hearing and to report thereon to the executive director of the air and land pollution control division of the ministry. The executive director then considers the report of the board as one factor in making his decision to grant or deny an application for a certificate of approval.

Although I continued to hear the representations with respect to the application for the balance of the day after Mr. Beckett had filed his submissions, I now feel that in view of the publicity which my conversation with Miss Murray has been given, it might be said that justice would not appear to have been done if I were to continue to participate in the hearing and the preparation of the report of the board. I am therefore hereby advising you that I will not participate any further in these proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, I might just add to that that the other two members of the board, who include the vice-chairman, and who had been on the hearings in Pickering, will continue them. The chairman will not take any part in the discussions of the board on the report of the members of the board who are conducting the hearing, until such time as they have completed their report to the director.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) shouldn't be chairman of that board.

WELFARE MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated some weeks ago, we are meeting with other provinces and the federal government for three days, from April 25 to April 27, at a welfare ministers' conference at which we shall begin a serious review of our social income security system in Canada.

Studies have been proceeding for some time in the various provinces, including our own, looking at various approaches that should be taken in revamping our income security programmes. What we have today is a conglomeration of programmes, both in the social assistance and in the taxation fields.

With Canada's present social security programmes thus fragmented, there are only so many ways the programmes we have can be fixed and patched every time a new need appears. Therefore, we need to devise a more integrated approach in this area. With such a major overhaul of the system under consideration, we have decided not to make major changes in our programme at this time. We are confining ourselves to statements to the existing system.

Last December, I announced adjustments in the scale of rates we paid to persons on family benefits. The family benefits programme, as opposed to general welfare assistance, is designed to serve persons who require assistance for a longer period of time. We recognize that there are persons on general welfare assistance who are unable to work because of basic disabilities. These persons, who have been referred to as permanently unemployable, are, therefore, being transferred to the family benefits programme. We estimate that this transfer will involve about 12,000 persons in the province.

We met with larger municipalities late in March—a few weeks ago. They have assured us of their co-operation in the orderly transfer of these permanently unemployable persons from general welfare assistance to family benefits over a four-month period, commencing this month. We have also asked the municipalities to look at persons now in receipt of assistance who may qualify. It will, therefore, not be necessary for the individual person in receipt of general welfare assistance to take the initiative in being trans-

ferred to the family benefits programme. We will, however, continue to accept direct referrals from persons not in receipt of general welfare assistance and who feel that they may qualify as persons permanently unemployable.

We plan also, Mr. Speaker, to increase the shelter portion of allowances being received by all persons on general welfare assistance to the same level as those who are in receipt of family benefits. For a single person, this means increasing the existing rate of $47 to a maximum of $57 per month. For a couple, or a family—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): That's not too much.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —the maximum increase will be $15 per month. Where actual costs of shelter are less than these maximums, we will continue to pay the actual shelter costs. This change is being made—

Mr. Haggerty: The minister can't get by on that.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Shame! That's a disgrace.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —simply in recognition of the fact that the shelter needs of persons on temporary assistance are similar—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Not much change in that.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —to those on long-term assistance, such as family benefits.

Mr. Lewis: So is their need for food and clothing.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the recent federal-provincial meeting, Mr. Speaker, held on Feb. 2 last in Ottawa, I made it perfectly clear—

Mr. Lewis: They eat too, like other people.

Mr. Martel: Does the minister think the cost of food hasn't increased in the last three years.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —that Ontario desires a complete rationalization of the income security area prior to any major alteration in any specific segment.

Mr. Lewis: In the meantime, this government starves them.

Mr. Martel: The government should be ashamed of itself.

Mr. Haggerty: The minister has tears in his eyes.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That's one way of cutting down the rolls.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No one can dispute that a great many of our senior citizens have an urgent need for increased income.

Mr. Laughren: Here it comes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, this is also true of those who are under 65 years of age—

Mr. Renwick: That's right!

Mr. Lewis: Absolutely!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —such as the handicapped. That's why we believe that efforts to achieve co-ordination and integration of the whole social security system—

Mr. Renwick: They can't live in the meantime.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —cannot be delayed any longer. Programmes are too fragmented and there are too many disparities.

As you are aware, since the conference in February, the federal government has announced an adjustment to the old age security, increasing the basic amount of a monthly pension that may be paid to any person to $100 per month. A single person formerly was receiving $82.88.

Mr. Lewis: No help from this government.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Now, with the combined old age security and the guaranteed income supplement, the allowance for a single person aged 65 and over has increased from $150 to $170.14 per month and for a couple from $285 to $324.60 per month.

Mr. Haggerty: What is this government's programme?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In Ontario, Mr. Speaker, some persons who are recipients of old age security are also receiving provincial benefits. These persons form two groups: one, those living in their own community; and, two, persons who are residents of institutions.

Those living in the community, who receive old age security and who also receive general welfare assistance or family benefits allowance, do so because they are in need in that they have a spouse or other dependants. Such a couple, or family, will be allowed to retain the recent increase in old

age security and, thus, will enjoy a higher income.

With respect to residents of institutions, those receiving old age security will be permitted to retain up to $35 for their comforts. This represents an increase of $10 per month from the present $25 comfort allowance.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): About time.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Similarly, recipients of public assistance who reside in institutions—those who are not receiving the old age security pension—will also have their comfort allowance increased up to $35 per month.

Mr. Lewis: What happens to the rest of them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that we see these adjustments as being in the nature of temporary measures, pending our overall review of income security with the—

Mr. Martel: They starve in the meantime.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —federal authorities and the other provinces.

Mr. Martell: It's a disgrace and the minister knows it.

WATERLOO LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I would like to acquaint the House with the proposals made to Waterloo Lutheran University last evening.

Responding to a request from Waterloo Lutheran University, the Ontario government has approved a recommendation from the Committee on University Affairs that the university become a public, non-denominational institution.

At present, church-related institutions at the university level may receive 50 per cent of operating formula support from the province. If Waterloo Lutheran University accepts the conditions qualifying for full funding, beginning in 1973-1974 operating grants will be adjusted over a period of years. At the end of that period, the dollar support for the new institution will reach the level provided to all provincially assisted universities under formula financing.

For Waterloo Lutheran to qualify for full formula support, a number of conditions will have to be met:

1. The institution cannot be affiliated with any religious denomination, in fact or name;

2. There can be no religious test for students or staff, and no compulsory religious subjects;

3. A new governing board, representative of the community, is to be established;

4. The capital assets of Waterloo Lutheran University are to be transferred to the new institution without the requirement of purchase but subject to negotiations regarding any compensation that might be deemed appropriate;

5. Enrolment in the new institution is to be limited initially to the present level;

6. Dr. Frank Peters, president of Waterloo Lutheran, is to confer with Dr. Matthews, president of the University of Waterloo, and a joint committee is to be established to ensure that the combined resources of the neighbouring universities are used to maximum advantage.

If Waterloo Lutheran's proposed change of status receives the approval of the Eastern Canada synod of the Lutheran Church in America, the ministry will establish a co-ordinating committee of ministry officials and representatives of the university to work out the details, including revision of the Waterloo Lutheran Act, 1967.

We are also indicating at this time that we are continuing our studies of recommendations from the Committee on University Affairs suggesting possible alternatives to the present arrangement for funding other church-related institutions. These, unlike Waterloo Lutheran University, are academically affiliated to provincially assisted universities.

I might say that we met last night with the chairman of the board and the president, and we acquainted them with our response. We heard from them this morning to this effect: that they were very pleased with our letter; the guidelines are clear, and they know the government's position. A number of points are open for negotiation and they have already made arrangements for a negotiating team consisting of representatives from the government, the church, and the university to meet next Wednesday at Queen's Park.

Dr Peters goes on to say:

> I feel confident that those details which are the direct concern of the Eastern Canada synod of the Lutheran Church in America will be clarified in time for the synodical convention in June.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING IN PICKERING

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment pertaining to the hearing of the Environmental Hearing Board and the withdrawal of the chairman, the member for Wellington-Dufferin:

Why would the minister leave the member for Wellington-Dufferin to continue as chairman of that board when it appears that wherever the hearings are going to be, and on almost any subject, there is bound to be some kind of a conflict of interest by virtue of the chairman's responsibility to his own constituency and by virtue of the fact that he is a member of this assembly, where the statutes are passed and the regulations are approved? Would the minister not move in his usual diplomatic way to replace the chairman and put in someone who does not have these built-in conflicts?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there has been a case of any specific conflict of interest. I recall saying to the Leader of the Opposition last spring, when the papers were reporting that the CPR proposed to make an application for a site in the hon. member's riding, that if in fact that happened—although it didn't—I would ensure that the vice-chairman would conduct the hearings because there could well be a conflict of interest. There has been no other occasion when there was any appearance of conflict of interest.

In this case, the chairman quite properly took a course similar to that of a judge who, if someone questions his impartiality, doesn't argue whether or not he is impartial. He simply says somebody else should handle it, and I think that is the proper thing to do.

This had nothing to do with conflict of interest. It was an interpretation, apparently, that someone put on a conversation with the chairman which, as I read the papers, gave the impression that the board or the chairman had made up his mind about what he was going to recommend to the executive director.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By way of supplementary, wouldn't there be a conflict—perhaps not the type that grabs the headlines—in the mind of the chairman who is aware that someone is proposing that garbage be dumped in the township in his area, in this case Minto township, when he is sitting on a hearing as to whether it should be dumped in Pickering? Whether or not there is a real conflict, there might be seen to be a conflict in the minds of those people who are desperately opposed to having a certificate of approval granted relating to Pickering or any other township.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I would say that that would apply to any member on the board. Obviously every member of the board has to live somewhere in Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Wouldn't the minister recognize that the present chairman, being the provincial representative for the constituency of Wellington-Dufferin, has a special responsibility to deal in the best interests, above all others, of those people who have elected him and who look to him for special concern and special representation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that we are looking at the setup and the operations of the board in relation to some of the things that were in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Doesn't the minister recognize that he is seriously undermining public confidence in the Environmental Hearing Board, and as long as the member for Wellington-Dufferin is its chairman that will continue?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, if the minister feels that it is so important to the welfare of the province that the member for Wellington-Dufferin continue as chairman of the board, wouldn't the minister agree that, discretion being the better part of valour, he should ask the member for Wellington-Dufferin to resign his seat in the House? If the minister wants him on the board, put him on the board; if he wants him in the House, let him resign from the board.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: Well, we will see if there is an answer to that one first.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Have a by-election.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I didn't really detect a question.

Mr. Singer: Yes; I said wouldn't the minister agree—that is how I started it.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, would the minister not agree that a chairman of a commission who does not have enough under-

standing of the need for public confidence should resign or at least withdraw from his position as chairman of a hearing when anyone casts any doubt whatsoever on his impartiality at a hearing?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I think the chairman took the proper course in this particular instance.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He could have taken one more step, though.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As he indicated in his letter to me, which I read to the House a few moments ago, he does not agree with all the substance of the affidavit but I don't think there is any point in arguing about that at this point in time. As he says, if there has been damage done it has already been done, so he feels he should dissociate himself and I think he is right.

Mr. Deacon: He should have done it yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have another question of the same minister, Mr. Speaker, pertaining to the same hearing.

Is he aware that a representative of his ministry and another representative of the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs have appeared at this hearing recommending the approval of Metro Toronto's plan to create a 1,500-acre sanitary landfill site; if they have appeared as has been alleged, does this mean that the government policy is to establish a landfill site in that locale?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the transcript of the proceedings that have taken place this week. I understand, though, that in the normal course of events a representative from TEIGA would be involved. My understanding is that this was to indicate that there was apparently no objection from the planning people as to this particular location. It had nothing to do, of course, with the technical matters.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Since the representatives of two of the ministries have appeared favouring the application, surely this could be an influence on the decision?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think, and I stand to be corrected when I have seen the transcript, but my understanding is that neither the representative of my ministry—who was there, really, to answer technical questions of the board—nor TEIGA's representative, from the planning point of view recommended the site or sites. They simply said they had no objections to it as far as the technical planning aspect is concerned.

OHIP PREMIUMS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health. Is the minister aware that the Deputy Attorney General has filed a report in which he gives the opinion that the action of the Minister of Health in connection with the $55 million in health care premiums is in fact illegal?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): I was not aware of it, Mr. Speaker, and so I can make no comment at this time.

Mr. Lewis: Since it is a fictitious sum anyway they are just going to ignore the whole matter from here on.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Is the member against it?

Mr. Lewis: If the government wants to abolish premiums go ahead, we will support them.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have further question?

HAPPY VALLEY RELOCATION

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Now that the minister has decided to relocate the residents of Happy Valley, how are the costs to be apportioned among the government of Ontario, the regional government of Sudbury, Falconbridge—the company primarily responsible for the whole situation—and the residents themselves?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question at the moment.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: But isn't this a matter in which the company has the major responsibility, and shouldn't the company accept that responsibility, otherwise it may be very detrimental to the province in terms of dollars?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would point out that there were many other considerations to this decision to move the community other than those associated with the air pollution count.

For example all indications are that this would be a very difficult area to service—should it become necessary—with sewer and water facilities. Indications are that from an overall good planning point of view and saving the community tax dollars in the long run, in consideration of all these factors, the move is advisable.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: My question concerns the air pollution problem, which is at the root of this matter. If the reading exceeds 32 for 60 consecutive hours, Mr. Speaker, how many times is that considered to be for going over the permitted level?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that it is only one time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That's why I said that I think the total—the 245—referred to total hours during that period, rather than total days.

Mr. Martel: Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the regional municipality of Sudbury has submitted a letter to the residents asking them to provide all the financial statements of their own personal position, doesn't the minister agree that that is an incorrect position for the municipality to take; in view of the fact that the people did not create the problem, and that their own financial position has nothing to do with that problem?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on that because I haven't seen the letter and I'm not aware of the reasoning behind it. I'm sure the hon. member will keep me informed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Sudbury East has written the minister a letter. I have a copy.

WCB AND OLRB EXCLUSION FROM ACT

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, Mr. Speaker? Is it the intention of the Justice secretariat in general to continue the exclusion of the Workmen's Compensation Board and the Ontario Labour Relations Board from the provisions of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act beyond April 17, 1973?

Mr. Singer: Does the member really expect him to know that?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, this of course will be finally decided by the particular ministry, which would be the Minister of Labour, and the cabinet. It is my understanding now that the Workmen's Compensation Board or the Workmen's Compensation Act will be excluded, the extension will be continued—

Mr. Lewis: That's definite?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes. However, I don't believe any decision has been made yet as far as the Labour Relations Act is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask by way of supplementary—and a quick redirection to the Minister of Labour—will a statement on its effect on the Ontario Labour Relations Act be made on or before April 17?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, this is a matter of government policy, and as soon as this policy has been determined I will be pleased to make a statement.

Mr. Lewis: We certainly welcome the announcement about the Workmen's Compensation Board.

BUDGET 'LEAK'

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the Premier a question: In the best British parliamentary tradition, for which he has reverence, will he consider requesting the resignation of the provincial Treasurer (Mr. White) for the extraordinary leak in the primary point to be made in today's budget; a leak which preceded the budget and which has very serious implications for the economic community?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that I read or heard—and I'm not sure which—a very close colleague of the leader of the New Democratic Party making certain predictions, if that is the source of the so-called leak I think it is fair to state that I am very confident that there have been no discussions

between the provincial Treasurer of this province and the financial critic of the New Democratic Party. As a result of that very obvious assurance, there is just no intention of even considering the resignation of the provincial Treasurer—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: For those reasons?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —because of the guesses given by the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald).

Mr. Lewis: Well, the Premier could replace him with the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter). Might I ask just one further question—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am still waiting to hear anxiously at 4 o'clock.

Mr. Lewis: We'll see whether the prediction of the member for York South is right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Now he calls it a prediction; I thought it was a leak?

Mr. Singer: Why not ask the member for York South to resign because he gave away this secret information?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I presume a lot of members bought furniture in the last 24 hours and benefited from the two per cent.

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the Minister of Education whether he is now aware that the task force on early childhood education consists of six persons, only one of whom is a woman?

How does that reconcile itself with the speech made by his colleague, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch)—under whose secretariat this task force was in fact recommended—with his grand protestations in the House the other night that he and the government had taken to heart the provisions of the committee on the status of women and that we would see that emerge in government appointments? How can this be reconciled?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it has to be reconciled. I think my friend will have to ask the Provincial Secretary for Social Development about the task force. He appointed the task force and we appointed our member on the task force. I think he'll have to direct questions concerning it to my colleague. But certainly his statement of policy, whatever may have been the case in the past—it may have been that we erred a bit in certain areas there; that may have happened in the past, and I'm not prepared to admit that it did happen—

Mr. Cassidy: We wouldn't expect the minister to do that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —if it did, my colleague's statement of policy stands as our course for the future.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Solicitor General has the answer to a question previously asked.

SUSPENSION OF OTTAWA POLICEMAN

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview has asked the question:

> Is the Solicitor General aware of the difficulty existing on the police force in Ottawa which resulted in the disciplining by suspension of a member of that police force who was a member of the anti-theft bicycle squad? Has the minister looked into, or would he look into, the advisability of laying criminal charges in this case and not just dealing with it by a private police disciplinary hearing?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East) We got an answer to that in the Ottawa Journal two weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why did the member for Downsview ask it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It came after the question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It's a pity the hon. member didn't give a copy of the Ottawa Journal to his friends. Don't they talk to each other in caucus?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What caucus? Can you imagine those people over there agreeing to anything?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the minister has exceeded his time.

Mr. Speaker: Almost.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If the hon. member had listened to the Throne Speech contribution of the member for Downsview—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Will the minister answer the question please.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I have apprised myself of the situation to which the hon. member has referred. Four men of varying ranks were charged under the Police Act and each convicted. Punishment was imposed in all four cases and in each case the punishment was confirmed by the Board of Commissioners of Police for the city of Ottawa.

Concerning the second part of the question—that is, the matter of laying criminal charges—that was considered by the force and the opinion of a solicitor was sought. It was the solicitor's advice not to proceed with criminal charges.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, before the minister gets into another question: Would the minister not agree that theft by a police officer of a bicycle should be dealt with in a more realistic fashion than in a secret disciplinary hearing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity of reviewing the whole file and I was satisfied that this was a matter of internal discipline. It was dealt with properly there. It was confirmed by the Board of Commissioners of Police. Advice was sought from a solicitor and given. In the light of all that, I am satisfied that there is nothing further that the ministry should do in this regard.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, wouldn't the Solicitor General agree that there could be nothing worse for the administration of justice than to have a policeman who engages in theft? Shouldn't the Solicitor General do something about that, rather than encourage private hearings?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has stated one fact. I have not gone into the details of the charges that were laid.

Mr. Singer: That is what it is all about.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have reviewed the file and I am satisfied that what has been done has been in accordance with the procedures that have been laid down. This is not to say that theft charges or any other charges could not have been laid under the Criminal Code.

I am satisfied on review of the matter that the thing has been properly dealt with by those who have been given the responsibility of dealing with the matter.

REMOVAL OF BOOKS FROM CIRCULATION

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member also asked this question: "Could the Solicitor General advise us whether or not the various steps set out in section 160 of the Criminal Code have been followed—" and I quote his words—"subsequent to the seizure by the Metropolitan Toronto police of the books written by—" I can never say her first name—"Miss Hollander—"

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Give her her title.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —commonly known as 'the Happy Hooker.'"

Mr. Roy: Commonly known as Holly Baby.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think the hon. members will know who I'm talking about.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, we got it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The answer to the hon. member's question is twofold. First, the Metropolitan Toronto police force has not seized any of the books written by Miss Hollander; and secondly, no information for the forfeiture of the books has been laid under section 160 of the Criminal Code—

Mr. Haggerty: Did the minister autograph her book?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —therefore the section for seizure does not have to be followed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: If the police did not seize those books as the press seem to indicate pretty positively, what exactly was the role that the Metropolitan Toronto police did play? Did they in fact prohibit the sale of those books in some of the stores, and if so how?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Toronto police have adopted a practice I believe which has been accepted to some degree in the business. When the Toronto police get complaints from sources, they express an opinion to the distributors and then the distributors are perfectly clear: They can continue selling the books, and therefore await an information being laid, and section 160 being carried out; or they can exercise a judgement based on an opinion given to them, and withdraw the books from sale.

Mr. Singer: One more supplementary: Did the police cart away some of those books?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My advice is that no books were seized.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Ruston: The member for High Park stole them.

An hon. member: How many has he got left?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Ruston: Don't answer his question. He should be charged. Collect his sales tax.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Here is the happy hooker himself.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, if no books were seized, can the minister explain the books that were taken from Lichtman's News Depot on York St., across from the Globe and Mail, a receipt for which was signed by detective Fenton?

Mr. Lewis: That's interesting.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether what the hon. member has described is a question of seizure or not. They may have used it as a way of getting rid of them.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on!

Mr. Martel: They are giving them away?

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister denying that these books were seized from that book store?

Mr. Singer: He did deny it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that particular—

Mr. Singer: Oh no, he denied it. Now he is changing his answer.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I said so far as I know—

Mr. Singer: He said no book were seized. That is what he said.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —they haven't seized any books. Now if the proprietor saw fit to deliver up his books.

Mr. Singer: The minister is deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. Shulman: The police deliberately walked in and took them.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Singer: The minister is deliberately misleading the House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Never!

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Downsview should not make such a statement. I direct him to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Singer: Pardon?

Mr. Speaker: I direct the hon. member for Downsview to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Singer: Which statement, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: That the hon. minister is deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I only take it from his own words. He told me—

Mr. Speaker: I heard him say it. The hon. member for Downsview will please withdraw the statement.

Mr. Bullbrook: How can he?

Mr. Singer: I cannot, Mr. Speaker; if the hon. minister has made two contradictory statements—

Mr. Speaker: I ask the hon. member, and give him this opportunity to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I cannot withdraw the statement because the minister has contradicted himself twice in three minutes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Now which one of the minister's answers is right?

Mr. Lewis: He will go to any length not to have to hear.

Mr. Speaker: For the last time I ask the hon. member for Downsview to withdraw a statement which is definitely, positively against the rules of propriety in any Parliament. He may not accuse another hon. member of deliberately misleading the House. I ask him to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Lewis: Well, with one exception.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would surely think that there must be an exception when the minister has proved in two consecutive answers that he has given two kinds of information. In one case he says it didn't happen—and two minutes later he says it did. One of those statements is wrong and one of those statements was deliberately misleading. That is all I said.

Mr. Lewis: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister is either venal or stupid.

An hon. member: Sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order; first of all the point of order raised by the leader of the NDP. It shows the kind of indecision there is in that party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Speaking to the point of order raised by the member for Downsview.

Mr. Bullbrook: He didn't raise any point of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Scarborough West called it a point of order.

Mr. Singer: The Speaker raised the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, with respect to the withdrawal, the member of Downsview is on the horns of a dilemma—he has been there before.

Mr. Singer: No, I'm not. The minister is.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The minister has made one statement; the member for High Park has contradicted him. So the member has to make a choice.

Mr. Lewis: It is impossible!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I suggest to the hon. member that two members of the Supreme Court have ruled upon the way he speaks the truth. No Supreme Court judge has ruled upon me.

Mr. Shulman: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is only one member of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Shulman: On the point of order raised by my leader, I wish to point out to the minister that it is a very difficult decision to make.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): It wasn't a point of order at all.

Mr. Speaker: The point before the House is simply the exchange that took place between the hon. minister and other members of the House. The hon. member for Downsview said that the hon. minister deliberately misled the House.

The hon. minister did say that he was advised as to certain things—

Mr. Lewis: I don't think that is true.

Mr. Speaker: —and in my estimation there was no deliberation on the part of the hon. minister to have misled the House.

Mr. Cassidy: He is wrong, but he didn't mean to be wrong.

Mr. Speaker: I do believe that the hon. member for Downsview should withdraw the statement that the minister deliberately misled the House.

Mr. Shulman: He is just ignorant!

Mr. Lewis: And I withdraw "venal". I have come to a conclusion.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, at your suggestion I will withdraw the phrase "deliberately misled the House." But I would say, sir, that if you could explain to me how a minister—

Mr. McIlveen: That is nothing.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): He's going to miss the budget speech.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Just change it to "misled" without "deliberately."

Mr. Singer: I would say, sir, would you please carefully consult the edition of Hansard that will follow this debate and advise me in due course how a minister can give two absolutely conflicting answers and still not mislead the House.

Mr. Reilly: The member does it all the time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And it's not by being venal.

Mr. Speaker: I will be very pleased to do that. I might only comment that such

statements may well be made in the House from time to time but not deliberately—there is a great difference.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, ministers do make mistakes?

Mr. Speaker: To the hon. member for St. George, yes.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

ACTION OF FORMER MINISTER OF HEALTH

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence).

Apparently he was Minister of Health at the time that the Ontario Health Insurance Commission made a decision on the non-collection of OHIP premiums, and apparently he was aware of this decision. Would he not agree that his incompetence as Minister of Health was exceeded only by his lack of legal knowledge and that maybe he should turn in his badge as a lawyer to the Law Society?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski: (Renfrew South): What a smart aleck! What a punk!

Mr. Martel: He is not even putting his feet on the desk.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

POLLUTION CONTROLS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, perhaps with an assist from his seat-mate, the Minister of the Environment:

In view of Washington's action in postponing effective pollution controls on motor cars until 1976, and in view of the fact that such controls must be on motor vehicles sold in California in 1975, will the minister mandate the same pollution controls on motor vehicles for Ontario as those in California for the model year 1975? Or if he hasn't that power, will he and his seat-mate make very strong representations to Ottawa that the same treatment be effective in Ontario as in California?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I will defer to my colleague on this matter. It is more properly within his ministry.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, in essence what has happened is the EPA, I assume, announced a one year delay in the introduction of proposed additional emission controls for cars which were planned for the 1975-1976 model years. They have given a one year hoist on the 1975 models.

However, we are not sure of this. The announcement was made yesterday. It appears that the postponement in the US has been qualified by a proposal to introduce interim, less stringent controls over hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions. It has not yet been possible to determine just what this will mean to air quality standards in Ontario, but I think I should say that it is quite certain that in no place in Ontario have we encountered the pollution problems caused by cars in Los Angeles, New York City and certain of the areas in New Jersey.

On March 22, 1973, the hon. Jack Davis, the federal Minister of the Environment, announced that he intended to comply with the rules applied by the Environmental Protection Agency in the US. I have not yet learned whether that applies to the hoist or whether he proposes to go ahead with the old 1975 standards.

Mr. Young: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister not consider that in view of the action of California and the action now just announced by Japan, that these controls must be installed for the 1975 models, that this is a real opportunity for Canada to give some leadership in this whole field?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I'd simply say that we want to remember, I think it was the National Academy of Sciences in the United States that predicted that between costs of control systems, extra gasoline and maintenance, the cost of running the average car fitted with the controls proposed for 1975 would increase by about $250 per car per year. I have no idea what the cost of enforcement of proper maintenance standards of this equipment would be.

I have stated on other occasions that in relation to the control standards required for Los Angeles, particularly because of its peculiar meteorological conditions, caused apparently by its geography, I have grave doubts whether those standards are required

in other places in the United States, and certainly in Canada.

Mr. Young: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister has mentioned the increased costs, but I wonder if the minister is pressing for skipping of one model year in the motor car industry, which would more than offset the cost of increased pollution to health?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Well asked!

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): What do the minister's friends in Oshawa think of that? The minister is really looking after his friends in Oshawa.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

FUEL COSTS

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the policy minister for natural resources. In view of a possible fuel crisis in Canada, and particularly in Ontario, is the government contemplating any policy to apply a freeze on home oil, natural gas, gasoline and other fuels to control any further price increases?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): I know of no such consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

TRUCK DRIVING PRACTICES

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Transportation and Communications): Has the minister yet received the report of the task force studying the driving habits and practices of those involved in the trucking industry? If not, when does he expect to receive it?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, I haven't received it yet, Mr. Speaker.

I presume the member is referring to the driving habits. No I have not received it, but it should be forthcoming within the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Community and Social Services has the answer to a question previously asked.

FAMILY COURT PROCEDURES

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this is in reply to a question posed by the hon. member for St. George. She requested clarification of our procedure with respect to the method followed in enforcing family court orders.

The first principle we have to keep in mind is the husband's legal responsibility to support his wife and family. When a court issues a judgement in an order for the husband to pay and, when he subsequently fails to obey that order, follow-up practice varies from one court to another. The matter of family court procedure is, of course, outside the jurisdiction of this ministry. In appropriate circumstances, the wife is expected to assist in the practice of enforcing follow-up orders.

In some areas of the province we are now taking direct action on an experimental basis. I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention a recent amendment to the regulation under the General Welfare Assistance Act, which was gazetted on Jan. 27 last.

Mr. Foulds: Get on with the question!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It reads as follows:

> In determining whether a person in need is eligible for assistance, a welfare administrator shall be satisfied that the person is making reasonable efforts to realize any financial benefit, or obtain compensation that he may be entitled to or eligible for.

While the hon. member has not raised the question of initiating court action in cases of desertion, where the wife has applied for family benefits, our objective is to ensure that the action taken by the wife is consistent with the principle of the husband being legally responsible for the support of his wife and children, and with the principle of determining each individual case on its own merits. In those cases where the woman is in danger, or where there is hope of a reconciliation, we waive the necessity for laying a charge.

Mrs. Campbell: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat puzzled by the answer.

Is the minister aware that it is the policy of this government, as enunciated by the civil

servants in the Attorney General's department, to take the position that philosophically it is wrong for this government to use the weight of its power against a man to make him support his wife and children? Is there not then, Mr. Speaker, a great inconsistency in the statements of the two departments — although in this case it is the minister speaking and in the other it was a civil servant? Could I have clarification on that point?

Secondly, the question was, when the minister is in receipt of the moneys from the husband, is it still his position that he should force the wife to make a declaration on hearsay evidence? Why wouldn't his department, being in receipt of the money, be the one to enforce the order?

That was the question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member, with her years of experience as a judge in the family court, is very well versed in this matter, but I think she will appreciate that this is a very grey area. That is why, as mentioned earlier, the Ontario Law Reform Commission has a study under way.

Mr. Cassidy: It is always grey where women's rights are concerned.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yesterday afternoon I received a submission from a group who are presenting this to the Metro social welfare council and I would like to say to the hon. member that in the past year, the number of deserted wives has quadrupled.

Therefore we feel that this area really has to be looked at very carefully and, as I mentioned in my remarks, we are not unmindful—

Mr. Lewis: All the more reason to answer the question.

Mr. Cassidy: They'll study it to death while women suffer.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —of those very deserving cases and that is why we are waiting — that she should lay other charges.

Mr. Cassidy: The situation right now is scandalous.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But again, I would like to repeat that this is a very difficult area and I would be pleased if some time when it is convenient, the hon. member could meet with our people, along with officials of the Attorney General's department — because some of the legislation comes under their aegis—to see if we can't get the benefit of her views.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent is next.

LONDON CENTRE FOR HANDICAPPED

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. Is the minister planning to take action to ensure that the facilities for the resident students at the London regional centre for the hearing handicapped are completed by September, to relieve the pressure on the overcrowded schools at Milton and Belleville?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, certainly I'm expecting that the new regional centre in London will open next fall. I haven't really had anything to the contrary drawn to my attention, so as of now I'm expecting that's what will happen.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

RUMOURS OF INCO LAYOFF

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: Has the minister been advised by the International Nickel Co. of any impending layoff of the work force substantial enough in numbers to warrant notification to the work force under the Employment Standards Act?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, Mr. Speaker. To my knowledge there has been no communication from Inco at Sudbury. I will make it a point to find out for the hon. member.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker! Would the minister inquire into this and issue a statement, because would the minister not agree that the kind of persistent rumours that are circulating in the Sudbury basin now create an atmosphere of real insecurity in the area? Would he please issue a public statement on it?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with my hon. friend. I think there have been rumours which have been denied but not officially, but I'll find out for him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North is next.

POLLUTION PROBLEM AT CANADIAN GYPSUM

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment.

In view of the many extensions granted to the Canadian Gypsum plant, Weston, on the completion of the installation of its pollution abatement equipment, and his statement that everything would be completed by March 1, 1973, can the minister inform the House that all matters related to the abatement and control programme have now been completed and tell us the cost of the complete installation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer in detail; I understand that matters have been completed. I also understand that the cost which was originally estimated at around $650,000 has climbed to about $1 million. I think there still may be one prosecution which has not been completely dealt with by the courts. I will get an up-to-date report for the hon. member and get it to him tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF RELOCATING PERSONNEL

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources.

In the reorganization of his ministry in many places throughout the province, has he taken into consideration the severe social impact that either a curtailment in the number of personnel or a relocation of a number of the personnel could have on the economies of many small communities in the north, such as Armstrong, Beardmore and White River?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the member for asking me this question because it is something that is very close to me, coming from northwestern Ontario. I can assure him that all these aspects were taken into consideration when we broadened the services of our ministry from 21 districts to 49 districts. Our main thrust, of course, was to provide services to a broader range of the general public and to bring the decision-making process closer to the people. The aspects to which the member refers were very carefully considered.

Mr. Stokes: As a supplementary: In any place where it can be brought to the attention of the minister that it is, in fact, working an undue hardship, will he defer any relocation of personnel until such time as other arrangements can be made?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if it is creating an undue hardship, I would be glad to review it.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, the time for oral questions has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Apps presented the annual report of the Ministry of Correctional Services for the year ending March 31, 1972.

Hon. Mr. Bernier presented the annual reports of the Ontario Energy Board, the St. Clair Parkway Commission and the St. Lawrence Parks Commission.

Mr. Lewis: Three reports!

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is pretty prolific today.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Ah, we're efficient—Natural Resources on the move.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a report from the standing procedural affairs committee.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Would the hon. member please repeat it? There was too much noise. I couldn't hear a word that was said.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the member make a statement about reservoirs?

Mr. Henderson: Wait; we will in the fullness of time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Henderson, from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your commmittee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts

and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Township of Gloucester;

Board of Education for the City of London;

City of Windsor;

Town of Vaughan;

New Augarita Porcupine Mines Ltd.;

City of Toronto;

To incorporate the Association of Natural Resources Technicians of Ontario;

Borough of York.

Mr. Taylor, from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the Town of Oakville.

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Compania Shell de Venezuela Ltd.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill Pr30 An Act respecting the City of London.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

USE OF PESTICIDES ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to control the Use of Pesticides.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, without going into detailed explanation at this point, I would say that in general most of the provisions in the new bill are adaptations or copies of similar provisions in the Environmental Protection Act, but there are two new features:

One is the requirement that a person responsible for a pesticide take whatever steps are prescribed by the regulations for decontaminating anything unlawfully contaminated by that pesticide, and such a person is prohibited from using any such thing unless the prescribed decontamination has been carried out. The person responsible is defined as being not only the owner of the pesticide, but the person having the management or the control of it or its handling, storage, use, disposal, transportation and display, and this would include the owner or occupant of land, water, vehicle or a building which has been unlawfully contaminated. As I say, it's a new provision. At present the regulations require cleaning and decontamination in general terms only.

Secondly, authority is given to make regulations regulating or prohibiting the display or disposal of a pesticide, regulating the transportation of designated pesticides by motor vehicle on a highway or road, prescribing the records to be kept by persons responsible for such transportation, prescribing decontaminating procedures, and for controlling the removal or disposal of any substance unlawfully contaminated by a pesticide.

NEW AUGARITA PORCUPINE MINES ACT

Mr. MacBeth moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the New Augarita Porcupine Mines Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER ACT

Mr. Handleman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Township of Gloucester.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF VAUGHAN ACT

Mr. Deacon moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Vaughan.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF YORK ACT

Mr. Cassidy, in the absence of Mr. MacDonald, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SIMCOE DAY ACT

Mr. G. E. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Simcoe Day.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, in this session I am introducing my bill honouring Governor Simcoe.

The purpose of the bill is to change the name of the public holiday celebrated in many municipalities on the first Monday in August from Civic Holiday to Simcoe Day, in honour of John Graves Simcoe, who was appointed first Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada on Sept. 12, 1791, and who convened the first legislative assembly and established the capital of the province at York, now Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, I have received considerable support for this bill and it is my hope that I will receive the favourable consideration of this House.

NATURAL RESOURCE TECHNICIANS ASSOCIATION ACT

Mr. Rhodes moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the Association of Natural Resource Technicians of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT

Mr. Wardle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR ACT

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: Before the orders of the day, if I may, Mr. Speaker, on two points to the House. First, might the House leader arrange to have copies of the budget available for members at 4 o'clock—to sing along with the Treasurer, as it were?

And, secondly, if I may ask the House leader—with reference to discussions earlier during the Throne debate—about the proceedings tomorrow morning, which concern some of us: Is it, in fact, true that there will be a simultaneous hearing of estimates from the same Justice secretariat in the House and in committee?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would expect not.

Mr. Lewis: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And in regard to the budget, I would certainly enjoy the member's happy co-operation and I'll do my best to see that they're distributed.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, may I just for a moment inquire in that connection—

Mr. Cassidy: The budget is Ontario's version of "The Happy Hooker."

Mr. Bullbrook: Through you, Mr. Speaker, may we have some assurance that we will not be called upon to debate the estimates of the Solicitor General concurrently with the estimates of the Attorney General (Mr. Bales)—one in this House and one in committee?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I believe that that is the idea of this. As I said the other day, I do my utmost not to interfere with the functions of the committee, but I think that the suggestion is correct and I will act accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

ARADCO MANAGEMENT LTD. AND OAK STAMPING LTD. ACT

Mr. Burr moves second reading of Bill Pr1, An Act Respecting Aradco Management Ltd. and Oak Stamping Ltd.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON ACT

Mr. J. R. Smith moves second reading of Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before this bill passes through the House, I do want to urge upon the government that it seriously consider general legislation which would prevent this sort of thing having to

be brought before the private bills committee ever again. It seems—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): They said so in committee.

Mr. Deans: Well, the hon. member for Sarnia says he thought they gave us such an assurance in committee. The unfortunate part about the committee is that an assurance from the representative of the government in the committee is hardly any assurance at all. The unfortunate part is that we have had, from time to time, to deal with matters pertaining to the protection of municipal councillors and their right to speak what they believe to be the truth without there being the opportunity or the possibility of suit. I feel that the same rights which are afforded all members of the Legislature certainly ought to be afforded members of municipal and regional councils, or for that matter all members who are elected to office in the Province of Ontario.

Frankly, I support this only because it would be wrong to impose upon these people the great cost which may well have to be borne by them if they had to proceed through the courts on their own initiative as a result of the suit that has been brought against them. Nevertheless, I hope that we'll never again have to deal with legislation of this kind in any future undertakings of any municipal councillor and that the government will proceed during this session—not next session—to introduce suitable changes to whatever legislation is required in order to ensure this will never occur again.

Mr. Speaker: I should point out, with respect to the hon. member, that he was not speaking to the principle of this bill. There is nothing in the bill regarding the remarks the hon. member made and, strictly speaking, he should have confined his remarks to the content, the principle, of this bill, although the remarks are well taken. I permitted him to continue for the benefit of those remarks.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

EAST YORK FOUNDATION ACT

Mr. Timbrell moves second reading of Bill Pr3, An Act respecting East York Foundation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SIMCOE AND ERIE GENERAL INSURANCE CO. ACT

Mr. Eaton, in the absence of Mr. Ewen, moves second reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Simcoe and Erie General Insurance Co.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

RELIABLE LIFE INSURANCE CO. ACT

Mr. Eaton, in the absence of Mr. Ewen, moves second reading of Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Reliable Life Insurance Co.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CONSTITUTION INSURANCE CO. OF CANADA ACT

Mr. Reilly moves second reading of Bill Pr8, An Act respecting Constitution Insurance Co. of Canada.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE ACT

Mr. Downer moves second reading of Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Town of Orangeville.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF GLENCOE ACT

Mr. Eaton moves second reading of Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Village of Glencoe.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): With regard to the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I think this is something that should be taken into consideration in future legislation. We found, in this case, that the town of Glencoe was building an arena with funds approved by the provincial government from another department of government, and without Ontario Municipal Board approval. Now, of course, it's built so we have no alternative to approving their selling deben-

tures and, as such, bypassing the Ontario Municipal Board.

I don't have any objections that way except that I think it's rather difficult when other municipalities are in the same situation. Maybe they have a lot of private funds to go ahead and they need some public funding. They're in a hurry to build and they do not take all the steps that maybe should be taken because they feel that the delays in the Ontario Municipal Board hearings sometimes are as long as a year and costs sometimes increase 10 per cent over that period.

It would appear to me that for some municipalities it may be much more economical for them to go in this direction rather than in the proper direction, which is through the hearings of the Ontario Municipal Board. I would hope that the government in the near future would take steps to see that municipalities could get this approval without such long delays.

Mr. Speaker: The comments of the hon. member are no doubt comments that were made at the private bills committee, and properly should have been dealt with there rather than at second reading in the House. The principle of his remarks is something a little apart from the content of this bill. Since I permitted the hon. member for Wentworth to proceed, I permitted the hon. member for Essex-Kent to do likewise. I should point out to the hon. members that in future there should be no such wide-ranging debate on the principle of private bills while the House is in session.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH ACT

Mr. Drea moves second reading of Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF ESPANOLA ACT

Mr. Lane moves second reading of Bill Pr 14, An Act respecting the Town of Espanola.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BRIDGE ST. UNITED CHURCH FOUNDATION ACT

Mr. Rollins moves second reading of Bill Pr15, An Act respecting Bridge St. United Church Foundation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TILLSON SPUR LINE RAILWAY CO. ACT

Mr. Parrott moves second reading of Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the Tillson Spur Line Railway Co.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF TILLSONBURG ACT

Mr. Parrott moves second reading of Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF BRUCE ACT

Mr. Gaunt moves second reading of Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the County of Bruce.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr1, An Act respecting Aradco Management Ltd. and Oak Stamping Ltd.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the next motion is put, I just thought I might address a question to the government benches. If any of the hon. members wish to question any of these private bills, I wonder who might answer the questions. Usually the movers don't.

I note that the minister responsible for municipal affairs, to which most of these bills relate, isn't here. I note that the minister responsible for corporate matters, to which some of these bills relate, isn't here. I just wonder how the business of the House can be logically carried on when those ministers who have accepted, or whose civil servants have accepted, some responsibilities in regard

to these private bills just aren't here in the House to answer questions.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Good point!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister of Revenue going to say something?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Aevenue): Does the member think we should be here all day long?

Mr. Singer: No. When bills the minister is concerned with are here, I think he should be here, yes. Yes, I do; I think that's fair. Even the minister would think that's fair.

THIRD READINGS
(*continued*)

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the East York Foundation.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Simcoe and Erie General Insurance Co.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering who I might ask, who is knowledgeable about company matters, whether or not adequate recommendations have come forward from the companies' branch officials in connection with this application. It has a substantial principle at stake and the transference of—

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): This is a private bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe this bill was passed by the private bills committee, and questions have been asked about it.

Mr. Singer: Oh yes, but I am entitled to speak on third reading, Mr. Speaker. I think it might be of some substantial interest, even when the bill went through second reading, that there could be somebody here who would accept the responsibility, which logically lies with government, to answer some questions or to make some presentations.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, these were well discussed in private bills committee. The member had an opportunity to discuss them at that time.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): That's not a point of order.

Mr. Eaton: He's a member of the committee and he wasn't there.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): He wasn't there, eh?

An hon. member: Is he a member of the committee?

Mr. Eaton: Yes, he is a member of that committee and he wasn't there.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! This bill has been duly processed by the standing bills committee and the necessary steps were taken at that time.

Mr. Bullbrook: For my edification, Mr. Speaker, would you please explain to me, as one member of this House, what necessary steps were taken that absolved the government of the responsibility to reply in connection with questions that might be put forward or comments made by my colleague from Downsview?

Mr. Speaker: As I understand it, the necessary certificates were presented in the proper way.

Mr. Singer: We are not questioning the advertising of the legislation.

Mr. Bullbrook: He is not questioning the formalities or the propriety of the legislation. The point and the comment he is making, and I suggest quite rightly Mr. Speaker, is who is to answer for the government in connection with any position they might take relative to this bill.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I was on the private bills committee and, on reconsideration this afternoon, found it was not thoroughly discussed. As a matter of fact, I had revelations overnight that the bill is thoroughly defective. Now what do we do in those circumstances?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! It was presented to the House and the report was adopted.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, then on a point of order, are you now telling us that any private bill that comes here and is presented for third reading cannot be discussed on third reading; and that the House is here as a rubber stamp?

Mr. Bullbrook: And we can't change our minds?

Mr. Singer: Are you saying that the expression just given voice to by the member for Lakeshore is meaningless; that he hasn't got a right to stand in his place and express his doubts; and that he hasn't got a right to get an answer from the minister? That is nonsense!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Are you saying that on third readings, members don't ask questions and they have no right at all?

Mr. Speaker: I haven't been in private bills committee, but it is my understanding that a full discussion had taken place, the report had been duly processed and then adopted by the House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, you don't get my point.

Mr. Bullbrook: Most respectfully!

Mr. Singer: Most respectfully, of course! If what you say is correct, then why do we go through the stupid charade of calling the bill for third reading, or for second reading?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So that members get a chance to vote against it if they want to.

Mr. Singer: Surely we can talk against it as well and expect that there is going to be somebody over in those benches who has some kind of an answer.

Mr. Roy: Show us in standing orders where we can't talk about it.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I don't happen to be a member of the private bills committee. Are you precluding me from making comments on this bill if I wish to do so?

Mr. Singer: That's right!

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the member speak on it.

Mr. B. Newman: You are ruling that we can't make comments.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I believe one of the members, and I forget which one it was, referred to some certificate which had been presented. I understand it comes from one of the members here.

I understand it has been presented to the committee. You may speak on third reading.

Mr. Singer: That's what we are trying to do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, with great respect, the point which the hon. member for Downsview is trying to make is that he really feels that all the ministers should be in their seats here when private bills are being discussed so they can be questioned. I suggest to you, sir, with great respect, that any member who is sponsoring a private bill should be prepared to answer for the matters related to that private bill, which was discussed in private bills committee.

Mr. Singer: Oh, nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To suggest that all the ministers be present at all times with such a volume of private bills going through every session is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): They should be there.

Mr. Speaker: This is not a government bill. It is a private bill.

Mr. Bullbrook: Of course, Mr. Speaker, no one here would take the ludicrous, ridiculous, asinine position that all the members of the government have to be in their seats to answer private bills. No one said that, through you or to you, Mr. Speaker. It is an example of the picayune exaggeration that particular minister gets into every time he recognizes the validity of a position taken by the opposition.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nonsense!

Mr. Speaker: Order please. This is not a government bill and is not answerable by any minister.

Mr. Bullbrook: With respect, may I say to you, my colleague from Downsview has never said that it was a public bill. The only point he makes is that as a member of the Legislature he is entitled to ask the minister responsible for the administration of the bill, what his thoughts might be with respect to it. That's all he is saying. Is that too much?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member for Sarnia will make a better leader.

An hon. member: It's a private bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

THIRD READINGS
(*continued*)

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting reliable Life Insurance Co.

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting Constitution Insurance Co. of Canada.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Town of Orangeville.

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Village of Glencoe.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on Bill Pr10, this is enshrining a principle that I've objected to over many years, and that is that there is much looseness and lack of control in municipal councils who come before us year after year asking that we regularize sloppy and loose procedures that they should have taken care of. I don't think that this House should continue to be beset every year by a series of bills like this, where the local municipal council has neglected to take the clearly authorized steps set out in the Municipal Act.

The amount here is not large, but the municipality is not very large. Obviously they missed the steps that are laid out, that every municipal clerk should know, and they didn't apply to the Ontario Municipal Board to get the necessary approvals for this expenditure of $275,000.

I don't think that this House should pass this bill unless and until we get some indication from whichever minister might be responsible for municipal affairs as to what he is going to do about it. I've complained about this for many, many years, and the ministers of municipal affairs say: "Well, it doesn't happen very often"; and: "Really, we're not going to send all these people to jail"; and: "Really, they spent the money and it wouldn't be nice if we didn't give them an authorizing bill to regularize their sloppiness"; and so on.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come that we should have a pretty clear statement from the minister responsible as to what he's going to do about it; whether or not those sections in the Municipal Act are meaningful and are mandatory. If they are not, take them out; and if the government feels that these steps have to be followed then we shouldn't put these bills through just by rote because somebody happens to come from the village of Glencoe and says: "We're sorry we made a mistake. We won't do it again".

THIRD READINGS
(*continued*)

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the Town of Espanola.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting Bridge St. United Church Foundation.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the Tillson Spur Line Railway Co.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the County of Bruce.

TRUSTEE ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 73, An Act to amend the Trustee Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, we've considered the bill and we have no comment about it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? I presume the minister wouldn't have a reply for that.

Mr. Singer: Well he's here, and that shows proper respect for the House.

Mr. Speaker: He's perfectly welcome to speak.

Motion agreed to; second reading of Bill 73.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Bill 73 ordered for third reading.

FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 74, An Act to amend the Fatal Accidents Act.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, we have considered this bill, and we have no comment on this bill either.

Motion agreed to; second reading of Bill 74.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Bill 74 ordered for third reading.

COMMISSIONERS FOR TAKING AFFIDAVITS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 75, An Act to amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, we've considered this bill and have no comment.

Motion agreed to; second reading of Bill 75.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading.

Bill 75 ordered for third reading.

DEVOLUTION OF ESTATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 82, An Act to amend the Devolution of Estates Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, we have considered this bill and we have a few comments.

The changes put forth in this bill make good sense. They're long overdue. I hope they are the beginning of a pretty good look at the whole of the Devolution of Estates Act. The minister has touched on some of the obvious faults, and I think he has come along fairly well on those things; certainly the increase from $20,000 to $50,000 as the surviving spouse's share of an estate that devolves, in the case of an intestacy, makes good sense. The removal of the escheat to the Crown of the portion of the estate that may be left over if the surviving spouse has not exhausted the whole estate again makes good sense.

The Crown seemed to have gotten into this escheat position in so many cases where I don't think the Crown belongs at all. This is not a new thing. This goes back, I guess many hundred of years. I just wonder, since the door is now beginning to open, whether the advisers to the Attorney General might some day soon begin to take out all of the statutes that involve escheat to the Crown and look and see whether or not the Crown should get into any of these various escheat rights where it can in fact insert itself.

In very brief summary, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill as far as it goes and I hope it is going to be followed by a continuation of advanced thinking along these lines. These old statutes relating to devolution of estates and many other fields, aren't up to date with our present way of life, and most of them should be constantly and elaborately revised.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, as I understand this bill, it is in direct response to a representation made to the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) and his predecessor, the former Mr. Allan Lawrence of the riding of St. George.

Mr. Singer: Well, what does he call himself now?

Mr. Renwick: I don't know.

I refer to Mr. Phillip Crouch, a member of the firm of Messrs. Flett, Beccario, Crouch, O'Neill and Morrison of Welland, who wrote to the Attorney General on March 14 of this year recalling the correspondence which he had had with his predecessor, Mr. Lawrence, the then Attorney General of Ontario. Mr. Crouch said in that letter:

> The specific problem concerns the distribution on an intestacy. The law, as I understand it, is that if a man dies leaving his wife and no children, then in that case the wife receives the first $20,000 and two-thirds of the residue. The remaining one-third of the residue goes to the next of kin and if no next of kin, to the Crown.
>
> My suggestion is that none of this estate should escheat to the Crown. If the man had died leaving only nephews and nieces, they would receive the complete estate. If he had died leaving only children, they would receive the complete estate.

Mr. Singer: That is what they have done.

Mr. Renwick: He continues:

> If he had died leaving only parents, they would receive the complete estate. Why is it that only in the case of a wife is there such a problem? This anomaly should be corrected as soon as possible, and probably at the same time the preferential share going to the wife of $20,000 should be increased, in view of the inflationary force that has been at work.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that a private citizen has all of the points he makes to the ministry incorporated in one bill at the same time, even if it was somewhat belatedly done.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments on this bill by any hon. member?

The hon. minister.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): I was glad to receive the comments from the gentleman. The bill was prepared some time earlier, and the member indicates he had been in touch with Mr. Lawrence.

Regarding the point raised by the member for Downsview, there is going to be a continuing study on these various Acts and they will be dealt with gradually.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 83, An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, we approve of this bill. It makes eminent sense, and we trust that the whole matter of bonding in these estates will be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: The business of bonding as a whole has acted as a real curb; having to go to companies to take out a bond is an extra cost to the estate. The bill is thoroughly in order. It's long overdue, as they say, and we give full accord to it.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill?

Did the hon. minister have any further comments?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 86, An Act to amend the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I really only have one comment about this. I know that the one provision which is in this bill is for practical purposes the incorporation in this bill of a provision standing, as the explanatory note states, in the Workman's Compensation Act. However, I am always concerned when I see that the opinion of a board, which is not particularly qualified to make the decision, is called in aid of the provision that funds can be paid to someone other than the person to whom the award is made on some basis that that person is incapable of managing his affairs, and therefore the money should be paid to somebody else.

Now I realize there are many clear cases where such payments should be made, but this Act provides that they should be made —if in the opinion of the Compensation Board the person is unable to manage his own affairs—to the public trustee or to some other person.

I have been concerned for some time—not only in this statute, but elsewhere—with the way in which decisions are made as to when funds will be paid to someone on the basis that he is not capable of managing his own affairs. Now certainly the compensation for crime board is not one particularly able to determine that question.

I wonder whether the minister would give some view as to the kind of information on the basis of which a board would make such a determination.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I have what is, fundamentally, really a question of the minister as to the second clause of the second section of the bill. What is the raison d'être behind these funds, which are granted to individuals, not being subject to any form of levy—such as executions or setoffs or any other form—as is basically the case with all other moneys that come into an individual's hands. If a man owes some debts and has failed to pay those debts to long-outstanding creditors, you foreclose the possibility of any garnishee in this particular case. It may be justified, but on the surface of the legislation, I don't see that justification.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: I just wanted to make mention of this, sir, if I could relate it to the principle shortly.

In this bill, which we approved of originally in 1970, we recognized the efficacy of the bill; we also recognize it calls for the expenditure of public funds, as does the legal aid plan.

I invite, succinctly, consideration of this comment, through the Speaker to the Attorney General: The time has come when the government has to recognize the impulse of individual lawyers, and collectively through the Law Society, that the trust funds these lawyers have of other people's money must be used for the benefit of the public at large. The inertia of the government in this connection is reprehensible and totally unacceptable.

The Law Society last week mentioned that they recognized a possibility of revenue of approximately $11 million a year available to the people of Ontario to assist them in carrying forward, rather than out of consolidated revenues, the operation of the legal aid plan; the operation of this particular statute. I would like, if the minister could consider in response — without invasion of his policy field—some idea of when the government is going to move in this connection.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, this is in reference to the final section of this amendment, relating to children.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Attorney General could advise us as to the status of those children who have been victims, for example under charges of contributing; and whether in such cases it would not be advisable to add the official guardian—either a guardian ad litem or someone of that stature—as well as the public trustee.

Mr. Speaker: Do other members wish to address themselves to this bill?

Mrs. Campbell: Could I have the answer to the question?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): It's not very often I have the opportunity of agreeing with the hon. member for Sarnia, but today I think he is correct; he is removed from his usual rascal-self.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Be careful; be careful!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If no one else wishes to speak, I would deal with the various matters that have been raised by the hon. members opposite.

In dealing with section 3, which was raised by the hon. member for Riverdale and the hon. member for St. George, there have been situations develop where, through an accident or other circumstances, a person may be of unsound mind. Rarely has it been a child, but it might be. And in those cases, at the present time, there is no authority to pay moneys to anyone other than to that person. We feel the money should be made available for the present benefit of the claimant and hence we have provided in this bill that it should go to the public trustee or perhaps to a person who has been the guardian; or the parent of the child. For that reason, we feel that with this amendment this will thereby benefit the individual more expeditiously. It's no assistance to them that they might have this money available to them some years hence; it is now that they may need that money. That's the reason for bringing in this provision.

The point that was raised by the member for Riverdale is valid, except that in almost all instances the board will have reports whereby they will know the physical and mental state of that person; and they usually will see the person. In these instances I think they are quite capable of making the decision as to whom it should be paid.

As to the question raised by the member for Lakeshore, I don't think a person should anticipate a payment under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, because it is an *ex gratia* payment; they shouldn't anticipate it to enter into contracts or other matters. When they receive the money, then it should be their business to expend it as they deem fit. I don't think they should use the anticipation of a payment to enter into other expenditures or contracts that they otherwise might not, or to seek credit on that basis.

I think I have dealt with all the points except the matter raised by the member for Sarnia. I agree with him and he may find that there will be a statement made by myself on the matter in a very short time.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, if I may, what the minister is saying then is that in anticipation of getting the award someone raises debts, and he doesn't want to encourage that situation.

Hon. Mr. Bales: That's right!

Mr. Lawlor: But that leaves out a whole field. Suppose he has numerous pre-existing indebtedness or has obligations that have nothing whatsoever to do—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Has the hon. member spoken previously to this bill?

Mr. Lawlor: I was seeking to aid this House by short-circuiting debate.

Mr. Speaker: That's what I thought. If the hon. minister wants to answer a point of clarification—

Mr. Lawlor: We will have to go to committee then to discuss it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister wish to answer a point of clarification?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, I think I have dealt with the matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has dealt with it then.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading or to the committee of the whole House?

Mr. Lawlor: No, committee. I want to talk with the minister.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 73, An Act to amend the Trustee Act.

Bill 74, An Act to amend the Fatal Accidents Act.

Bill 75, An Act to amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act.

Bill 82, An Act to amend the Devolution of Estates Act.

Bill 83, An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed I might say that, in accordance with a request, copies of the budget will be delivered to the leaders of the other parties; the rest of us will wait until later.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That wasn't the request. The request was for all members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Was it not the intention that all members would be able to have a copy of the budget?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, it was not possible for me to make that arrangement, but the leaders will have them.

Mr. Bullbrook: We thought that that was the response the minister made.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well I tried.

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 1

Clerk of the House: Government notice of motion No. 1.

Hon. Mr. White moves that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government.

BUDGET ADDRESS

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before embarking on the budget statement proper, may I make one or two informal introductory remarks?

First of all, to say that I had invited the hon. Leslie Frost to be with us here on this occasion. I am sorry to say that his response was his health did not permit that. He informed me in a letter that he was being well-cared for and was making progress and I know I speak for all members of the Legislature when I send to him our best regards for a quick and full recovery to good health and full vigour.

I am happy to say that the hon. John Robarts has been able to join us here today. He is an old friend of ours. He is a very great personal friend of mine and he is a guest of Mr. Speaker.

The member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), I think, is coming. I don't see him here at the moment. Of course, he is a previous Treasurer and I hope that he will find the endeavours on this occasion equal to the high standard which he himself has set.

Mr. Charles MacNaughton is going to try to get here from out of town before these proceedings are over. He has extended, through me, his best wishes to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House.

The member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough), my very dear friend, is here with us today. He is another previous Treasurer and a man for whom I would like to restate publicly I have the greatest personal affection and enormous respect.

Mr. Speaker, as your special guest in your gallery, I am glad to say, is Beatrice White, who is my best friend, and who has given me this handsome tie to commemorate the occasion; it is a cunning admixture of par-

lour pink and royal purple. I am given to understand it has no significance.

Mr. Speaker, the easiest way for me to deal with this budget would have been to change nothing. The most popular approach to taxes as in the short run would be to leave everything as it is.

Quite frankly, we could do this because our provincial resources have expanded as fast as our curtailed expenditures, but to do nothing about decreasing property taxes would be irresponsible, and to do nothing to make the retail sales tax fairer would be cowardly. To do nothing to lower our public debt would be imprudent. I will, therefore, ask the Legislature to increase certain provincial taxes substantially, permitting offsetting decreases of property taxes and permitting significant increases in tax credits as this mechanism evolves toward a meaningful, guaranteed, annual income plan.

The decrease in public debt will reaffirm my determination to keep Ontario's credit among the best in North America.

The budget which I present today is idealistic and realistic. It portrays Ontario's confidence in the strength of our economy and in its capacity to generate job opportunities and increased incomes for our people.

It builds on the success of past expansionary policies. It recognizes that Ontario must create a sound financial base for essential provincial and municipal services in the future. And it accepts the responsibility for raising provincial taxes in the present, as I've said, in order to lower property taxes and to make the retail sales tax system fairer.

In constructing this 1973 budget the Ontario government set itself the following objectives: To ensure that the economy continues to move towards full employment. To exercise maximum restraint on provincial spending while providing resources for priority programmes. To give the highest priority to sharing provincial resources with local governments and to ensure that property taxpayers derive maximum benefits. To redistribute tax burdens on the fairest possible basis. To encourage wise use of resources; to simplify certain taxes. To nurture small Canadian business. To preserve the family farm and decrease upward pressure on food costs. To decrease the public debt. And to decentralize government in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the taxation and reform policies in this budget meet these objectives in a way that is workable and responsible. Before proceeding to describe these measures, let me thank those public servants whose untiring efforts made this budget possible and whose dedication to the well-being of our people satisfies the highest standards of public service. Their undoubted talents, their tireless energy, their intellect and their compassion have made a deep impression on me in recent weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose there are scores of men and women who have worked on this budget, but I should single out the Deputy Treasurer, Mr. Ian Macdonald; the executive director, Mr. Terry Russell; and the director, Mr. Duncan Allan, as those who have been particularly active with me in this endeavour.

I should like to comment on the government's fiscal plan for 1973 in the context of the state of the economy, Ontario's expansionary fiscal policy since 1970, and the considerable financial cost this policy has entailed, and federal-provincial fiscal policy co-ordination.

Mr. Speaker, in 1972 the Ontario economy continued to strengthen so that the gross provincial product reached a level of $42 billion — an increase of 10.8 per cent over 1971. In constant dollar terms the increase was 5.7 per cent, compared with a gain of 5.3 per cent in 1971.

As a result of this increased pace of economic activity a record 140,000 new jobs were created in the province in 1972. This enviable increase in employment of 4.5 per cent was the largest achieved in more than 15 years.

Despite the rapid growth of the labour force the rate of unemployment declined to 4.8 per cent in 1972 from 5.2 per cent a year earlier. In January of this year the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment fell to 4.2 per cent, and in February it declined again to 4.1 per cent—the lowest level since April, 1970.

I am encouraged by the growth in employment in the province. Substantial numbers of new jobs were created in all sectors of the economy with the exception of the construction industry. For example, 43,000 new jobs were created in manufacturing, another 43,000 in wholesale and retail trade, and 45,000 in the service industry.

I am confident that this improvement will continue in 1973, an estimated rise of 11 per cent in gross provincial product—about six per cent in real terms—and an average rate of unemployment of 4.4 per cent over the year as a whole. We can have confidence we're moving toward fuller employment.

Let me repeat, however, the message of my predecessor who stated that any unemployment figure in excess of three per cent is unacceptable to this government. Given the very rapid rate of growth of the labour force in Ontario, the provincial economy must realize an annual rate of real growth of at least six per cent to reach this target level of unemployment. We have achieved this kind of performance in the past and we must do it again.

A strong private sector and a high level of investment is essential to rapid economic growth. In the current situation, with housing construction approaching capacity, the critically important element in the private sector is the level of business investment in plant and equipment anticipated for this year.

The federal 1973 budget provides a modest boost to consumer spending, but no overall net fiscal stimulus. This situation arises because the personal income tax cuts have simply offset the federal government's surplus revenue capacity and its revenue gains from tax reform. Consequently, we must rely on strong business investment and balanced growth of the private sector to create the jobs necessary for our fast growing labour force.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): But no tax cuts at this time to corporations?

Hon. Mr. White: During the past three years the Ontario government has made maximum use of its financial resources to stimulate the economy, and our fiscal policy has played an important role in restoring a high rate of job creation in the province. Budget paper A shows that since 1970, Ontario's fiscal policy has been flexible, and its impact on the provincial economy has far exceeded that of the federal government in the national economy. As a result, we have achieved a faster growth of employment and a greater improvement in unemployment than the country as a whole.

To illustrate the government's fiscal plan for 1973, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the province's full-employment budget estimates. These estimates are calculated on a national accounts basis to measure most effectively the budget's economic impact. There's a chart in the statement which illustrates this point. Given the expenditure programme and tax reform measures I am proposing today, the full-employment budget would be in approximate balance in 1973 if the economy were operating at capacity levels of output, such a balanced full-employment budget represents a neutral fiscal stance, which is realistic given Ontario's financial capacity. The government has already fully used its financial resources in the current cyclical phase. Continued deficit financing on this scale would weaken our long-term ability to finance essential public services and municipal tax reforms.

In his recent budget, the federal Minister of Finance stated that large provinces such as Ontario must be prepared to run substantial deficits to stimulate the economy. For the past three years this province has run large cash deficits in order to create new jobs and incomes. Ontario's fiscal policy has substantially reinforced federal action in the national economy.

As I said, the relative stabilization effort of this government has surpassed that of the federal government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in every year since 1970, Ontario's net cash requirements as a percentage of gross revenues have substantially exceeded those of the federal government. Thus the province has exerted a greater degree of fiscal influence in pursuing the goal of full employment. The cost of this provincial effort is reflected in rising per capita debt.

Consequently, the government must seek a balance between the allocation of resources for stimulating the economy and for meeting long-term public needs. I think this budget achieves this goal. With the full-employment budget in approximate balance, our fiscal stance will be neutral in 1973. The lagged impact of our past policies will, of course, continue to stimulate the economy. Nevertheless, continued progress towards full employment depends primarily on the policies of the federal government.

I hope this message is clear. There is no way that Ontario can continue to carry an undue share of deficit finance.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Double-talk and double-thinking.

Hon. Mr. White: The member's leader is nodding his head in agreement.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Typical of that group though.

Hon. Mr. White: Better be careful.

An hon. member: Typical of the indecision in that party.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): I've heard the NDP leader say that.

Hon. Mr. White: I turn now to a review of the government's expenditure programme for the new fiscal year. May I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that a principal objective of this budget is a new revenue-sharing deal for Ontario municipalities.

Mr. Lewis: Why is the minister looking heavenward?

Hon. Mr. White: In the next section of my statement, I shall outline these measures in detail but first it's appropriate to review the overall provincial expenditure plan.

I should explain to the members that in this budget all expenditure figures are expressed for the first time on a gross basis rather than on the net basis used in previous budgets. This improvement means that budget figures will now be on the same basis as the expenditure estimates. A full explanation of this and other accounting changes is contained in budget paper C which accompanies this statement.

In 1973-1974, budgetary expenditure including transfers to municipalities will be $7,269 million, an increase of 11.7 per cent over 1972-1973. This is a greater increase than last year because of $182 million in new grants to the local governments, making this year's total grants $280 million more than last year's. If these transfers are excluded, the overall rise in provincial spending is less than nine per cent. In short, our increase in spending will not exceed the 11 per cent rate at which the overall economy is growing.

Mr. Speaker, our expenditure plan for 1973-1974 was developed within the framework of the new government structure to reflect three major priorities of the government.

First, our programme will continue to provide a high level of public service while containing cost increases through increased programme effectiveness and efficiency. Our second objective is to ensure that local governments have the financial capacity to perform effectively without inequitable increases and property tax burdens. Third, we seek to ensure a vital financial capacity within both short- and long-run time horizons to meet changing public needs. This capacity must be obtained by rigorous spending limitations and by enhanced efficiency.

I would like to focus briefly on the containment of provincial spending. The point has been made in previous budget statements, but it deserves to be emphasized once again. In order to maintain a capacity to establish new priorities and to meet public needs, the government must restrain the growth of existing spending programmes. The Ontario government is very conscious of its responsibility to limit spending growth. It is clear from our records that we have been successful. We have initiated a number of major measures which apply to every ministry and, in particular, to health and education programmes. Additional measures are being planned which will be announced soon by the Minister of Health.

The success of cost cutting which we have already undertaken is indicated in a number of ways. For example, the growth in expenditures of ministries in the social policy field, which accounts for 67 per cent of total budgetary spending, has been reduced from an annual growth rate of 14 per cent in 1971-1972 to 8.9 per cent in the coming year. This has been achieved, I suggest, with no appreciable decrease in the quality of services provided under the auspices of any ministry.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to compare Ontario's spending record with that of other provinces and the federal government. An accompanying table indicates that Ontario will have one of the lowest increases in budgetary expenditure in 1973-1974. It is particularly interesting to compare our expenditure estimates with those of the federal government, which is increasing its expenditure this year by more than 16 per cent, and that compares to our 11.7.

Control of expenditures allows the province to respond to changing public needs. One of the best indicators of the ability of a provincial budget to respond to new priorities is the proportion of provincial investment funds devoted to emerging programmes. It is the investment account, represented by loans and advances, which should be most sensitive to new priorities and resultant expenditure policies. An accompanying table shows the relative portion of capital investment allocated to education, housing and environment.

With the completion of the bulk of needed capital spending in the fields of primary, secondary and post-secondary education, the government has been able to effect a shift in investment to the fields of housing and urban development and environmental protection. During a four-year period, the amount of capital investment in education has declined from 60 to 25 per cent of total investment. Investment in public housing

and development has increased to take up the largest share at 41 per cent of the total and environmental protection investments have also increased. A table gives details of these items, Mr. Speaker.

As explained recently by the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. Winkler), the estimates are being tabled separately this year on the basis of policy fields, and the responsible ministers will provide a detailed description of expenditure plans when the estimates are debated. Accordingly, I will confine my remarks to a brief overview of expenditures along with a few highlights before moving on to describe our new approach to provincial-municipal finance.

Budgetary expenditure, including transfers, will be increased by about $760 million, or 11.7 per cent. The bulk of this increase, more than $500 million, will be devoted to increased transfer payments to individuals, local governments and other institutions in order to make our revenue and expenditure system more equitable. The increase caused by the province's direct operating spending will be slightly more than $100 million, which is 10.7 per cent. Increases in capital spending have been curtailed greatly, because it is this area which can exert strong influence on future increases in operating spending. We plan, therefore, to limit the increase in capital spending to 3.9 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, some examples of increased expenditure provided for in our 1973 plan are: $36 million to the Ministry of Transportation and Communications for municipal transit subsidies, expansion of GO Transit and development of new modes of public transportation; $66 million additional grants to universities and community colleges to modify the impact of decreased enrolments and increase student support.

We have established a value of $1,825 for the basic income unit in 1973-1974, up 3.4 per cent from the $1,765 dollar value in 1972-1973; $15 million additional operating funds for homes for the aged, Children's Aid Societies, children's institutions and day nurseries; $35 million in capital loans to municipalities for winter employment capital projects; $24 million allocated for student employment, of which $8 million will be devoted to special summer employment programmes; and $39 million to the Ministry of Health to provide improved psychiatric and mental health programmes, increase the number of nursing home beds, and improve home-care programmes.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize the success of the policy field committees and Management Board in developing an effective and comprehensive expenditure programme, sensitive to new social priorities, yet developed within strict spending guidelines.

In his 1969 budget the hon. Charles MacNaughton presented the Ontario government's blueprint for provincial-municipal tax reform. In the intervening years his budgets, and those of the member for Chatham-Kent, each marked consistent and considerable progress in achieving our long-run objectives. During the period 1967 to 1972, the Ontario government more than doubled its payments to local governments, agencies and property taxpayers from $955 million to $2 billion. This controlled the growth of property taxes and achieved a fairer distribution of property tax burdens among taxpayers.

It is both an honour and a pleasure, therefore, to be able to increase our aid to local governments this year. In this budget I shall propose a group of reforms costing over $180 million, which, together with the growth of existing forms of assistance, will bring our total payments to local governments, agencies and taxpayers to $2.4 billion. This represents an increase of more than $400 million in provincial relief of property taxes between 1972 and 1973.

In designing our policies for 1973 we have undertaken intensive studies of the financial outlook of local governments. These studies have confirmed again the chronic problem for local government of the low growth potential of the property tax. We estimate this growth for the whole province not to exceed four per cent. In contrast, local spending is expected to grow by eight per cent. As a result we estimated that local governments would have experienced a deficiency in current financing during 1973 of about $140 million, which would have required an increase in mill rates averaging almost eight per cent.

The financial outlook for local governments is further aggravated by the uneven financial pressures resulting from different demands for services and inequalities in tax capacities. There will be significant variations, therefore, around the anticipated eight per cent mill rate increase in 1973. Figures have been provided in detail on this point.

The Ontario government has examined fully the implications of the local fiscal outlook. Consequently, we have decided that there is need for imaginative and compre-

hensive reforms which will be of benefit to all property tax payers. In designing a bold new approach to provincial-municipal finance, we have set ourselves a number of objectives: To make additional transfers to local governments in excess of the $140 million required to avoid an increase in the average mill rates. To distribute these new funds in a way which takes account of different needs and deficiencies in tax capacities. To reduce further the problem of tax exemptions for public property. To reduce the financial pressures experienced in areas of substantial temporary population, such as resort areas. To recognize the unique problems of local governments in northern Ontario. And to recognize separately the financial problem of those local governments which have their own police force. I suggest to the members that the revenue-sharing plan in this budget meets all of these objectives.

There is one final and important objective. The government believes there is great scope for the consolidation and simplification of the existing conditional grants. However, we feel it is important that the deconditionalizing of grants be discussed fully with local government representatives before making changes in this direction. It is my intention to continue discussions with the provincial-municipal liaison committee so that progress can be made toward this objective in 1974. In an appendix to this statement I have set out a list of conditional grants which will be considered for deconditionalization.

In the past few months the government has intensified its procedures for consultation with the municipalities. In addition to the regular monthly meetings of the provincial-municipal liaison committee, a great number of meetings have been held with individual municipalities and counties on a number of issues of general concern to these governments.

As a result, a number of amendments to legislation will be introduced in the near future. Prominent among these are: Greater freedom for county councils to determine their own representation. Elimination of the requirement that the minister approve municipal appointments to joint planning boards. And enabling legislation giving municipalities control over the development of particular sites.

These amendments are concrete examples of the government's policy of enhancing the autonomy of municipalities and broadening the scope for decision-making at the local level.

We have developed a comprehensive plan to attain our objectives. It contains a number of innovations which make it unique. We have called it "the property tax stabilization plan." The main elements of this new reform plan and other forms of assistance are the following:

A property tax stabilization plan. A new resource equalization grant. A special allowance for temporary population in the resource equalization grant. A new general support grant. An additional general support grant for all municipalities in northern Ontario. Higher grants toward policing costs. And the elimination of mining revenue payments, which are less than the benefits under the new plan.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Nothing for unorganized communities.

Hon. Mr. White: This budget will do more for the north than if the member for Thunder Bay sat here for a million years.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Don't worry, he will be here.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The Treasurer won't.

Hon. Mr. White: Let's make it 1,000.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: We'll still be here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: No, I think a million years is too harsh, we'll make it 1,000.

Other reforms and additional assistance: Provincial support of school board costs will be raised to 60 per cent. The education mill rate subsidy will be enriched. The local tax base will be broadened to include public institutions. Payments in lieu of taxes on public lands will be extended and increased. Library grants, museum grants and sewerage and water subsidies will be enriched. Many general welfare assistance recipients will be transferred to the provincial family benefits programme. And the county roads grant system will be simplified and enriched.

In total the above plan and enrichments and other assistance are estimated to deliver over $180 million in new financing to local governments. This is well in excess of the $140 million local government deficiency from existing tax levels in 1973. It can be expected, therefore, that municipalities which control their expenditures will be able to increase property taxes this year.

By far the most important part of our 1973 reform programme is embodied in the property tax stabilization plan. This five-part plan is designed to provide basic assistance to all municipalities. It contains special recognition of the problems associated with a low tax base and temporary population.

Mr. Renwick: Municipal tax foundation of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Lewis: Does the Treasurer mind giving credit where credit is due.

Hon. Mr. White: I am looking at my old friend from the select committee on taxation, the member for—

Mr. Lewis: Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. White: —Lakeshore, whose smile enlightens this House, if not his political philosophy.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The Treasurer's borrowing the philosophy at the moment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: It takes account of the unique costs incurred by northern municipalities, and it incorporates incentives for economies in municipal spending so that savings will be encouraged and passed on to property taxpayers.

The new resource equalization grant: This government will introduce a resource equalization grant which closely follows the recommendation of the select committee on taxation. The grant will enable municipalities with below-average taxable assessment to provide improved services without imposing severe burdens on their taxpayers.

All municipalities with equalized assessment per capita below $10,000 will be eligible for this particular equalization grant. A simple example will serve to illustrate clearly how this equalization grant will work.

In a case where assessment per capita amounts to only $7,000, a municipality would have a $3,000, or a 30 per cent, deficiency relative to the $10,000 standard. The equalization grant to this municipality would amount to half of this 30 per cent deficiency times its 1972 municipal level.

We've chosen a standard of $10,000 for equalization purposes, beuause it is slightly above the average of $9,700 in the province and makes a large number of municipalities eligible. We will pay these grants at half the deficiency percentage to keep the total cost of this new grant programme within the province's financial capacity.

The resource equalization grant will contain two additional refinements. First, there will be an allowance for temporary population so that the resort areas will have a more appropriate entitlement for equalization grants.

Second, a maximum equalization grant rate has been established at 20 per cent of municipal levies to avoid unnecessarily high payment to a limited number of municipalities.

The total cost of the new resource equalization grant in 1973 is estimated at about $57 million. Some 748 Ontario municipalities will be eligible for this equalization grant. In other words, the benefits of this new grant will be widespread, affecting more than 63 per cent of the population, and will have greatest impact where financial assistance is most needed.

Our new resource equalization grant will strengthen the fiscal capacity of all less prosperous municipalities. It will introduce a greater degree of equity in local government financing that existed before. Its impact will be sufficiently powerful to allow substantial tax reductions, notably in the resource-scarce communities. The equalization grant alone will prevent the mill rate increases that would otherwise occur in many municipalities.

There is a new general support grant. The local government financial outlook also indicated that municipalities in general are facing financial pressures. Resource-rich as well as resource-poor municipalities are faced with potential mill rate increases. To correct the chronic imbalance in local financing, a new approach is required.

The problem of general financing pressures is closely related to local needs, but it's difficult to measure these needs. Therefore, we chose municipal levies as an approximate, although admittedly imperfect, measure of local needs. On this basis we've developed a new general support grant.

Starting in 1973, Ontario will pay all municipalities a general support grant of four per cent of their 1972 municipal levies. We are confident that this four per cent support of the levy, combined with natural growth in assessment, will relieve much of the pressure to increase property tax levels. This grant will be available on the same basis to both upper- and lower-tier levels of local government.

We estimate the total cost of the new general support grant at $41 million in 1973. Of

this total, some $22 million will go to our metropolitan, regional and district governments and their constituent municipalities. The remainder will go to counties, cities, towns, townships and villages in Ontario.

An incentive for municipal economy is next. The new resource equalization grant and general support grant provide revenue sharing with municipalities of $100 million. It is this government's position that the bulk of these new transfers should be of direct benefit to local taxpayers and not be dissipated on unnecessary spending increases. If the new provincial transfers are to be of lasting benefit, local governments should exercise restraint and economy in their spending.

To encourage municipalities to be prudent, we have designed an incentive in conjunction with the new general support grant. As I've said, the standard rate for this grant is four per cent of municipal levies. This grant could rise to six per cent, however, if a municipality contains its spending growth rate in 1973 to eight per cent or less. On the other hand, for municipalities that increase their 1973 spending by 12 per cent or more, the support rate will drop to two per cent instead of four per cent. In this way municipalities can tailor their own budgets to secure maximum support grants from the province and pass on these benefits to their taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, the printed copies of this statement contain a table showing how this incentive will work. In future we will further refine this approach to our new transfer mechanism in light of our experience, keeping in mind Ontario's basic objective of containing the total public sector and property tax levels.

A special grant for northern Ontario is the next item. Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend a few moments now on the special position of northern Ontario. The government has recognized the unique costs that confront our municipalities in the north. These communities have to cope with problems related to severe winters, high transportation costs, unusual geographic features and lack of certain services, all of which lead to higher costs of municipal services and a higher cost of living to northern taxpayers.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They recognize that is a problem at last!

Hon. Mr. White: From time to time we have taken certain steps to alleviate part of these problems, and in the case of mining municipalities we have made available mining revenue payments. In introducing a new revenue-sharing plan, we have recognized the additional needs of northern Ontario.

The government has decided, therefore, to add to the general support grant for all municipalities in northern Ontario. These municipalities will be eligible for an additional 10 per cent of their municipal levies, over and above the four per cent general rate. We estimate the value of this extra support for northern Ontario municipalities to be about $8.6 million in 1973.

For a municipality in the north, the maximum total of the assistance in 1973 from the above programmes would amount to 36 per cent of its 1972 municipal level.

That is, 20 per cent from the resource equalization grant, 14 per cent from the general support grant and an extra two per cent for economy in spending.

For years mining municipalities, most of which are in northern Ontario, have enjoyed special recognition for the unusual financial position in which many of them found themselves by virtue of the presence of mining enterprises which could not be easily assessed.

In 1971, the programme of payments to designated mining municipalities was revised and increased by the introduction of a resource equalization formula. This formula was similar to the general resource equalization grant introduced in this budget. Because of the increased grants to mining municipalities in the form of resource equalization and general support grants, including additional grants to northern Ontario, mining revenue payments will be discontinued. Each mining municipality will be more than compensated for the elimination of those payments by the new property tax stabilization plan.

To complete the government's comprehensive plan for reduction of property taxes, I would like to describe the final feature of the plan. As the members know, not all municipalities incur the cost of policing in their communities. Where policing is provided, however, the costs put considerable pressure on local budgets.

In recognition of this fact, the government established an unconditional grant of $1.75 per capita last year. We now propose to raise this grant by $1.25 to a total of $3 per capita for eligible municipalities. The present grant of $3.25 for regional police forces will be raised by $1.75 to a total of $5 per capita. These increases will require additional grants from this government of more than $9 million in the current year.

It might be appropriate for me to stress at this point that we are urging and encouraging

municipal governments to put the highest priority on restraint in their spending. The government expects similar prudence from the boards and agencies which budget independently from local governments and yet are financed by local property taxpayers.

Mr. Lawlor: The more they get, the less they spend—or vice versa.

Hon. Mr. White: Let me review briefly now what I believe to be a well-balanced and new approach toward property tax reduction and stabilization. I have no illusions that this plan will prevent mill rate increases everywhere in this province, but to the extent that some increases do occur they will be significantly modified by our new revenue sharing.

I recognize that this plan will have a major impact on the 1973 budgeting and financing processes of municipalities. This draws attention to the problems inherent in having different fiscal year-ends at the provincial as compared with the municipal levels. I should therefore like to invite municipalities and affected institutions to comment on the advisability and implications of changing the provincial fiscal year to a calendar year basis.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Are they going to ask that before the statute or after the statute?

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): After.

Hon. Mr. White: I think the main point to be made about the government's comprehensive new plan is that it's balanced and takes account of a great variety of factors which have a bearing on rising property taxes.

The plan counters fiscal impairment by providing generous equalization payments. It recognizes the general financial imbalance with a general support grant. The plan recognizes the higher costs borne by northern municipalities and their taxpayers. It reduces the adverse impact of temporary population on resort municipalities. It meets the differential needs of communities that pay for their own policing. And finally it rewards economy in budgeting and efficiency in spending by both local and regional governments.

Our $100-million property tax stabilization plan makes available to municipalities almost three quarters of their anticipated cash deficit in 1973. I am confident that the overall package will be fair and provide assistance where it is most needed.

Other reforms and additional assistance: In addition to the $100 million for this major initiative, the government plans to carry forward its ongoing reform programme and increase the assistance to local governments.

Assistance to school boards: As the members will recall, the past few years have brought significant changes to the provincial support of school boards. Prior to 1970, our support amounted to less than 48 per cent. We have since raised it in three steps to a level of 58 per cent. During the same period, we have introduced spending controls and ceilings to avoid excessive demands on the taxpayers at a time of easing enrolment pressures.

The government has announced it will increase provincial grants to 60 per cent of school board spending in 1973. This concludes our staged increase in support level and fulfills our original pledge to reach this high level by 1973.

An hon. member: Done!

Hon. Mr. White: Another promise kept.

Mr. Foulds: The only one.

Hon. Mr. White: This major measure will be combined with an enrichment of the mill rate subsidy. The net cost to the government of this move will be approximately $40 million in the present fiscal year.

This year the government is taking another step in the implementation of its policy of bringing provincially owned or supported property into the local tax base. The approach taken for payment of local taxes by universities and community colleges has proved successful and will be expanded and extended to correctional institutions and hospitals.

The following reforms—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Wait for it!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps) should have some music!

Hon. Mr. White: This is a little birthday present on his 300th birthday.

The following reforms will provide municipalities with an additional $7.8 million in tax revenue in 1973. The payment for student post-secondary institutions will be increased to $50. A new payment will be made of $50 for public and provincial psychiatric hospital beds. A new payment will be introduced of

$50 per resident place in correctional institutions.

There will be a limit of 25 per cent of the net general levy on the amount a municipality can receive from these extensions of the tax base. These extensions of the tax base will be for municipal purposes only.

Now, with respect to payments in lieu of taxes. In recent years the government has acquired a great deal of land and will continue to do so for the preservation and development of accessible recreational areas. In a number of municipalities this policy involves a significant transfer of land into provincial ownership, with a corresponding reduction in the local tax base. Therefore the government intends to broaden its payments in lieu of taxes to cover such land acquisitions.

Assessment and taxation of land on Indian reserves: The government is offering to provide funds in 1973 to compensate municipalities for the elimination of taxes on tenant-occupied Indian lands. After extensive study of the law and practice of taxation of leased property on Indian reserves and of its social and financial implications, the government believes that this property should be removed from taxation and the estimates will include this expenditure intention.

Meetings will be organized for the near future with representatives of the Indian bands and municipalities to discuss how the transition from the taxation to the exemption of property leased to non-Indians can be best achieved. I expect that some Indian bands and municipalities will want to make agreements for the supply of municipal services on reserves in return for reasonable payment. Others will want to proceed independently. These practical matters will be resolved on consultation with the people directly concerned in each case.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear! By the time the member for Thunder Bay has been here for 1,000 years, the Treasurer will have become a socialist.

An hon. member: Good move; good move.

Hon. Mr. White: Other forms of assistance. The government will also make available substantial additional funds to municipalities in a variety of existing programmes. Some of these have already been announced by my colleagues responsible for these programmes. Full details on others will be provided during the estimate debates. Let me enumerate these major changes being proposed by the government:

Library grants: Various aspects of these grants will be enriched, involving additional grants of about $4.5 million in 1973-1974.

Transit assistance: The province will make grants of 75 per cent on approved spending on transit vehicles and related facilities at a cost of about $13 million in 1973-1974. An increase in the maximum subsidy for transit deficits will cost an additional $2 million in 1973-1974.

Computer traffic control: The province has set aside $2.5 million in 1973-1974 for assistance toward the cost of traffic signal systems, installation of computer traffic control systems, and municipal studies on intermediate capacity systems and corridors.

New regional governments: The Sudbury and Waterloo regional governments will become eligible for $3.2 million in unconditional grants. In addition, they will receive $2.7 million in transitional assistance.

Welfare costs: The province will assume about $2.4 million in welfare costs formerly borne by municipalities through a transfer of certain general welfare assistance recipients to the province's family benefits programme.

Water and sewage: Eligible municipalities will receive an increase from 50 per cent to 75 per cent in capital subsidies on sewerage and water projects.

Museum grants will be doubled in 1973-1974.

In total, these provincial commitments will transfer more than $30 million in additional funds to local government.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to summarize the total provincial programme of new reforms and additional assistance to local governments. As detailed in a chart, the 1973 reform plan involves additional financing of more than $180 million to local governments. That's in the new plans only. This reform plan represents an increased emphasis on unconditional transfers to local government. Moreover, existing per capita unconditional grants will be continued at past rates of funding.

These additional transfers far exceed the 1973 financing deficiency of local governments. As a result, I expect there will be reductions in mill rates in most municipalities. The distribution of our 1973 reform will, of course, provide much greater benefits to some municipalities compared to others. There will be a whole range of mill rate effects, with many substantial reductions as well as a

limited number of increases. This is as it should be. We have made certain that the greater relief goes where it is most needed.

I would like to put in historical prospective for the members the magnitude of the province's efforts to improve local financing. Our financial transfers to local governments have mounted steadily since the provincial-municipal reform programme which started in 1969. In 1973, the government will transfer $1.9 billion to local governments, or 48.5 per cent of their total revenue. This compares with 1.3 billion, or 41.5 per cent of local revenue in 1970. In addition, to this direct assistance to local government, and $260 million to local agencies, the province will pay $200 million directly to property taxpayers in 1973 in the form of property tax credits and farm tax relief grants.

In total then, the province has assumed some $2.4 billion, which would otherwise fall on the property tax. This represents more than 90 per cent of the total yield in 1973-1974 of our retail sales and personal income taxes together, and these are Ontario's most important tax fields. The $180 million in new financing provided in this budget passes on to local governments more than the equivalent value of one point of our retail sales tax.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Let's talk about that now.

Hon. Mr. White: Details of that are given on the next page.

Mr. Reid: And now the bad news! We have had the good news.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, let me now describe the ways by which this government proposes to finance its 1973 spending programme, the new property tax stabilization plan and other reforms. As I have already stated, this budget embodies the fiscal constraints and expenditure imperatives which we must accommodate. Accordingly, the government has decided to raise certain provincial taxes, to decrease property taxes, and to improve the incidence of the retail sales tax.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Improve the incidence?

Mr. Singer: Improve the incidence?

Hon. Mr. White: In deciding tax changes for 1973-1974, I have considered a number of factors: The state of the economy and the appropriate fiscal stance for the province; our long-term financial outlook and reduced revenue growth potential in future; the existing level of public debt; the need for new revenue-sharing with municipalities; and simplification of the tax structures.

With these considerations in mind, I concluded that our budgetary deficit must be reduced in 1973-1974 to a level of about $400 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Treasurer is sure about that is he?

Hon. Mr. White: Expenditures, including the municipal reform plan I have just outlined, requires gross budgetary spending of $7,269 million in 1973-1974.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Very gross.

Hon. Mr. White: Our existing tax rates and base can be expected to generate $6,534 million in revenue. This would leave a budgetary deficit of $735 million, which is more than is prudent at this time. Accordingly, I am proposing tax measures to raise about $330 million in additional revenue at the provincial level during the 1973-1974 fiscal year.

A tax increase of this magnitude means we must look to our major revenue sources—personal income tax, retail sales tax and corporation taxes.

I have rejected an increase in the personal income tax for two reasons.

First, the federal Minister of Finance explicitly asked the provinces not to increase their use of this tax field in 1973. Now that the federal government has turned back to taxpayers some of the revenues from its surplus income tax capacity and its gains from tax reform, I am reluctant to deny these tax savings to our citizens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: The second and equally important reason, however, is that the Feb. 19 federal budget proposes major structural changes in this tax field less than two years after the income tax system was thought to be reformed. The latest federal proposals would not only lock the provinces into a decreased progressivity pattern in personal income taxation, but also reduce the long-run growth capacity of the income tax field.

I am convinced, therefore, that an increase in our income tax rate would be unwise before the implications of these changes are fully understood. A federal-provincial meeting of finance ministers is scheduled for early May at which time Ontario intends to pursue these considerations.

I have also decided not to recommend an increase in corporation income tax.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: To raise a significant portion of the new revenues required would necessitate an increase in the corporate tax rate which would make Ontario uncompetitive with other jurisdictions. Moreover, the expiration on March 31, 1973, of our five per cent investment tax credit means that the income tax liability of many Ontario corporations will automatically be somewhat higher in 1973-1974.

Finally, I am convinced that we must avoid placing greatly increased tax burdens on our businesses at a time when a high level of investment is needed to improve our international competitiveness and create new jobs.

Nevertheless, I am proposing to raise some additional revenue from the corporate sector in the form of the paid-up capital tax. Having exhausted this potential I must rely upon the retail sales tax to produce the remainder of our revenue requirements.

Let me proceed, therefore, to enumerate the tax measures which I am proposing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Taxes on corporations: I have decided that the most appropriate way to secure additional revenues from corporations is to increase the paid-up capital tax, particularly as this can be accommodated by structural reforms in this tax. Accordingly, I am proposing the following changes in the paid-up capital tax, effective with respect to the fiscal years of corporations ending after April 12, 1973.

The rate of general capital tax will be doubled from one-tenth of one per cent to one-fifth of one per cent.

The capital tax base will be broadened to include all bank loans.

The archaic special tax on railway, express, telegraph and Pullman car corporations will be repealed. Instead, these corporations will be liable to the general capital tax imposed on ordinary corporations.

The capital tax on banks will be streamlined by redefining the capital tax base to include only that portion of capital used within Ontario; repealing the office tax on banks; and imposing a single rate of two-fifths of one per cent on all taxable capital of banks compared to one-fifth of one per cent on paid-up capital stock, and one-tenth of one per cent on the reserve funds.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: In addition to increasing revenue, these measures will eliminate inconsistencies in treatment of different corporations and simplify the tax application. I estimate that these changes will generate an additional $33 million gross revenue in a full year and $10 million in the 1973-1974 fiscal year.

I would also point out that the final burden of these tax increases will be somewhat less since the capital tax is allowed as a deduction under the federal and provincial corporation income taxes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I remember very well not so many years ago when it was the custom in this House not to interrupt the Treasurer's budget statement. I do not know if the objective was courtesy or comprehension, but I have observed that the opposition lacks both.

I also propose to raise—

Mr. Lewis: The government is taking $10 million from the corporations and $280 million from individuals. That's a nice balance the Treasurer has in this budget. A nice balance.

Hon. Mr. White: The member should speak to his financial critic. The member doesn't quite understand it.

Mr. Lewis: I am quite confident that our financial critic will say the same.

Hon. Mr. White: I also propose to raise additional revenues from corporations that pay management fees, rents, royalties and similar payments to foreign owners with whom they do not deal at arm's length. An amendment to Ontario's Corporations Tax Act will be introduced to achieve this necessary tightening up, which I estimate will produce an additional $5 million in revenue per year.

A number of minor improvements will also be introduced in our Corporations Tax Act and Income Tax Act covering mutual fund corporations, mutual fund trusts and fraternal societies. These changes will generally parallel federal legislation and will have minimal revenue significance.

Retail sales tax: The principal tax source which I have selected to raise additional

revenues is the retail sales tax. As shown in budget paper B accompanying this statement, the retail sales tax has a number of positive advantages over other revenue sources. It is an economically responsive tax and automatically generates revenue increments at a faster rate than the annual growth in the economy.

A substantial component of the sales tax is highly progressive in that high-income tax payers tend to consume a relatively large share of those items taxed at the 10 per cent rate.

Mr. Lawlor: That isn't what the select committee said.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh yes they did.

Mr. Lawlor: No it did not. It is retrogressive.

Hon. Mr. White In addition, the exemptions for food, children's clothing and prescription drugs protect low-income families from the main burden of the tax.

Finally, the Ontario committee on taxation recommended that greater use be made of this tax field when the province was seeking to augment its basic financial position. To meet Ontario's need for substantially increased revenues I propose to increase the retail sales tax rate from five per cent to seven per cent, effective May 1, 1973.

Mr. Lewis: Resign. Resign.

Mr. Stokes: Why aren't the Tories applauding?

Hon. Mr. White: While I recognize that this represent a large increase, I would remind members that all provinces east of Ontario have an equally high or higher rate of sales tax. I estimate that this move will produce an additional $280 million in sales tax revenues in 1973-1974, and some $340 million in a full fiscal year.

I would emphasize again that our new revenue-sharing deal for municipalities means that more than half of this increased sales tax revenue will be passed through to local governments. Moreover, I am proposing a substantial enrichment in Ontario's tax credit system—which I shall outline later—to ensure that the burden of this tax increase will fall on our more prosperous taxpayers.

Members will recall a sales tax credit was recommended by the select committee on taxation "with the objective of improving the equity and efficiency of the provincial sales tax."

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The White committee recommended that.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, and the Liberal members subscribed to it, if I'm not mistaken.

Concurrent with the increase in the sales tax rate, I'm proposing a number of changes in the retail sales tax base to improve its equity and efficiency of administration. Having carefully considered the retail sales tax recommendation of the royal commission on book publishing, I have decided not to tax magazines and periodicals for the reasons set forth in the report of the select committee on taxation.

While I recognize the constructive nature and good intent of the royal commission's recommendation, I continue to be opposed philosophically to taxing the flow of information and knowledge to our citizens.

Mr. Stokes: Is the Treasurer going to pay them for collecting the extra $280 million?

Hon. Mr. White: In the tradition of Winston Churchill.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): How come the government isn't fighting on the beaches?

Hon. Mr. White: I am recommending an increase from $2.50 to $4 in the exemption for meals served in restaurants. This recognizes that the costs of eating out have risen since 1969 when the $2.50 level was established. The new $4 level will improve the equity of the sales tax because it means that breakfasts, luncheons and many dinners will now be exempt from tax. It also means that Ontario's exemption will be more generous than the $1.25 to $2.50 levels allowed in most other provinces.

Mr. Singer: His generosity is too much.

Hon. Mr. White: Flowers and gardening: I am pleased to recommend that all seeds, bulbs, natural flowers, trees, bushes and shrubs be exempted from the sales tax.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are environment-conscious over here.

Hon. Mr. White: In the past we have tried to differentiate among these growing things, taxing some and exempting others. I am convinced that the province can afford the $4 million loss in revenues by exempting all such forms of vegetation, if only because of the beauty they add to our environment. In particular, those citizens who enjoy garden-

ing will appreciate this modest concession to one of the most pleasant aspects of our daily lives.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: There are a lot of vegetables over there we can do without.

Hon. Mr. White: Household pets: For similar reasons I propose to eliminate the retail sales tax on the purchase of household pets. Personally, I find it abhorrent to put a tax on these lovable creatures which become, in effect, members of our families.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the government allow pets in Ontario Housing Corp. developments?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Special occasion permits: At present when alcoholic beverages are resold under a special occasion permit, the 10 per cent retail sales tax must be collected from the consumer. This has proven expensive to administer, and difficult to enforce. Therefore, I propose to repeal the sales tax liability under special occasion permits and replace it with a special levy to be collected in the liquor, wine and Brewers Retail stores at the time of purchase.

This practical change will decrease the tax burdens on those organizations, clubs and groups which have properly collected and remitted sales tax in the past, while ensuring a revenue contribution from those who have failed to collect and remit the sales tax in the past. I estimate that this change to a more practical system will produce some $3 million in extra revenue annually.

Even after the increase in retail sales tax, I found it necessary to secure additional revenues to meet the target deficit. Accordingly, I am proposing to apply the retail sales tax to all forms of energy which are presently untaxed in Ontario. This would be a seven per cent value tax to be collected primarily under the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Singer: No applause for that?

Hon. Mr. White: Because gasoline, diesel fuel, propane and some other energy fuels are already taxed on a unit basis however, it will be necessary to integrate these existing forms of energy taxation within a comprehensive system.

Allow me to illustrate for you how we propose to do this in practice. Gasoline, liquid petroleum gases, diesel fuel, furnace oil, kerosene, natural or manufactured gas, coal, coke and electricity used for heating, lighting, cooking and similar purposes will be taxed at seven per cent of the retail selling price—

Mr. Singer: Oh that's nice. No applause for that.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): That will help the poor.

Hon. Mr. White: —or two cents per gallon in the case of gasoline. When these fuels or forms of energy are used directly in manufacturing, they will not be subject to tax. This means that the electricity used to operate production machinery will not be taxed, while the electricity used for lighting will be taxed.

Mr. Bullbrook: Take the tax off their house —and tax their stove.

Hon. Mr. White: It also means that energy sources which are used in basic production processes, such as natural gas, will be exempt. Gasoline, liquid petroleum gases and diesel fuel, when used in motor vehicles, road construction equipment, pleasure boats and snowmobiles will continue to be taxed at 19 cents per gallon and 25 cents per gallon, respectively.

Gasoline and diesel fuel operating internal combustion engines, used for purposes other than licensed vehicles or manufacturing, will be subject to a seven per cent tax on selling price; or two cents per gallon in the case of gasoline. This means that activities such as farming, fishing, tourist camp, and railways, formerly receiving full or partial rebate, will now bear a standardized, low, effective tax rate.

Because this represents a new approach to energy taxation in Ontario, I propose to delay the effective date of implementing this policy to July 1, 1973. The expected net revenue yield therefore is estimated at only $65 million in 1973-74, as compared to $100 million in the full fiscal year.

Let me point out some of the positive benefits of this new tax policy, apart from generating increased revenues. First, diesel fuel used in mining and manufacturing and forestry will now bear no tax as compared to the present eight cent tax. This represents a substantial tax cut which will lower costs to all users, particularly in northern Ontario communities, largely dependent on this energy source. Second, the taxation of all energy sources used for the same purpose eliminates

the bias in favour of formerly untaxed energy sources. Third, by taxing energy there will be an incentive to prevent waste and to achieve the most efficient utilization of this vital resource.

Mr. Stokes: That will really help the people of the north with their heating. The government should be really proud of itself.

Hon. Mr. White: I think it is not too much to hope that pollution will also be diminished somewhat.

Finally, let me emphasize again that I am proposing to enrich Ontario's tax credit system. The additional tax credit I am proposing will more than offset the additional costs of heating and lighting on the average residence resulting from this taxation of energy.

The members will recall that in the 1972 budget, Ontario established a new property tax credit plan which relates property taxes to ability to pay via the personal income tax mechanism. Subsequently, Manitoba and Alberta introduced similar schemes to channel tax relief to those individuals and families least able to pay.

Ontario taxpayers are now filing their 1972 income tax returns and getting the benefits of this progressive programme. We have co-operated closely with the Department of National Revenue to iron out initial difficulties and have found that the tax credit system is working remarkably smoothly.

I expect that $160 million or more in property tax credits will be provided to Ontario taxpayers either in the form of tax refunds or reduced income tax liability in this year.

Given this good performance, I am proposing to enrich the benefits distributed through the tax credit mechanism to ensure that the burden of the tax on energy and the increased sales tax does not fall on our low income families, I am recommending the introduction of a retail sales tax credit which would provide $90 million of offsetting tax relief.

While the mechanics of such a sales tax credit must be arranged with the federal government, I favour a simple tax credit formula equal to one per cent of personal exemptions. Based on the 1973 level of exemptions, this would provide a tax credit of $16 to single taxpayers, $30 to a married couple, $36 to a family of four, $48 to a family with six children and so on.

By comparison, the seven per cent tax on energy would amount to $28 per year per household on average, estimating total expenses on home heating and lighting to be $400 per year. Where families choose to economize on heating and lighting costs however, they will be money ahead as a result of this move.

Mr. Stokes: Why can't they freeze a little? Is that what the minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I notice that our family is turning down the thermostat a bit this year.

The total value of the retail sales tax credit is estimated to amount to approximately $90 million.

An hon. member: Cover it again.

Hon. Mr. White: No, I have covered that.

The total value of the retail sales tax credit is estimated to amount to approximately $90 million per year compared to total tax increases of $50 million from energy used for residential heating and lighting. Thus, a new sales tax credit will offset the energy tax and the increased sales tax burden on half or more of our families. Budget paper B illustrates the progressive result of the sales tax credit and the existing property tax credit.

When Ontario's new credit tax system was introduced in last year's budget, my predecessor indicated that the province would like to substitute tax credits for our supplementary grants to needy pensioners. At present we are paying some $20 million, in the form of $50 and $100 grants, to pensioners in receipt of the federal guaranteed income supplement.

Now that the basic tax credit plan has been in operation for a year, I think it is appropriate to make this change. Accordingly, I am recommending a pensioner tax credit of $100 on a sliding scale related to taxable income to tax filers who are 65 years of age or over. This pension, or tax credit, will have a value of $40 million annually, which is $20 million more than our existing grants to needy pensioners, which will be ended.

Altogether then, the new tax credits I am proposing will enrich Ontario's tax redistribution plan by $130 million to a total value of $290 million for the 1973 income tax year.

The total tax credit payable under Ontario's enriched plan will be the sum of the property tax credit, sales tax credit and pensioner tax credit, less one per cent of taxable income. This ensures the distribution of benefits among Ontario taxpayers on the fairest possible basis.

I am confident that this will make our total tax burden more equitable for our people.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined the tax measures the government has decided to recommend to strengthen Ontario's basic financial capacity and to ensure fairer distribution of the total tax burden. Now let me turn to a number of tax changes which I am proposing for other reasons.

Security transfer tax: The Ontario committee on taxation regarded the security transfer tax as "a nuisance tax and that it has no relation to benefits received." It said the tax was "not simple, clear or certain" and it proposed the substitution of a retail sales tax on the commissions charged by security dealers and brokers. The select committee of the Legislature endorsed this recommendation, subject to implementation of similar taxes in Quebec and British Columbia. The select committee recognized that it is impossible to impose either form of tax in Ontario without losing business, unless similar taxes are imposed on all Canadian stock exchanges. Quebec abolished its transfer tax a year ago and there is no similar tax in British Columbia, so Ontario now is alone in taxing security transfers.

A significant loss of trading is evident as a consequence. Statistics show that Toronto's share of the market has fallen to 70.4 per cent in the first quarter of 1973, from 71.3 per cent in the corresponding period last year. A further decline is indicated for March when the share dropped 69.3 per cent. Even more significant, the value of trading on the Toronto Stock Exchange grew by only 8.7 per cent in the first quarter of 1973 over the first quarter of 1972. By contrast, trading on the Montreal exchanges rose by 35 per cent.

To the extent that this shift in trading is likely to continue as a result of this tax differential, the security transfer tax is self-defeating as a revenue-raising instrument. More important, retention of this impost by Ontario would result in a loss of related private sector income and jobs, with consequent reductions in our other revenues such as personal and corporate income taxes. Therefore, I propose to repeal the security transfer tax, effective immediately, to ensure that Ontario retains its position as the major capital market in Canada. The anticipated gross loss in revenues from this source this year is $7 million. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that the removal of this impost will have a positive influence on the acquisition of equity ownership by Canadians.

Highway tolls and park fees: Fees, licences and permits of various kinds are an important element in Ontario's total revenue structure. Following a complete review of these fees in 1972, many were increased and more properly reflect the actual operating costs of the associated service, function or benefit to users. Further review this year has indicated two areas where a change is desirable—tolls on the Burlington Bay and Garden City skyways, and provincial park fees.

I propose to eliminate tolls on the Burlington Bay and Garden City skyways effective July 1.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Be careful. Don't get carried away. The member for Welland South almost let himself go.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): He just doesn't like the name.

Hon. Mr. White: These tolls have proved to be costly and troublesome. They are not in accord with the government's overall policy of toll-free highways and bridges.

This removal should speed up traffic and eliminate irritation to commuters, tourists and truck drivers. I also propose to eliminate camping and day fees in our provincial parks for all Canadian senior citizens, effective tomorrow.

An hon. member: Great move. Great move!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: This will ensure that our senior citizens can enjoy the serenity of Ontario's public recreation areas at no cost. My colleagues responsible for the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the Ministry of Natural Resources will provide full details in their estimates.

Mr. Martel: That will aggravate!

Hon. Mr. White: Regarding succession duty reductions, as you know, Mr. Speaker, it has been the policy of the Ontario government to withdraw gradually from the succession duty field of taxation as capital gains taxation matures.

Mr. Lawlor: A mistaken policy.

Hon. Mr. White: In the 1970 and 1971 budgets we introduced tax changes which eliminated succession duties on all but the largest estates. As a result, our revenue yield has declined from $81 million in 1970-1971

to an estimated $70 million in 1973-1974. During the same period, revenues accruing to the province from the federal estate tax have gone from $28 million to $2 million for this year.

In this budget, I am proposing measures to continue this policy of phased decreases in succession duties. I think this approach is warranted for two reasons. First, our succession duties continue to have an undesirable impact on small businesses, family farms and Canadian ownership. Second, other provinces are vacating this field. In recent months both New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have announced their intention to eliminate succession duties. Quebec has also announced staged reductions in its succession duties—a 20 per cent cut effective Jan. 1, 1973, and a further 20 per cent cut effective Jan. 1, 1974.

Last year the government appointed an advisory committee on succession duties under the chairmanship of Mr. J. Alex Langford, QC. This committee has just completed its report, which has been tabled in the Legislature. On behalf of the government, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee for their efforts and accomplishments. In the months ahead, we intend to review and assess the committee's recommendations with a view to making improvements in our statute.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the government intends to proceed with immediate changes in three priority areas, interspousal transfers, family farms and family firms. Let me outline, briefly, the substance of these changes and the principles upon which they are based. Full details are set out in the appendix to this statement dealing with tax changes.

I propose to eliminate all duty on transfer of assets between spouses. I feel strongly that the accumulation of assets by a couple over their lifetime is a joint effort and that it is unreasonable upon the death of one partner to impose a tax on the surviving spouse.

I also propose to relieve the burden of succession duties on bona fide family farms by permitting a disappearing amortization or gradual forgiveness of death duty on farm assets over a 25-year period, provided the farm continues to operate as a family farm. Family farms make an important contribution to the social and economic fabric of this province. Relief from death taxation will help to preserve family farms and their attendant green space as well as ensure continuation of their unique contribution to our society. In conjunction with these changes in succession duties, the government also intends to make provision for a once-in-a-lifetime gift of an interest in a family farm by a farmer to his children of up to $50,000 free of gift tax.

I intend to introduce amendments to alleviate the burden of duty on family firms. The government considers it imperative that Canadian ownership be encouraged, particularly in family firms which have been created by Canadians. Therefore, I'm proposing a choice of alternatives—six years to pay or payments in shares to the Ontario Heritage Foundation. This latter provision is similar to the practice in the United Kingdom where it appears to have worked well. If an election is made to pay in shares, the government will accept shares from the firm at fair market value, thereby eliminating the need to sell controlling interest in the company in order to satisfy succession duty obligations. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that these new measures will help retain family firms within the control of Canadians.

This package of succession duty reforms comes into effect after midnight tonight. I estimate the total revenue cost of these necessary and practical reforms to be about $11 million in the 1973-1974 fiscal year.

Reduction in farm property taxes: In addition to the relief from gift tax and succession duties on family farms, the government has decided to reduce the property taxes borne by farmers. At present, we provide $20 million in grants, offsetting 25 per cent of the total property taxes paid by farmers, or about half of the property taxes applicable to farm lands. This year we are increasing our tax relief grant to 50 per cent of the total property tax burden, which is equivalent to complete exemption from property taxation for all farm lands.

Concurrent with this additional farm tax relief, the province intends to tighten the administration of this programme to ensure that the benefits go to genuine farmers. Consequently, the increased funding we have provided in the 1973 estimates amounts to $16 million. This will help Ontario farmers to hold down production costs at a time when food prices are rising rapidly.

Let me conclude this section on tax measures by mentioning briefly the province's policy with respect to taxation of resource industries. This area of taxation has been subject to extensive federal changes in Bill C-259, as well as much recent changes by a number of provinces. Ontario is devoting considerable time to researching this complex area in order to develop its own long-term

strategy. In the meantime, we have introduced some minor changes to parallel improvements made in the new federal legislation.

Mr. Martel: That's not an improvement.

Mr. Foulds: May give them time to get it out of the ground.

Hon. Mr. White: Other federal changes involve major policy considerations and a complete assessment of their potential impact on Ontario mining and petroleum companies. Moreover, these federal changes do not begin to take effect until Jan. 1, 1974. Accordingly, I wish to reiterate that Ontario will bring forward its long-term policy on resource taxation as well as the necessary amendments to the Corporations Tax Act before the end of 1973. In designing our policy we continue to aim for the objectives set out in the 1971 budget by my colleague: To maintain the total tax burden on the mining industry approximately at its present level.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer doesn't have to say any more.

Mr. Renwick: There's a lot of study to be done.

Hon. Mr. White: To preserve provincial revenues and revenue growth capacity from the mining industry as a whole.

Mr. Martel: Santa Claus.

Hon. Mr. White: To provide incentives to encourage new investments in mining and processing in Ontario. And to compensate for tax shifts which would endanger small companies and dependent mining communities.

Mr. Martel: The Treasurer had better read Kierans. Small companies are going out of existence.

Hon. Mr. White: We are concerned also about the future of our pulp and paper industry. We intend to assess our tax impact on the forestry industry, on the pulp and paper industry, as well as other considerations in determining what provincial assistance might be required and practical.

Mr. Lewis: Forty-six million out of one and a half billion!

Hon. Mr. White: In aggregate the tax measures I have proposed will generate an estimated $333 million in additional tax revenues in 1973-1974.

Mr. Martel: It's a disgrace.

Hon. Mr. White: Of this amount Ontario is passing on $182 million, or more than the value of one point of our retail sales tax, to local governments. This will greatly strengthen the financial base of Ontario municipalities and create a more balanced and progressive overall structure in this province. In addition, $130 million will be dedicated to retail sales tax and pensioner credits which improve the fairness of the tax system.

The revenue changes I've described will maintain cash requirements at $836 million, almost the same level as 1972-1973. Our budgetary deficit will be reduced to $402 million which I believe to be appropriate for the coming year. Moreover, this improvement in the province's financial position has been achieved at the same time that we have embarked upon a bold plan of revenue-sharing with local governments. As a result, the total provincial-municipal sector in Ontario will now be in a sound financial position to meet public needs and emerging priorities. A table sets forth the details.

Total cash requirements of $836 million in 1973-1974 are consistent with our decision to adopt a neutral fiscal stance in the economy. It also demonstrates the government's determination to protect the province's high credit rating in the capital markets. I point out that this estimate of cash requirements includes $144 million for the North Pickering community development project. We have provided this full amount in our estimates but our net costs could be substantially lower if a satisfactory agreement for CMHC participation can be reached. Final cash requirements for 1973-1974, therefore, could be $692 million.

I estimate that our non-public financing will amount to $915 million in the current year. This exceeds our cash requirements by $79 million. It is my intention to use these funds and any unutilized portion of the $144 million North Pickering suspense account to reduce the province's outstanding public debt. In other words, Ontario's public debt will be reduced by between $100 million and $200 million in 1973-1974.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Legislature to share my belief that this is a workable and a responsible budget which charts a clear course of action for the year ahead.

Mr. Foulds: The Treasurer's course is clear. Hit the little guy.

Hon. Mr. White: It applies stringent restraints on provincial spending. It accords the highest priority to sharing resources with local governments. It redistributes the burden of taxation to make it fairer. It nurtures our rural sector. It encourages wise use of resources. It assists Canadian entrepreneurs. It raises revenues to keep the province in a sound financial position and it maintains Ontario's reputation for fiscal integrity.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my budget statement and copies with the budget papers will now be distributed. Thank you.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Lewis: No one else could have carried it off; I am prepared to give the Treasurer that. Two per cent on the sales tax and he smiles.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the House but, prior to that, I would advise the House that tomorrow we will be in committee of supply.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 12, 1973

Toronto downtown housing, statement by Mr. Grossman 873

Environmental hearing in Pickering, statement by Mr. Auld 873

Welfare ministers' conference, statement by Mr. Brunelle 874

Waterloo Lutheran University, statement by Mr. McNie 876

Environmental hearing in Pickering, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Deacon 877

OHIP premiums, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon 878

Happy Valley relocation, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Martel, Mr. Laughren 878

WCB and OLRB exclusion from Act, questions of Mr. Kerr and Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 879

Budget 'leak', question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 879

Status of women, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis 880

Suspension of Ottawa policeman, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman 880

Action of former Minister of Health, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Roy 884

Pollution controls for motor vehicles, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Young 884

Fuel costs, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Haggerty 885

Truck driving practices, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Gisborn 885

Family court procedures, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mrs. Campbell 885

London centre for handicapped, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Spence 886

Rumours of Inco layoff, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Laughren 886

Pollution problem at Canadian Gypsum, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Good 887

Economic effects of relocating personnel, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes 887

Presenting report, Ministry of Correctional Services, Mr. Apps 887

Presenting reports, energy board, St. Clair Parkway Commission, St. Lawrence Parkway Commission, Mr. Bernier 887

Presenting report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Henderson 887

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Taylor 888

Use of Pesticides Act, bill to control, Mr. Auld, first reading 888

New Augarita Porcupine Mines Ltd. Act, bill respecting, Mr. MacBeth, first reading 888

Township of Gloucester Act, bill respecting, Mr. Handleman, first reading 888

Town of Vaughan Act, bill respecting, Mr. Deacon, first reading 888

Borough of York Act, bill respecting, Mr. MacDonald, first reading 888

Simcoe Day Act, bill respecting, Mr. G. E. Smith, first reading 889

Natural Resource Technicians Association Act, bill to incorporate, Mr. Rhodes, first reading 889

City of Toronto Act, bill respecting, Mr. Wardle, first reading 889

City of Windsor Act, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 889

Aradco Management Ltd. and Oak Stamping Ltd. Act, bill respecting, Mr. Burr, second reading 889

City of Hamilton Act, bill respecting, Mr. S. R. Smith, second reading 889

East York Foundation Act, bill respecting, Mr. Timbrell, second reading 890

Simcoe and Erie General Insurance Co. Act, bill respecting, Mr. Ewen, second reading 890

Reliable Life Insurance Co. Act, bill respecting, Mr. Ewen, second reading 890

Constitution Insurance Co. of Canada Act, bill respecting, Mr. Reilly, second reading 890

Town of Orangeville Act, bill respecting, Mr. Downer, second reading 890

Village of Glencoe Act, bill respecting, Mr. Eaton, second reading 890

Borough of Scarborough Act, bill respecting, Mr. Drea, second reading 891

Town of Espanola Act, bill respecting, Mr. Lane, second reading 891

Bridge St. United Church Foundation Act, bill respecting, Mr. Rollins, second reading 891

Tillson Spur Line Railway Co. Act, bill respecting, Mr. Parrott, second reading 891

Town of Tillsonburg Act, bill respecting, Mr. Parrott, second reading 891

County of Bruce Act, bill respecting, Mr. Gaunt, second reading 891

Third readings 891

Trustee Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 894

Fatal Accidents Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 894

Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 895

Devolution of Estates Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 895

Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 896

Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 896

Third readings 898

Notice of motion No. 1, Mr. White 898

Budget address, Mr. White 898

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to 916

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 916

No. 21



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, April 13, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1973

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors with us today—in the east gallery, students from Bloor Collegiate Institute of Toronto, and St. Roch Separate School of Weston; in the west gallery, students from T. A. Blakelock Secondary School of Oakville. Later on in the morning we will be favoured with the presence of teachers from St. John's School of Kitchener in the east gallery.

Statements by the ministry.

CYANIDE DISCHARGE TO SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning in Kitchener the sewage treatment plant experienced an upset in treatment process. One of the operators who had had experience with cyanide suggested this smelled like it and the bylaw enforcement officer for the regional municipality was contacted.

Samples were collected and at noon the aeration section contained about five parts per million total cyanide and at 2 p.m. the effluent contained about 1.5 parts per million free cyanide. The river flow at the time was about 1,000 cu ft per sec giving a pollution factor of about 50 to 1. Therefore the concentration in the river was probably less than 0.1 parts per million, and I might say that the permissible level in public surface water supplies is 0.2 parts per million.

Our staff and staff from the region were on site and the waterworks downstream at Brantford and Cayuga was notified as a precautionary measure. With the time delay to Brantford of 30 hours and a further 30 hours to Cayuga, and the additional dilution from the Nith River and other tributary streams, the levels will be much below the safety limit when the contaminant reaches these potable supplies.

The MOHs have been notified, of course. In summary, at this point, no public health hazard exists. The source is being traced by the city but some biological life in the river may be affected.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with the recommendations contained in section 116 of the Provincial Auditor's report, 1971-1972, and in response to several questions with respect to government policy in this matter, which have been raised recently by hon. members opposite and directed to my colleague the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier).

Mr. Speaker, on Jan. 2, 1973, the Management Board of Cabinet directed that the cost of all flights for purposes other than resource protection and development is to be charged at a standard hourly rate, approved for this purpose by the Management Board and on a pro-rata basis where applicable, to the ministry or ministries concerned. Where a group of ministers or officials is involved, the total cost will be charged to the ministry of primary interest. Where such a flight is made in respect of government business generally or by any minister representing the government, the cost will be charged to the Ministry of Government Services.

With respect to the policy governing the use of these facilities, Management Board has further directed that they shall be made available to transport ministers or deputies on those occasions when constraints on time, cost and the availability of alternatives make any other transportation arrangements inappropriate. This policy is now in effect in all ministries, and the policy outlined by the Premier (Mr. Davis) in his statement of April 4, 1972, will continue to apply insofar as the Premier is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the government has not altered its view with respect to the tabling of flight records, logbooks or other documents in connection with the various aircraft used by the government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the government has not deemed it advisable to act on the first

recommendation contained in the report to the minister and has determined that the complete supervision, including the administrative and operating expenses of the Toronto-based aircraft, should continue to be under the Ministry of Natural Resources rather than transferred to the Ministry of Government Services.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about making them available to northern members?

WCB OFFICIAL

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 3, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), who unfortunately is not in his seat this morning, in his reply to the Speech from the Throne made several remarks about Mr. A. G. MacDonald, executive manager of the Workmen's Compensation Board. The tone and context of the remarks have left the impression in Hansard that Mr. MacDonald accepted a bribe.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How does Hansard express a tone?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: As the House knows, Mr. Speaker, such action on Mr. MacDonald's part would constitute grounds for a criminal prosecution.

The hon. member said:

> He has a $75,000 yacht, he has two lovely homes, he winters in Switzerland, yet he is the man who, on a $30,000 salary, engineered the Fidinam deal.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the House that Mr. MacDonald does not own a boat, he has one home and he has never been to Switzerland, or even Europe, for that matter.

An hon. member: Wrong again!

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Par for the course for the member for Grey-Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. MacDonald has been with the Workmen's Compensation Board since 1946, and in those 27 years he has been steadily promoted to his present position as executive manager, which is the equivalent of a deputy minister.

I very greatly regret that the hon. member should make such an attack on Mr. MacDonald, and I feel that the member's actions were cruel and cowardly. The member is well aware that Mr. MacDonald cannot rebut the member's remarks either in the House or in a court of law.

I do not expect the member to apologize to the House, neither do I presume that he would have the courage of his convictions to repeat his remarks outside the House. My only purpose in making this statement is to ensure that Hansard shows the member's accusation did not go unchallenged.

OPERATING GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I have two statements in which I think the members will be interested. One has to do with the letter that went out yesterday to all the universities and community colleges advising them as to the implications of the budget as far as their own funding is concerned.

Total operating grants to the universities and community colleges will rise from $555.4 million to $603.9 million, or 8.7 per cent over 1972-1973. Much of the increase in the funding comes with a rise in the value in the basic income unit which is used as referred to yesterday in the Treasurer's (Mr. White) statement. Other factors affecting the increase to universities include added weight to part-time programmes for grant purposes; more support for bilingual programmes, and an increase in grants to municipalities in lieu of taxes for education facilities.

As members were previously made aware, the formula for calculating grants based on enrolment has been changed with the introduction of slip-year financing. Under this method, grants for the 1973-1974 fiscal year will be based on actual enrolment in 1972-1973. At a time when post-secondary enrolment is levelling off or actually declining at some institutions, this approach will provide the institutions with an assured level of provincial support and assist them in their financial management. Since many community colleges still are expanding at varying rates, however, they will receive a transitional slip-year grant for this part only to allow for enrolment growth in full-time and part-time programmes.

Smaller universities, such as Brock and Trent, which have been experiencing problems due to declining enrolments, will receive added assistance in the form of a fixed sum compensatory grant based on careful assessment of their needs.

The government's policy of placing greater emphasis on part-time studies at Ontario universities is reflected in a decision now to count five course registrations as a full-time

equivalent for grant purposes. A new method of calculating support for bilingual programmes will also be introduced.

I might add that the full text of this statement will be made available to all members today.

University schools of social work will receive supplementary grants to finance field construction that used to be supported by the federal Department of National Health and Welfare and the former provincial Department of Social and Family Services.

Extra-formula grants for undergraduate programmes in health sciences and law will go to nine universities: University of Guelph for veterinary medicine; University of Windsor and York University for law; University of Ottawa and Queen's University for law, medicine and interns; University of Toronto and University of Western Ontario for law, medicine, interns and dentistry; McMaster University for medicine and interns, and to the University of Waterloo for optometry.

For the first time in 1973-1974 the colleges' estimates include operating support for 9,500 diploma nursing students who will be integrated into the system in September. Several colleges already are involved in health sciences programmes. Some nurses' training will continue in regional and hospital nursing school facilities.

The ministry's estimates, when they are presented to the Legislature, will also provide support of registered nursing assistants schools, including some provisions for students' living allowances. It is expected that the RNA schools eventually will be integrated into the colleges, at which time the college grants will be adjusted accordingly.

In addition to support for fee-paying post-secondary students, colleges will receive grants approximately equal to last year's for adult training. This will include sponsored students referred by Canada Manpower centres and from the province's programme for training in business and industry.

The estimates also provide for apprentices' tuition under the Ontario Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act. For both colleges and universities, grants to municipalities in lieu of taxes for post-secondary education facilities have been increased from previous dual rates of $25 or $35 to a universal $50 for each full-time student.

We have emphasized that the status of capital financing remains essentially unchanged since last November's announcement of a moratorium on new building projects. The capital estimates for 1973-1974 of $65 million, which is down from the 1972-1973 actual $147 million, will provide only for the capital requirements of those facilities already under construction or for emergency renovations. The renovations will be on a very limited basis, reflecting the results of a government survey of institutional needs.

STUDENT AWARDS PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. McNie: The other statement, Mr. Speaker, has to do with student awards.

Major changes in the Ontario Student Awards Programme are being announced today. I just visited this morning with the student awards officers from around the province and I am pleased at the very enthusiastic response we have received from these officers.

The total provided in the estimates for all student aid programmes in 1973-1974 has been increased to $38.4 million compared with an actual expenditure of about $27 million in the current year.

The modified student aid programme includes improvement in the parental contribution table, higher allowances for married students, an increase in the student awards weekly allowances, loans for students seeking financial independence from their parents, more bursaries to help students complete high school, fellowships for Ontario graduate students and pilot programmes to assist part-time students.

There are several highlights I would like to touch on, Mr. Speaker.

1. To encourage scholarship and academic excellence under the Ontario Student Awards Programme, exemptions for academic awards will now be allowed up to the level of tuition and incidental fees. Previously the limit was $150.

2. An improved parental contribution table has been adopted which boosts the basic family allowance from $1,800 to $4,000. This change will make available an additional $5 million in grants to students from lower and middle income families.

3. Where both of the student's parents are working, the allowable deduction has been substantially increased and now includes a babysitting allowance.

4. The weekly miscellaneous allowance has been increased by about 10 per cent to supplement existing provisions.

5. Married students will benefit to the extent of half a million dollars in grants as a result of a modified assessment procedure.

6. Ontario students who have worked for at least two full years and who wish to be financially independent of their parents can now apply for independent status under the Canada Student Loans Plan.

I am happy to report that considerable progress has been made in provincial talks with Ottawa leading to substantial improvements in the overall Canada Student Loans Plan. The disparity between our programme for assistance and the other provinces tends to increase, and we have taken leadership—and I think appropriately—in getting the other provinces together to get Ottawa to improve the programme as it applies to the whole of the Dominion and not just to the students in our province.

We have made a great deal of progress and they have been very co-operative. However, to date no action has been taken on two matters which have been sought by Ontario and other provinces:

1. Conditional repayments of loans based on income after graduation.

2. Aid for part-time students under the existing federal CSL programme.

We have developed an interim programme which goes part of the way but not all of the way toward meeting part-time students' needs:

1. In the first place, all publicly supported post-secondary institutions in Ontario will be encouraged to allow part-time students to spread their tuition payments over the length of their course when that fee is $50 or more. The province will make accelerated payments to institutions to offset any internal cash flow problems.

2. The ministry is also undertaking a programme which will make bank loans more readily accessible to part-time students, and also to those full-time students who for various reasons choose to be financially independent of their parents but who do not at present qualify for assistance.

Continuing studies of conditional repayment of loans and aid to part-time students through the Canada Student Loans programme are being carried out by the federal and provincial governments.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the highlights of the programmes that we have just announced to the student awards officers and which are being released to the press today. We felt it was important to get this information to the campuses while the students are still there and making plans for the upcoming year.

'BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS'

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform members of the Legislature that a document entitled "Budget Highlights" has been put in each member's postal box. This document shows the additional grant moneys available for every municipality in Ontario, and my thought was that some of the hon. members might like to get this before they go home for the weekend.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. member for Downsview.

SALES TAX ON ENERGY

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer.

Does the Treasurer not think that the imposition of a seven per cent tax on energy announced in yesterday's budget is a regressive form of tax, taxing as it does necessities of life which make up a higher portion of a poor family's budget than of a wealthy family's budget? Does the Treasurer not agree that this particular form of tax levies a substantially and grossly unfair burden on those residents of the province in northern Ontario whose annual costs for light, and particularly for fuel for heating, are in excess of those in southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the answer to both of those questions is no. First of all, the retail sales tax credit for the average family in this province will exceed the retail sales tax on fuel and the incremental retail sales tax on other goods.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): No way.

Hon. Mr. White: Secondly, the additional resources—$8.6 million in the stabilization fund for northern municipalities—will result in a disproportionately large mill decrease. So the residents of northern Ontario will have a lower tax burden as a result of this budget than they did before.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Oh, come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Supplementary: I wonder if the Treasurer has considered the impost that will apply to rural areas of the province, other than in northern Ontario, as a result of the additional rural Ontario Hydro rates?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, as the hon. member knows, we have shifted $16 million in one project alone into rural Ontario—by which I mean the complete property exemption on all farm lands. There are additional benefits for the rural sector in the succession duty changes and so on. So while what my hon. friend says is perfectly correct, this will be more than offset by the special provisions for rural Ontario.

And if I may say so, since the rural sector has lagged and since average incomes are lower, the amount available to most citizens in the rural sector through the tax credit mechanism, I should think, will be on average very much larger than for the average urbanite.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Treasurer not realize that his seven per cent tax on energy requirements completely undermines the credibility of Ontario's position vis-à-vis Alberta; that it is impossible to pretend any longer to be opposed to a two-price system in Alberta because of its effect on the consumer costs in Ontario, and then in the next breath impose a $28-a-year tax for families in Ontario as well?

Hon. Mr. White: No, sir. My hon. friend has not understood these provisions.

Mr. Singer: Nobody understands them except the Treasurer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: This falls into two categories. We object to the two-price system emanating from Alberta on constitutional grounds and on economic grounds.

Mr. Singer: Oh, on constitutional grounds!

Hon. Mr. White: Dealing with the economic grounds, the matter falls into two parts: the increased costs to our manufacturers which will, if implemented, induce higher prices, and which will jeopardize our position in world market. This is not touched by the tax because all energy going into production directly or indirectly, is tax-free.

Mr. Lewis: He doesn't like giving his corporate friends taxes.

Hon. Mr. White: Secondly, since the retail sales tax credit will exceed the average impost on households, in the final result there is no net tax on these energies consumed.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, since the Treasurer in response to my deputy leader is able to tell this House and the members of the public without reservation or equivocation that the additional unconditional grants to northern Ontario will outweigh the adversity put upon them in connection with the seven per cent energy tax, would he please give us some figures upon which he and his ministry base such a comment?

For example, would he tell us the benefit accruing under the additional grants to a family with, say, four children and earning $5,000 a year in a home assessed at $2,800, having regard to the additional expenditure for energy that they require over the people of southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, sir, I will be glad to do that. I provided that information at the press conference today. I'll tell the hon. member the figures I remember.

The total net tax effect on a married person with a spouse—

Mr. Bullbrook: That isn't what I'm asking.

Hon. Mr. White: —and two children under 16, earning $5,000 a year, is minus $30, by which I mean his total tax burden will be $30 less this year than last.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That is assuming that the mill rate comes down.

Hon. Mr. White: And for a married person with a spouse and two children under 16.

Mr. Bullbrook: I take it that the rules of this House are such that the minister does not have to reply to a question. I understand that and I'll abide by that.

Hon. Mr. White: The member doesn't want to hear it, eh?

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is not answering the question. Mr. Speaker, speaking to

this point of order, what he is doing now is mouthing the equation that he gave to the press yesterday that the tax on that particular family will go down $30 and the tax on people earning $50,000 will go up $180.

In answer to my deputy leader—

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Mr. Bullbrook: The point of order is that you are permitting this minister not to answer the question at all. He is answering a completely different question.

I want to know how a family in northern Ontario is not adversely affected by the seven per cent tax on energy, as the Treasurer replied to my deputy leader.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the reason is that we have shifted enormous resources into northern Ontario—

Mr. Bullbrook: Give me the amount.

Hon. Mr. White: —and the average household in northern Ontario will have a tax decrease—aside from the general provisions—of $2.59, I think it is.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second—a year?

Mr. Bullbrook: A further supplementary then. Am I correct in understanding that the average benefit to a residential property owner in northern Ontario over his counterpart in southern Ontario is $2.59 and that that benefit will outweigh the seven per cent imposition on energy? Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. White: No, I am not saying that. I am saying that the additional resources put into northern Ontario amount to something over $60, while the additional taxes, including the tax on energy and the higher heating and lighting costs in northern Ontario, amount to something like $58.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Treasurer doesn't have the figures at all.

Hon. Mr. White: I have the figures approximately. And I've got them precisely—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. White: I'll provide the exact figures to the member.

Mr. Stokes: As a supplementary, did the minister not say yesterday that he was putting an extra 10 per cent weighting factor in the north which amounted to $8.6 million? Did he not say that he was eliminating the mining revenue payments, which were $13 million, so there would be a decrease of $4.5 million accruing to the north, vis-a-vis the south?

Hon. Mr. White: Mining revenue payments were made to municipalities all over this province. The $8.6 million is simply one aspect—

Mr. Stokes: They are really all in the north.

Hon. Mr. White: Just a minute. These are complicated matters. Does the member want an answer or doesn't he? Read the budget.

Mr. Bullbrook: Read the budget!

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: I'd like one, but can I defer to my colleague?

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to cut the supplementaries off at this particular point, but I must point out to the hon. members it's becoming an argumentative debate and the purpose—

Mr. Stokes: I'd like an answer to my question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The purpose of the question period is to elicit information from the minister. We don't want a wide-ranging, argumentative debate.

In view of the importance of the topic, I have allowed several supplementaries. I allowed the hon. member for Thunder Bay to ask a supplementary. The next one was the hon.—

Mr. Stokes: The Treasurer was in the process of answering—

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, if I may. Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of this particular member, nor I believe the basic intention of members of the opposition, to be argumentative. But sir, may I make this point of order to you to explain our position?

Time and time again, week in and week out, we don't get the answers to our questions. Instead it's a circuitous involvement by the minister, and this is permitted. If they would stand up and say, "I don't know," there would be no further comment on our part.

Mr. Speaker: This is up to the ministers.

Hon. Mr. White: If I may respond to the question of the member for Thunder Bay. The $8.6 million is just one of the factors in this new property tax stabilization plan. The document in the member's postal box will show him exactly how much additional money is available to his municipalities.

Mr. Stokes: I've got it here.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, the member has it there?

The fact of the matter is we have built in a further assurance for mining municipalities, namely, that they will receive at least 105 per cent of what their mining revenue payment would have been.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George, a supplementary.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could be enlightened as to the method by which this retail tax credit is to be administered? I don't follow the administration of it, and I would like to know the costs of administering this particular item.

Hon. Mr. White: The details of the credit are yet to be worked out with Ottawa. It will constitute an additional line on that section of the income tax form which deals with the Ontario tax credits. The cost of administration, as far as I know, is zero. I think the federal government does that for us without any charge.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary which is almost for clarification, because I couldn't believe what I heard.

Is the provincial Treasurer saying that the additional revenues and credits granted to northern Ontario amount to approximately $60 a year per family; and that the additional taxes imposed by this budget amount to something like $58 a year per family, so that the addition for northern Ontario in this year, by the nature of the beneficience of this government, will be approximately $2 a year per family?

Mr. Singer: Let's be fair to him. He said $2.59.

Mr. Lewis: Well, $2.59. I have two questions which flow from that and then I'll take my seat. Is the minister telling the people of northern Ontario that he is correcting the tax inequities in this province for them at the level of $2.59 a year? Can he imagine what the people of the north would say to him if they understood it in those terms?

Hon. Mr. White: No, sir. I have responded to a question from the member for Sarnia, dealing with the extraordinary heating costs and the effect of this tax. I am saying that it will not cost them any more, it will cost them less. What is not taken into consideration in this figure is a wide variety of tax changes and expenditure changes which are a special benefit for the north. While I won't attempt to enumerate all of these, let me just mention, by way of illustration, the fact that the tax on off-highway fuels has gone from eight cents to two cents. This will save the pulp and paper industry alone a couple of million dollars. As I say, this is only by way of illustration, because there are many changes which will affect northern Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not giving the answer to my question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

MUNICIPAL GRANTS

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have another question of the Treasurer. If, as I understand it, one of his important budget theories is that the people of Ontario in the end run are going to benefit in dollars rather than pay more dollars—and that's a rather hard concept to grasp in view of the fact that he is collecting so much more money—and if that depends on the advantage taken of the general support grant, could the minister explain how any expanding municipality, which is going to have to provide for more people than it did a year ago and which is going to have to pay more in salaries than it did a year ago, is going to be able to lessen its gross revenue fund expenditure and still provide for more people, pay greater salaries and provide the additional services? Isn't the minister prepared to agree that this particular benefit is only going to be available and the general support grant is only going to be of reasonable advantage to those small municipalities in Ontario that are not expanding at all, that are adding no people and that, in fact, are slowly disappearing?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, these matters are fully dealt with in the budget.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and I read it.

Hon. Mr. White: If the hon. member can read, I hope he will spend the weekend reading it and trying to understand it.

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister answer instead of giving a lecture?

Hon. Mr. White: I will deal with the question. Toronto is going to get more than $8 million more this year. There are a number of additional grants.

Mr. Singer: Only "if".

Hon. Mr. White: There is a four per cent standard grant. There is a property tax assessment deficiency grant. There are unconditional grants, including the increase in police grants. So almost every municipality in this province will receive considerably more money than it did before. In addition, there is a provision that a fast-growing municipality with extraordinary costs can receive additional moneys from the Treasurer.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, the minister has not—

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary. We have spent—

Mr. Singer: No, no! This is the first supplementary on the second question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We have spent more than one-third of the question period on the topic of the budget.

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Speaker, when the budget document is the most important document—

Hon. Mr. White: If the hon. member hadn't been sleeping and yakking all yesterday afternoon, he would understand what had been said.

Mrs. Campbell. Oh, Mr. Speaker!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is a more rude or intolerant or impertinent man in this House than the hon. member for London South—

Mr. Speaker: Is that a question?

Mr. Singer: And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer, who believes that he is handling probably the most important facet of Ontario's business in some businesslike fashion, should at least attempt to have sufficient courtesy to answer the questions posed to him by the opposition in connection with this $7.3 billion budget with its $400-million-plus deficit.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if the member for Downsview and his colleagues on the front bench—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of order!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: —if they had been listening instead of interjecting all yesterday afternoon, these questions would be unnecessary.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, when all else fails, the member for London South hurls insults; he doesn't answer.

Let me try again, as a supplementary to the question I asked him. Could the Treasurer—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Well, there you are. You see, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Could the member for London South please explain to someone of my simple intelligence—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): The pot calling the kettle black.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: —how the expanding municipalities are going to be able, in the words of the budget, to have a lesser gross revenue fund expenditure in the year 1973 if they have to look after more people and pay higher salaries? And if they aren't able to do that, how are they going to be able to take advantage of this sliding scale from two per cent to six per cent? Could he tell us that?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, in another portion of the budget it is explained that where extraordinary costs are experienced because of fast growth of a municipality, additional money will be available on application to the Treasurer. This cannot be put in a formula. It calls upon the good judgement of myself and my ministry.

Mr. Cassidy: The decision will be made here!

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, does the minister not agree that the basic philosophy inherent in his dealing with municipalities—that is, that he will increase their grants conditional upon self-restraint—is the very essence of the philosophy taken by the

federal government over the last four years with this province?

Mr. Speaker: This is purely argumentative.

Mr. Bullbrook: How can it be purely argumentative?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Treasurer—

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to ask how—

Mr. Speaker: The question is purely argumentative!

Mr. Cassidy: In view of the fact that guidelines on municipal spending—

Mr. Bullbrook: With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, would you permit that kind of volatile diatribe—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Order.

Mr. Lewis: I told the hon. member for Sarnia he would reduce the Legislature to violence before his tenure was over. I warned him about that. He is the most inflammatory fellow around—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As far as the member for Scarborough West is concerned.

Mr. Lewis: He has to control himself.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, can the Treasurer explain how this budget increases municipal autonomy when he has begun to introduce spending guidelines which in the course of a couple of years will become as stringent as the education ceilings?

Hon. Mr. White: No, Mr. Speaker, we are providing another $440 million at the municipal level; much of this is brand-new—$182 million—most of which is unconditional. We were not prepared to make these additional unconditional funds available and watch municipal councils expand their expenditures rapidly as we witnessed the school boards doing for 10 years from about 1960 to 1970.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They don't trust them—but they encouraged them.

Hon. Mr. White: In preference to imposing ceilings per se, as we found ourselves compelled to do in the case of school boards, we built in what we thought was an appropriate incentive to induce economy. Whether it will work or not, only time will tell.

Mr. Singer: Any municipality that is decreasing in people and lowers it salaries can take it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Since municipal costs have been rising in the range of nine or 10 per cent a year, can the minister explain how essential municipal functions which have not been carried out, such as housing and land development, can be carried out under the new incentives that he's introduced?

Hon. Mr. White: The increase on municipal costs this year on an average across the province is eight per cent, and our standard is built around that. But I point out to my hon. friend that there are tens of millions of dollars being made available which don't relate to that particular incentive grant.

Mr. Singer: That is still the cornerstone of the Treasurer's budget.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: That is how they are going to make more money.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Half the question period has now elapsed on one topic. There will be no further questions on the budget.

New questions.

Mr. Lewis: Oh now, now, I am going to object. On a point of order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Mr. Singer: That arbitrary ruling is absolutely ridiculous, because there isn't a more important topic that comes before this Legislature than the expenditure of money. Goodness knows we have enough difficulty trying to get lucid answers from that gang of clowns over there, particularly the Treasurer, without your having to say we can't ask any more questions on the budget.

I would respectfully ask you, sir, to allow the questioning on the budget to continue at least to the full extent of the question period.

Mr. Speaker: I might point out to the hon. member that there have been numerous com-

plaints from backbenchers other than the leaders of the opposition parties that they have not been having enough opportunity to ask questions. These complaints were directed to me.

As the hon. member well knows, the purpose of the question period is not to engage in an argument for the entire period. As I said, we have devoted one-half of the question period to an argumentative debate on the budget, which in my view is not a proper use of the question period.

Now if all of the members of the opposition unanimously agree that the entire question period should be on the budget, I'm not going to stand in their way. But I must defend the rights of the other backbenchers to ask new questions.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Do all the members of the opposition wish to spend this period on the budget?

Mr. Bullbrook: This is the Legislature, not—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. With the greatest respect, sir, I don't think that the ruling that you are about to make should depend on whether all the opposition members agree, or even all the government members agree, or even all 117 of us agree together.

There is a question period. We are talking about what, in my opinion, is the most important order of business that comes before this Legislature, and I think, sir, that your responsibility is to keep the question period in order and to allow this questioning to go on. I can't think of any single matter that is of more importance to this Legislature than its budgeting procedure which involves, as I say, $7.3 billion this year.

Mr. Speaker: I am not debating that point at all. Go ahead.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Supplementary!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

MINING REVENUE PAYMENTS

Mr. Laughren: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, of the Treasurer: Could he explain how he justifies the removal of the mining revenue payments tax on the mining companies, considering that the individual citizens in the province are all paying more tax, and that the mining revenue payments tax has been replaced by a more regressive kind of tax on the entire province?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member had been able to hear what I said yesterday—

Mr. Laughren: Certainly I did.

Mr. Lewis: We listened carefully.

Hon. Mr. White: —which was precluded, presumably, by the continuous interruption that was taking place, he would know that the mining tax has not been altered at all.

Mrs. Campbell: The Treasurer interrupted, that is the problem.

Hon. Mr. White: That is quite different from the mining revenue payments.

Mr. Laughren: That is right, that is what I'm talking about.

Mr. Lewis: That is right, but for the northern communities, that is not.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister not realize that by removing the mining revenue payments he is adversely affecting the mining municipalities in that the northern Ontario grant is dispersed over all northern Ontario communities and not the mining municipalities exclusively?

Hon. Mr. White: The mining revenue payments have been unsatisfactory for a very long time.

Mr. Laughren: They have not been high enough, that is true.

Hon. Mr. White: They are now replaced with a more general grant provision which takes into consideration the property tax assessment deficiency. When the hon. member gets the publication I mentioned a moment ago, "Budget Highlights", he will find that his municipalities will all benefit from this series of changes—in some instances by a very large amount, 36 per cent of their actual levy.

Mr. Laughren: Mining companies aren't paying that.

Mr. Singer: I have no more questions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I also have a question of Houdini, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the provincial Treasurer where is the money for the purchase of the Niagara Escarpment, and in what amount, and in which ministry?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, these particular expenditure expectations are all included in the operating ministries' estimates, which I think will be tabled next week. And, of course, during the debates on the operating ministries these details will be made known to the House.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, but really—by way of a supplementary—surely the minister can tell the House this morning how much money in his overall budget he is providing for acquisition of Niagara Escarpment land and in which ministry it will ultimately be found? Surely that's not a secret now that the budget is tabled?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, there is no special account established for any one of these projects. There are moneys provided through the Ministry of Natural Resources for parklands, through the Ministry of Transportation and Communications for roadways, and so forth. As I say, to establish these various values one will have to wait until the estimates are presented to the House.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I feel the minister is leading me gently down the garden path, and he wouldn't want to do that.

Mr. Singer: The minister is misleading the member.

Mr. Lewis: If I remember, perhaps he will recall that the centrepiece of the Throne Speech was the rescue of the Niagara Escarpment again this year, and I am asking the minister, how much money has he put aside in his budget for that purpose? He's now given me the ministries in which it will be found in bits and pieces. How much money is the minister spending on the escarpment, given his declaration of purpose in the Throne Speech? And how is it that he doesn't know and he can't tell us?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, this information is contained in the estimates which will be presented to the House next week.

Mr. Lewis: That promise is as empty as every previous year. Sorry, Mr. Speaker. A question of the—

Mr. Bullbrook: A little argumentative.

Mr. Lewis: A little argumentative but succinct.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of the Environment. Maybe I can shift discussion for a moment. In view of the profits of Denison Mines, which were just published this last week—giving considerable increased earnings from its subsidiary, Lake Ontario Cement, relating to its sand dunes operation—does he not think that the government of the Province of Ontario should pass legislation to compensate Lake Ontario Cement in the amount of what remains of the lease rather than proceeding through expropriation, which will give that company quite a windfall in addition to the enormous profits it has extracted over the past several years?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, since we are not directly involved in any expropriation or any activities with the cement company, I think perhaps that question might be directed elsewhere.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Pass it around.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, will it be the Minister of Government Services who is dealing with the sand dunes and with Lake Ontario Cement?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Right! Well then, can the minister explain to me how he justifies giving this company a very considerable additional amount of money over and above what it has received by way of profit over the last several years, rather than simply exchanging the lease at it's current value of $1 a year?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I advise the hon. member that my ministry is carrying out the expropriation of the lease at the request of the Minister of Natural Resources. The property is for parks purposes, as I understand it, and it will come under his ministry. The funds will be paid out of his budget. My ministry carries out the process of acquiring

the land, whether it be by purchase or by expropriation.

Mr. Lewis: Therefore, I should direct it to the Minister of Natural Resources?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Isn't it convenient that the Minister of Natural Resources is the only one associated with this question who isn't here?

I won't ask any more questions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of the Environment has the answers to previous questions.

POLLUTION PROBLEM AT CANADIAN GYPSUM

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have it somewhere, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good), asked me yesterday about what progress was being made by Canadian Gypsum Co. in order to comply with the requirements of the director's order of April 10, 1972. I think I indicated that I understood they had completed it, but the answer is that Canadian Gypsum Co. has completed installation of all required control equipment as prescribed in the order. All compliance dates were met and, in fact, some equipment was installed ahead of schedule. The company did not appear to have difficulty in meeting the March 31 deadline. Inspectors from the air management branch of my ministry are carrying on daily inspections to ensure the successful operation of the equipment.

As far as the court cases are concerned, at the present time there are no charges outstanding in provincial courts against Canadian Gypsum in connection with its Oak St. plant. There are, however, three appeals pending from provincial court decisions, although two of these appeals relate to the emission of odours rather than to particulate fallout.

There are three charges, together with one appeal, relating to the Mount Dennis plant which are yet to be heard. The trial of one of these charges was to begin last week in provincial court. I understand the other two charges are scheduled for trial in provincial court either this week or early next week.

These charges relate to the emission of odours and violations of a minister's order which was issued to the above noted in connection with the Mount Dennis plant.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, might I ask a supplementary question with respect to the answer that the minister has given? My question is this: Did I understand the minister to say that the orders have been completely complied with in the case of the Oak St. plant? Is the minister aware that over this last weekend there have been very serious complaints about emission of odours from that very plant?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I was not, Mr. Speaker, but I will find out about it. That's the first I've heard of it.

THREATENED ARMSTRONG EPIDEMIC

Hon. Mr. Auld: The hon. member for Thunder Bay asked:

> Is the minister aware that there is a danger of an epidemic because of the low quality of water in the area, as a result of contamination by the CNR in allowing fuel oil to escape and other matter from ground sources? [This is in connection with Armstrong.] Is the minister aware that the Ministry of Health has sent inspectors in and said that something must be done to avert such an epidemic? In view of that, what will his ministry do to avert such an epidemic?

Our ministry is, of course, aware—as I think I indicated at the time—of a continuing problem of bacterial contamination in some of the individual shallow well supplies in Armstrong. Generally speaking, this is caused by faulty well location, construction and maintenance, together with unsatisfactory waste disposal practices.

To our knowledge, at no time has the railway operation caused fuel oil contamination of local wells. However, during the past winter, a local service station did lose some gasoline which resulted in minimal impairment of two or three wells. This was investigated by both this ministry and the Ministry of Health and commensurate action is being taken to rectify the situation. This didn't cause bacterial contamination of any wells.

I might say, in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, that there has been an inter-ministerial committee put together and working. It has produced some preliminary suggestions about services to unorganized communities because, as certainly the hon. member for Thunder Bay knows, and other members from the north are aware, our problem has been that technically we can't put in a system in a community unless we have some community organization or some elected or representative group to deal with.

We are hoping to surmount that problem in some fashion very shortly.

AIR POLLUTION IN TORONTO

Hon. Mr. Auld: The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) asked me a couple of days ago if I was aware of what he referred to as the Touhey report, saying—I haven't the quote here—that the Toronto air is going to get worse.

On checking through one of my staff I find that the so-called Touhey report is a weekly publication in California geared to the gasoline marketing industry. The owner of this publication, Mr. Touhey, had been in Toronto a few weeks ago to speak to the Automatic Car Wash Association. Apparently the report of April 9 that the hon. member referred to was based on his visit here.

He headlined the report as follows: "Toronto, the Clean City." He went on to report that the city will be fighting smog in the future because it is being overbuilt with high-rise buildings, service stations and car washes. He indicated that in Toronto the builder is not required to show that there is need for the additional service stations or car washes, nor was the builder required to prepare an environmental impact statement in order to receive the permit to build a car wash. The report stated that no public hearings are required prior to the construction of additional service stations or car washes.

In my staff's telephone conversation with Mr. Touhey, he indicated that it is his belief that the large numbers of service stations are the cause of the smog problem in Los Angeles. He thought that Toronto was a very clean city, but would not remain so as a result of the increasing number of service stations.

We pointed out to Mr. Touhey that the meteorology, the weather, and the topography of Toronto and Los Angeles are very different, and that it is due to these differences that the Los Angeles smog is so bad in comparison to Toronto.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has the answer to a previous question.

RUMOURS OF INCO LAYOFF

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to a question from the hon. member for Nickel Belt with reference to International Nickel Co. of Canada Ltd., Copper Cliff.

Following the question period yesterday, I asked my senior official to get in touch with Mr. F. Burnet, vice-president, employee relations. Mr. Burnet made the following statement:

> No further cutbacks are anticipated in the Sudbury area, consequently no layoffs. Recent press reports in Sudbury of imminent layoffs are without foundation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

HURON COUNTY COTTAGE SURVEY OF SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment.

Why did the ministry refuse to grant permission to hire two summer students to do a cottage survey in Huron county of sewage disposal systems and their continued potential for pollution to lake water and drinking water supplies, and will the minister reconsider this matter?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I'll be delighted to look into it. I imagine, as has happened in other places, there was a request to do this kind of cottage survey and we don't have the resources to do them all at once. We are doing about 5,000 a year. Perhaps in the judgement of our officials, there was not as great a priority need there as there might have been in some other place. However, I'll look into it and get in touch directly with the hon. member about it.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Chatham-Kent): Very low priority.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the OWRC has indicated that cottage pollution is a very serious problem along the Lake Huron shoreline, would the minister also consider that when he is looking into the entire matter?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

NATURAL GAS EXPLOSION IN PETERBOROUGH

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment, regarding the natural gas explosion in Peterborough on Jan. 8 and

the coroner's jury report of March 3. This is the explosion in which three children were killed and the mother lost both legs.

Is the minister considering legislation which would make it mandatory for an independent inspection of gas mains after work has been done by other utilities in the vicinity of the gas main, and for inspection of all municipal gas mains on a more frequent basis than the present law requires?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, that does not come under the jurisdiction of this ministry. I know it's a little difficult to keep track with the reorganization and so on.

Mr. Ruston: The government changes it around so often, one never knows.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We have not been involved in that since the Ministry of the Environment was set up. It used to be in Energy and Resources Management. I can't tell the hon. member directly but I believe that it would be either the Ministry of Natural Resources, which has the Energy Board, or the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations which has most of the inspection function.

Mr. Ruston: The minister doesn't even know himself.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations whether he is the responsible minister?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): I'll "fess" up to it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

WEST BERTIE SEWAGE SCHEME

Mr. Haggerty: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment.

Can the minister inform the House why there has been a six-year delay in the approval for construction of the West Bertie sewage scheme in the town of Fort Erie by his ministry? Can the minister apply all his resources to expedite the approval of this scheme? The estimated cost, I think, has more than tripled since 1967.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, perhaps that might properly be put on the order paper for a detailed report as to the situation in the past and where we are standing at the moment. I am aware of that situation and I know there have been a number of problems—a whole variety of things—that have come up during the period having to do with the region. I'll get a full report for the hon. member if he'll put it on the order paper, Mr. Speaker.

NATURAL GAS EXPLOSION IN PETERBOROUGH

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Would the minister like me to repeat the question that I asked the Minister of the Environment, or can he answer that question now?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, it isn't necessary for the member to repeat the question. I have read something in the press about that within the last 24 hours. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the technical requirements are set out in the regulations under the relevant legislation.

It would appear, certainly from my reading of the article in the paper, that the regulations were not adhered to by the local municipality or municipal people in removing the earth and doing certain repairs in the location of that house which led to the subsequent tragedy in the deaths of three children and serious injuries to the mother. I have this morning directed an inquiry to the director of the technical standards branch to ascertain the extent of our involvement in that. I will be more than pleased to advise the House or, in turn, to advise the individual member, if he would like, as soon as I have that information.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Is the minister considering the mandatory use of plastic-lined pipes in place of the iron pipes which were installed back in 1909 in that area?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I have had some discussions along those lines with the senior people in my ministry. The problem, of course, is one of cost. It would be practical, perhaps, to have legislation, making it effective from now on, for that type of pipe. As far as considering the removal of all such pipes throughout the province is concerned, the cost, I suspect, would be entirely prohibitive and if passed on to the consumer would result in great financial burden to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

EFFECT OF ENERGY TAX ON GEARED-TO-INCOME RENTS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue: In light of the imposition of the seven per cent energy tax and its effect on senior citizens' geared-to-income housing, making their costs of operation somewhat higher, will the minister assure the House that these additional costs for light, heat and power will not be passed on in terms of increased rental to senior citizens living in geared-to-income housing?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, of course I cannot give any such assurance at the present time because we have to study the impact of this on public housing.

Mr. B. Newman: The minister should have studied it before!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In any case, the hon. member was advised a week or two ago, in answer to a question—perhaps it was another hon. member—that we were holding the line on any possible increases in rentals of public housing until the whole schedule is reviewed. We have been asking the federal government to do this for some time, and it has now agreed to do so. That will all be taken into consideration presumably at the time we discuss the rent schedule with the federal government and with CMHC.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES OF THE BUDGET

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege in this House. Yesterday, at the conclusion of the budget speech, 117 copies of the budget were given to the pages to pass out to this House. A number of people sitting under the galleries acquired copies from the pages —some of the pages were a little distraught over it—but the members up in this area didn't get copies. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to see that the privileges of this House are maintained so that the members get this information.

Mr. Speaker: I am not just sure what the hon. member wants the Speaker to do about it. I will speak to the Treasurer and see if he can get more copies.

Mr. Eaton: What I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that in the future you could prevent the interference of the work of the pages by the people who are sitting under this gallery and by the number of people who are gathering behind there all the time.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Carton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, this bill is an amendment to the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act. It authorizes the Minister of Transportation and Communications to enter into an agreement with respect to experimental and demonstration projects related to public transportation, the design of transit systems, and the industrial property rights related to transportation.

It is being introduced at this time to permit the completion of an agreement with the developer of the intermediate capacity demonstration project at the CNE, who will be chosen within the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, PROVINCIAL SECRETARIAT FOR JUSTICE

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Chairman, in bringing before the Legislature the estimates of the ministries within the Justice policy field, I know that the ministers associated in this field will share with me a consciousness that we are dealing with the most sensitive areas of public responsibility. While this sensitivity does not make our task any easier, it does give us the satisfaction that we are dealing with signifi-

cant and important matters of concern to every person in the province.

The work of this field is not as concerned with money and resources as it is with concepts and principles, although money becomes significant in the provision of those services that we must provide for the people in order that they may enjoy the concepts and principles upon which our society is founded.

In reviewing the total estimates for this field, I know that the hon. members will not be overpowered by the relative claim upon public revenues, but at the same time I believe they will all recognize that the services represented by this field are an integral part of the structure of government in its new form.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): And completely supernumerary.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The concept of a Justice policy field recognizes that justice does not consist of isolated principles or institutions. It consists of the effective co-ordination of the separate responsibilities of law enforcement—the Crown, the courts, and the correctional system—so that they deal justly with the public, the individual, in the determination and protection of rights.

The reorganization that has been carried out by the government through this Legislature has not only enhanced and clarified the basic rights of our people, but in establishing the Justice policy field has provided an effective structure for developing and co-ordinating our many systems with equitable resolution of conflict.

Within the Justice policy field we find that above all ministries in government we have to achieve a difficult balance, for in serving the needs of public protection we must, to some extent, affect the rights of the individuals who compose that public. In protecting society as a whole we must still provide for the rehabilitation of the offender who sometimes threatens that society.

In protecting the consumer we must ensure a recognition of the proper and reasonable needs of a supplier. In meeting this balance the law is not always the complete answer. While I do not always go back to the Old Testament for authority, I think we could share with the prophet Jeremiah the recognition that the written law cannot resolve all of man's problems and that he himself must, in some way, respond to the laws and support them if they are to benefit all mankind.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That's what the provincial secretary has been thinking about. I was wondering.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Has he tried Amos? He's actually even better.

Mr. Singer: Shall we beat our swords into ploughshares?

Mr. Lewis: Poor Jeremiah!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In approaching our problems we have encountered the difficulties of attitudinal change in all the ministries and recognize that one of our purposes must be to create an environment within which social forces can better develop attitudes that will in themselves do a great deal to maintain the kind of society within which we would wish to live.

The thrust of the programmes which are represented in the estimates, which the members will shortly review, will demonstrate to the hon. members our endeavours to relate our principles and institutions more clearly to the people so that they may not only serve, but be better served, in our system of justice.

The estimates of the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) will reflect new methods and approaches in the development of a court system and the management of the various aspects of that system. In moving further in the training of justices of the peace and the development of Crown legal clerks, the hon. members will recognize the relating of the Attorney General's ministry to the needs, not only of the public, but to the needs of law enforcement as that ministry co-ordinates these responsibilities with those of the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko).

The Solicitor General's estimates will reflect our concern for the protection of the public from the offender in a manner that is consistent with his reform and rehabilitation. You will note the increase of resources for criminal law enforcement in areas of major concern—better communication facilities, better training programmes and facilities and more effective systems—all designed to serve and protect our society.

But in conjunction with this, Mr. Chairman, you will also see that we will develop the community resource programme for the humane and effective assistance of the offender who deserves and merits that help. Our temporary absence programme and our group homes have opened new and acceptable ways that have been most effective in the treatment of carefully selected offenders.

The Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps) will, no doubt, speak with some pride and authority on these subjects as he reviews them in his estimates.

As in all areas of justice and law enforcement, the hon. members will see the same balance being developed in Consumer and Commercial Relations. The problem of consumer reporting agencies will be dealt with in a manner that will meet the requirements of both the people and the industry, for each of these needs the other to meet their objectives.

In a similar manner, the ministry is approaching consumer warranties so that any action will reflect not only the protection of the purchaser, but the relationship of such protection to commerce and to costs and to the purchasing public generally. Thus, the preparation of a green paper.

Our presentation of a position on federal competition policy pursues our practice of bringing together the appropriate ministries so that these fundamental policy positions will give the co-ordinated and considered decisions of government. The programme structures as disclosed in the estimates of this ministry will indicate the difficult objectives that are sought to be obtained by all ministries in this field.

The ministers who are associated with me in our endeavour will be reviewing their estimates in detail, but I did wish to illustrate for the hon. members, however briefly, the mutuality of principle throughout the ministries and the manner in which their programmes relate. It is in this general area of co-ordination and policy development that the ministers have worked with me in the policy field so that we share ideas and exchange views that bring us towards our common objectives.

My own secretariat is small both in numbers and in expenditures, as members will shortly see in their perusal of my estimates. This selectiveness is by design for in meeting my responsibilities I make full use of the resources not only of the ministries but also of the Management Board and cabinet office.

Indeed, of the three professionals in my office other than my deputy, two are seconded on a flexible arrangement; one comes from the Ministry of the Attorney General and the other comes from the Ministry of Correctional Services. In using the resources of others engaged in similar missions, I feel that we not only recognize some economies but, more importantly, we obtain the best and most helpful advice from those who are already fully informed upon their subjects.

With this small nucleus my office works with the ministries in bringing together and preparing material on the issues that are brought forward for the consideration of the justice committee of cabinet. These issues relate to proposed new legislation, policy evaluation, priority setting and similar matters in which our advice and recommendations may be helpful not only to the ministries but also to the government in other fields.

We in the Justice policy field are fortunate, Mr. Chairman, in that our purpose and our goals are closely associated in the end result—the protection of both the public right and the individual's right in a manner consistent with the principles of law and justice upon which our Legislature and this province are founded.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I listened with fascinated interest to this nine-page statement because I had puzzled at very great length as to what the Provincial Secretary for Justice really does. Having listened carefully and having, through the courtesy of the minister, been supplied with a copy of his statement which I could follow as he delivered it, certainly not one doubt has been removed from my mind. I still don't know what he does.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He reads Jeremiah.

Mr. Singer: He reads Jeremiah! I thought it was very touching that Jeremiah has been consulted, and I wonder when the minister is going to start beating the swords into ploughshares and generally improving the situation of the world.

I'm puzzled, Mr. Chairman; I am really genuinely puzzled because we have nine pages of absolutely nothing. The minister has told us that everybody gets along fine together. They have a small staff; he has a small budget. I suppose in relation to $4.3 billion, the minister's request for $358,000 doesn't loom that large.

I am amazed, Mr. Chairman, at the absolute lack of any information in these estimates, one pages J8 and J9, to tell us what's going to happen to even that paltry sum of $358,000. It's going to be taken up in salaries and wages, employee benefits, transportation and communication, services and supplies and equipment. I would have been most interested, Mr. Chairman, to have the minister tell us the kind of meetings that go on.

How often does he meet with his colleagues, the Attorney General, the Solicitor

General, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Clement), and the Minister of Correctional Services? Do they meet once a week, or twice a week? What kind of agendas do they really consider? Do the civil servants come and see the minister or don't they come and see him?

Does it fall within the aegis of the superminister to examine broad questions of policy? If so, what broad questions of policy has he recently examined? If he has recently examined any, I would like to hear about them and perhaps hear his views.

I know, for instance, Mr. Chairman, that there is in the possession of one of the galaxy over there—maybe all of them—the latest report from the Law Reform Commission which was supposed to be a mammoth, monster and erudite production telling us how to reorganize the courts. The government has sat on this report for a month or more, and I note a hint that when we get to the Attorney General he's going to tell us how the courts are going to be reorganized.

Mr. Chairman, wouldn't one have thought that it might be appropriate at this time, when the superminister, the superchief from Halton, rides happily into the Legislature and says, "Give me a measly $358,000," that he could have spent a minute or two telling us about the recommendations of Mr. Leal and his Law Reform Commission, and whether the government likes him or whether they don't like him? It might even have been courteous to provide in advance to the opposition copies of the Leal report reorganizing the courts, so that we could have read it and had some opinions about what the minister is going to do.

That's not going to be the way. Mr. Chairman, the minister didn't refer to it directly, but let me ask him if he has read the Leal report. Is the Leal report going to be adopted in full or in part or not at all? And is his reference to reorganization in the courts, which he sloughs over to his friend the Attorney General, who I note is now coaching him out of the side of his mouth—and this minister needs lots of coaching—is the reference to the Attorney General really the sole consideration that the Provincial Secretary for Justice has brought to the question of court reorganization?

One would have thought that in a job such as this one, which in essence might well present a challenge to an ambitious minister or to a lawyer who has in mind some kind of genuine law reform, the minister would have been given a chance to tell us about some of his views about how the courts might be reorganized.

Perhaps the minister has some views about our divorce procedures. Does he think that our courts are working well insofar as divorce procedures are concerned? Does the minister, or the ministry, or the galaxy, have any theories about improving divorce procedures? Is there any point, for instance, in continuing the adversary system in divorces?

One would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that the minister on the way by might have noted the efforts by a number of non-lawyers —terrible people—to facilitate, to their own financial advantage, divorce actions through our courts. With proper righteousness, the Law Society descended on those people; some of them were haled before the courts, and some of them were convicted.

But when people who are not legally trained give this kind of impetus to a segment of law enforcement and it is apparently received by some people in the public with much enthusiasm, one wonders if perhaps there is something wrong with the system. Perhaps the Provincial Secretary for Justice could have given some of his ideas on whether the system could or should be improved.

The detail, I would have thought, might have been expanded by the Attorney General; but surely the theory of this kind of thinking might have been expressed today by this minister who asks us for this paltry $358,000.

One wonders if the Provincial Secretary for Justice has any new theories about our land registry system. I am sure that the minister has followed very carefully the disposal by the Court of Appeal of that great series of questions involving Green Acre, A and B, mortgagees, land divisions and so on, and that the Provincial Secretary for Justice has thoroughly digested the 50-odd page judgement of the Court of Appeal dealing with those important questions.

One would have thought that because thousands of titles in the Province of Ontario are called into question, the Provincial Secretary for Justice, together with his advisers, might have been able to indicate to us what the Justice galaxy has decided to do about clearing up these matters. After all, they do have a very substantial facility in terms of lawyers and advisers, an ability to hire outside experts and so on. But there has been not a word. We just get quotes from Jeremiah.

One would have thought that perhaps it had occurred to the Provincial Secretary for Justice that he might have looked into the conduct of negligence actions in the courts.

Does the minister really believe that we are handling our litigation in relation to automobile negligence actions with care, dispatch and intelligence?

I am involved in one now. I was telling the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations about it. It's an intersection accident, apparently quite simple except that two cars were involved; one car had three people in it, and the other car had five people in it. There's quite a discussion as to whose fault it might have been: Did car A stop at the stop sign or didn't it? Did car B go barrelling on through? Was it driving with proper care and attention?

Incidentally, besides three passengers in one car and five in the other, there were owners of each car who were not present; so they of course are involved in the litigation. So there are three principals in one car, five in the other, and two owners. So that is 10 people who are involved.

Out of this comparatively simple incident, I think seven law suits have been generated. And they are bouncing back and forth; some in the Supreme Court, some in the county court.

And this is how ludicrous it gets, Mr. Chairman: One unfortunate passenger neglected to take legal advice before the year had expired. So he just has no remedy at all. He is out of luck. Now the other nine people are going to have an opportunity to have their claims adjudicated upon in due course, if we can ever get down to trial because of this multiplicity of action. But the poor fellow who didn't happen to wander in to a lawyer's office within the year's time is just out of luck. He was seriously injured and he has no remedy at all.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Is this an argument for public insurance?

Mr. Singer: No, it is an argument for bringing some sense to this kind of public problem. I won't accept that it is an argument for public insurance at all.

Mr. Young: Sounds like it to me.

Mr. Singer: But surely, Mr. Chairman, it is an argument—and I am going to explore this at greater length with some of the other ministers. It is an argument for the government to look at this thing; to wonder whether or not two or three years after the event—the accident took place on Dec. 5, 1971; we are only up to April of 1973 now; we might get on to trial in 1974. Whether it makes any sense three years after the event trying to figure out whether car A stopped at the stop sign or car B didn't stop at the stop sign. Whether the eight people were injured or not. Whether the poor fellow who was unfortunately not aware of the fact that he had to come in and consult a lawyer before the limitation period had expired should be deprived of his rights.

Surely there must be a simpler way than involving six different lawyers, each one of whom has his own idea about how these cases should be handled; each one of whom has his own idea about where the discoveries should take place, when they should take place, if they should take place at all. Several motions have already gone before the courts to argue these things out.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, one would have thought that someone in the exalted position of the Provincial Secretary for Justice could have come to us with some idea of how we could improve the public handling of these matters. When you involve six or eight lawyers in this sort of thing, who is going to suffer? Each one of those lawyers is going to be paid, and probably paid very well before this thing is over. Is anything going to be proved? Is any public good going to be achieved? This is the sort of problem that I would have wished that the Provincial Secretary for Justice would have told us about, and not just quotes from Jeremiah.

I would have liked to have heard the Provincial Secretary for Justice's opinion about the effectiveness of the new bail laws. Does he think they are good, or does he think they are bad, or does he have any theories at all—or has he given it any consideration?

Some of the police officers who have been questioned, and who have given public statements, have expressed grave concern about it. I think there is room for presenting the other side. But I would like to hear what the government's side is. Has the government got a side at all? Does the Provincial Secretary for Justice have any ideas about bail laws?

Recently in Toronto, Mr. Speaker, two unfortunate policemen were murdered and there was a considerable public discussion and concern expressed about the circumstances of their murder. For instance, out of those unfortunate deaths arose several questions dealing with the public availability of guns.

Does the Provincial Secretary for Justice have any theories or ideas about the availability of guns? Is there any thinking in the Justice galaxy about the handling of guns?

Should guns be made available for sale on the conditions they are now? Should there be more registration—less registration? Should there be prohibition? Is there any consistent theory emerging from this new group over there? What powers have we got in Ontario? And if we haven't got enough powers, are we preparing briefs and making representations to the Department of Justice in Ottawa? That is the sort of thing that I would have enjoyed hearing from the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Well, I could go on and cover 15 or 20 more subjects. I say, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect to the hon. minister—because I like him; he's not a bad fellow—these nine pages of pap that he presented here are a further insult to the members of this House. It gives us no idea really of what he is doing. Then, having listened to him, to try to find out what he's doing and not being able to find it out at all, we look at his estimates, and there isn't one thing in those estimates that tells us what he's going to do, other than that some people are going to get some salaries and there are going to be some employee benefits. There's a little for transportation. There are some services, and I think they are going to have some supplies and equipment.

Now I think that's just great! Perhaps $358,000 in the context of $7.3 billion is not very much, but if this is all this minister has to tell us, then I think it's a waste of time and I think this estimate probably should be reduced to $1.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, that is one thing that it is very difficult to do. The leading question is why a man of the parts of the minister in question could not roll this whole portfolio into a single ball and handle it all himself as other progenitors of his have been known to do, including the Macaulays and the Whites of this world, and he wouldn't unduly sweat.

Now what have we got? The previous minister was so bored and he found this portfolio so empty and whimsical a one that he departed elsewhere to find something to keep him occupied. A man who has some considerable ability and demonstrated it in another portfolio moves into his place and the thing is equally as empty and innocuous as it has been previously, as was proved this morning by this statement which I had awaited with some anticipation, hoping that fulfilment would come and that Jeremiah standing on the rooftops would have been listened to. But the call of the prophet he made is very different from the one that the minister is making.

It may be in this context—and I suspect it is and time will prove its worth—that the efficiency experts who sought to rearrange the government portfolios are wrong in this particular instance. I can see a considerable justification for a superminister over human or natural resources because of the plenitude, the diversity, intricacy and what not of the various agencies and portfolios that fall under him. But in Justice it is kind of artificially created. They tried to find some common factor that welds it together. It seems in some vague way as if all the four different ministries under the head of this minister have a correspondence and a drift in common.

I think if you look a little more deeply, you will find that it is not altogether as it might superficially appear. The simple thing that they would have in common would be public protection, of course. That is shared by numerous other ministers, I suppose, in a vague way or an indefinitive way by every ministry of the Crown. Labour, for instance, has certainly a major role in public protection in a diversity of fields, and the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) protects the public, I trust, on occasion from bad merchandise.

That particular function would appear to be the central one. So they've lumped them together under a particular head and, having disarrayed it, have prevented a person who has considerable capabilities from performing any function that, as far as we can see on the surface and from the statements made, is worthwhile. That is regrettable.

This ministry is described in the estimates as being responsible for the development and incorporation of policy recommendations. What co-ordination specifically was arrived at in the past year, say, between the Consumer and Commercial Relations on one side of the fence and the Solicitor General on the other? How did the two boys get along together? What was it they discussed?

I suppose that the policing aspect has always been tied in somehow with securities commissions. The blackguards water the stock and they take off for the hills, and I suppose the police would be needed. I don't know why the government needs a special ministry and special co-ordination to see that they perform that obvious and traditional function. Is there something deeper that escapes the eyes of the opposition? Then, if

so, let us know. We are entitled to know. The public is entitled to know—and I think we are going to insist upon finding out a bit more that goes on.

When the former minister was here, he partially justified his existence in a speech—which I would call a Cosa Nostra speech—of July 26, 1972. The speech was prepared for the Italian-Canadian associations and clubs and in it he said a word or two as to what internecine, "very secret projects", as he called them, were going on apace within his department.

He said there was no particular reason he couldn't give voice to this, but the fact of the matter is that he didn't. He hinted, darkly so to speak, that there were numerous machinations. The wheels were turning over and projects were being initiated with respect to the control of syndicated crime, various aspects of international espionage, immigration controls, all this sort of thing. But he simply didn't give us any real indication of what was done.

He said "quietly", in his speech—you're telling me, sotto voce, not only beneath the arbour, but beneath contempt—"and without fanfare":

> . . . devise new structures and new organizations within the government and law enforcement agencies to effectively combat a problem that, to my knowledge, has not been successfully met elsewhere.

What I want to know is: What new structures and what new organizations is he talking about? He speaks of one here—a project working with the Solicitor General and with groups in the community; and with the AG's department and police; partially with the Securities Commission; and with a representative from his own office—believe it or not—on a project with respect to the international crime context. This is one of those liaison internal committees that was set up. But, as I say, this is the only one of which I am particularly cognizant.

I wish—without totally bringing the government down or revealing the things that will so jeopardize its future and the work of law reform and the work of investigations—that if it is all that deep and sensitive, then please let us know and one will keep one's mouth shut; but I just don't believe it.

Therefore, within the ministry—objectively speaking and apart from how they feel about one another, which is too subjective for my emotional taste in this House—the only thing that there is in common is the business of policing. I would think that in that particular context, taking his lead, perhaps—or maybe this will turn the minister off and maybe I'd better not say it. I was going to say, taking his lead from Mr. Lang's book, up in the federal level; he's making considerable public impact. He attends the judicial gatherings and various university meetings. He makes speeches. He's groping. The man's trying. He's trying to be imaginative. He's creative. He's doing something called thinking.

But what speeches has the hon. minister made recently before any august—or August or January—tribunal or group with respect to anything under the sun?

I've written into the ministry asking that every word spoken by any of these ministers be immediately sent over so I can drip with the wisdom coming out of the boughs, but I haven't seen very much. As a matter of fact there's been such a dearth on this part of the total doldrums of the government at the present time—nothing—no rainfall comes, nothing to celebrate with; no blessed view coming—no oasis; drought.

Mr. Gaunt: The member hasn't read the budget report.

Mr. Lawlor: Jeremiah-like, from heaven with which to refresh the day! I sit in anguish over here wishing also to have something to do.

The legislation that the minister is bringing in at the present time is simply atrocious; bits and pieces, tatters and tatterdemalion. I'm surprised at the minister, with all the things that are going on. However, we're hoping for better things in the next two weeks—after Easter.

In any event, what the minister needs and what he should do and what he should be studying—and the Solicitor General is partially studying—is the philosophy of the police. Has the minister really given any thought to the functions of the police force in modern society and, particularly, in the context of this society? My colleague, the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and I on previous occasions have outlined two philosophies of the police—what I would call, basically, the British one on one side and the American on the other.

The British one is very different. It's all contained in Halsbury and it's come down through history. It's one of high beneficence, independence and autonomy on the part of every individual policeman.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): They certainly treat the Catholics that way in Ulster.

Mr. Lawlor: He is an independent agent. The American is the sergeant-major theory of policemen with federal military echelons, with everybody gradated down and working under orders in the strictest type of military context.

I find that unpalatable. I think we gravitate toward it, more and more, as we do most things American. I think we should shift our emphasis; but you don't do it unless you know about it and unless you study it and unless you spend a good deal of time on this particular context.

There is also the whole business of the training and education, both of guards in correctional institutions and police which have a certain ad idem of function. What is the Provincial Secretary's thinking about that? What is he doing about that? There again, there seem to me two basic schools. One is the coercive school. You put the thumb down. It's authoritarian. You damn well make people do what they don't want to do. This is a basic thing—many men are temperamentally inclined that way and use authoritarian tactics; they think it's the only effective way to order society.

On the other hand there are other types of men—I won't judge between them—who are suaver, if you will. They would appeal and be more persuasive, go to people's humanity and try to encourage them. They have found that a recalcitrant kid or a juvenile delinquent who will not respond to a kick in the pants might be egged on by a little honey; you know, by a kind word or by a little understanding.

These things work right across the spectrum from the time we're children until we are aged. Which way do you get along best in life? Which is the way to treat other human beings? By which method do you grow? If you grow by that method, how do you expect the other guys who are kicked in the teeth all the time to do anything but to retrogress, grow more frustrated and grow more cruel and hit back harder against society as a result of it? These are the two schools.

Is the minister studying them? We placed him on a perch of ultimate eminence. He sits like an eagle surveying the plains. Why doesn't he swoop down and pick up a little pablum once in a while and come forward with that in this House? He should not give us an empty statement like he gave this morning but say what he thinks of these particular matters.

These matters, you know, Mr. Chairman, probably are not susceptible of legislation. Legislation isn't that neat; it isn't that sensitive to human needs. It can't be. It's too broad. It's too categorical. It's like a knife or a cleaver that hacks and causes a good deal of bleeding. Ministers in their attitudes, in the ways in which they look upon the problems of law and the problems of administration of justice in the province can give a tone to it; they can give an orientation, by making public statements in this House and elsewhere and by orientating the ministries in a particular direction.

It can be a great alleviating force for human civilization and for the advance of people in terms of the things that they suffer from. If you add to them you are part of the problem, of course; by and large, we suspect that that is the way it is over there.

The government is too much in line with current apathetic thinking instead of bearing down and seeking new paths, testing new possibilities and forcing the pace. If it doesn't, it loses office. The fact is that it has retained office because it has been sufficiently flexible and sympathetic over the years to feel just enough of what's going on in the populace to respond to it. Respond to it to a greater extent I would ask.

If by doing so, it confers blessings and stays in office, so be it. That's the way it is. I'm giving the government the elixir and the key to success this morning and I would ask that it has the effrontery and the wisdom to absorb it.

On a specific issue under this head, the philosophy of the police, would the minister give some thought to the very concrete problem of police commissions in Ontario? That is an area in which the member for Downsview and I have been very much exercised. We think that the present methods of appointments and the way in which they operate are not particularly democratic, as you well know. They are insulated, obtuse, high-handed, all the features that we find just are not palatable in the modern world and which, by and large as politicians, we have had to learn to dispense with.

Why should the Provincial Secretary perpetuate under his aegis a whole series of these bodies which act in a way that is professionally contrary to what he himself would do. He wouldn't retain office if he took this position. Maybe the minister thinks that they need a certain aloofness and an arm's-length relationship with the people; I don't. I think that all that breeds is an insensitivity to the

changing police forces, to the needs of the police themselves, and to the community. But, when many women approach the police commission office of Ontario, and sit in the hallway for hours waiting for these obtuse beggars not to speak to them, then it is high time that the ministers of Justice and the provincial secretary in the higher role, working with them, should move in.

Again, I don't think it has to be necessarily by way of any legislation. It needs simply a directive, you know; just one word in the right place. But if the Provincial Secretary is going to reform and make these institutions democratic, I suppose he could keep one or two appointed people on there, if he really insisted upon it—if he was like Alexander Hamilton and didn't trust the people—if it was his thinking that aristocratic intent was necessary to get the very best people you would appoint.

But for the rest of a seven-man commission, or say a five-man commission, I would think three ought to be elected—the majority ought to be elected at least. And the business of having the judges in there we have spoken about too often, but it could bear repeating.

I would like to know whether the minister has been working over and is deeply concerned with constitutional issues. You know, we hear every day, and increasingly, about our malformed constitution—that the powers as segregated between 91 and 92 are inefficient, ineffective and nonsensical—and I agree with that—that nobody from this government, so far as I know, has ever made a profound study of it.

Mark McGuigan was the parliamentary assistant who, working with the members of the Senate, went throughout the country. They produced an eggshell. It was empty of yolk, if you looked at it. It's the most disappointing document that I have read recently. In order, I suppose, to try and appease and accommodate all the various diverse warring factions in this country, they finally came down with a blob, with a common denominator of nothingness.

Why don't we do something on it, since they have abandoned the field, and came forward with nothing of any efficacy? Why doesn't the provincial secretary's department go forward with an investigation and make recommendations, perhaps on an ad hoc basis?

In this field it is obvious that, say, in marketing legislation, something has to be altered, not just by way of the under table deals that we have accommodated ourselves to over the last 100 years; where we do in effect what we can't do verbally with the constitution as it stands, and simply scout it, simply ignore it, go around it, without bringing its explicit terms into mind.

I would ask that the provincial secretary does give some consideration to a study of the constitution, perhaps with some participation from members of this House, because it certainly is in need of reform. Where the vital spots are, they are rubbing against you every day of the week, in Treasury and in practically every other area—Natural Resources are subject to it too.

I just want to pause for a moment, Mr. Chairman, to congratulate the ministry—all the ministers who are concerned with this are in their seats now, I think. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has left for a few moments, but he was here previously. Now that's commendable, that's doing their job—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Don't overdo it.

Mr. Lawlor: —when everybody finally shows up to take an interest in their area. I think perhaps it's a banner day in the House. It is the first day in the history of the Ontario Legislature that I can remember that it has ever happened, and they are to be given credit.

I would like to know next as to what the Provincial Secretary's liaison with the federal government is, how he is participating, under what heads are ongoing conversations taking place between them—the Provincial Secretary that way, without making them feel in any—as, I suppose, the ambassador plenipotentiary between his four subordinates, if I may put it that way without making them feel in any way inferior—and the man in charge of the justice system up in Ottawa.

I notice again that Otto Lang, the Minister of Justice, on Aug. 6, 1972, made a speech called "New Perspectives in the Judicial Function", in which he outlined a number of things which might take place within the judiciary. They would have a profound reforming effect, a highly beneficial effect, in the sense of speeding everything up—of getting cases on and getting them adjudicated with efficacy.

He pointed out that practising lawyers don't necessarily make the best judges. He also pointed out that a man appointed to the bench may only be highly competent in a

single field, whereas by the laying on of hands he is supposed to be a master of many —and that is not so. At the very least, he contended, there ought to be a special kind of training for judges—either in-service training or after appointment but prior to them assuming their seats—by experts in many fields. I think all that he says about this is particularly true.

One of the many things the federal minister suggests is that the judiciary attend conferences that are cognizant of and allied to fields of interest in which they are carrying on their work, particularly with minority groups, say, so that they will have a better understanding and a better working relationship with them, and rub shoulders with those people at the grass-roots level to know how these people think and what their problems really are, instead of pontificating from on high as to what they should or shouldn't be doing. And he has arranged conferences of that kind with the Metis and others. Surely we in this province can place our provincial judges in greater rapport with the community?

I know there are conferences of judges talking to themselves—and that is precisely what they do—but surely we could open the way to improved relationships. One of the faults of the judiciary is insulation; there is a sense of loneliness, of detachment, which means abstraction and that they get away from the core issues. They no longer understand things because they don't feel them with their skins; as lawyers they rubbed up against it, but as judges they are abstracted from the day-to-day life of human beings.

This is a great fault, and something must be done to rectify it. But they can't do it on their own, because they are not in a position to do so. A judge must be extremely careful and sensitive of his relations with the public. But we can make it artificially possible for him to do that by setting up the appropriate apparatus and mechanism. Otto Lang is doing it, and I suggest that it would be a thing that the minister could do in his ministry which in some way would justify its continued existence.

In the area of law reform, as has been said, we are waiting with eager anticipation that munificent document with respect to the reorganization of the court structure, with various types of duties that may be given to various types of judges. I suspect this would be the central work that we might get down to in this term of the Ontario Legislature in this particular department. That would be nose-to-the-grindstone work, so to speak.

We were kept extremely busy under Mr. Wishart in the old days, doing what I felt was fruitful and valuable work. There was quite a lot of intense study at home and getting ready; when we came in, we could trade ideas. We thought we were serving some minimal function in the life of the courts of the province.

That seems to have died right off; bankruptcy of intellect and operation has taken its place. Perhaps we can get a small revivalist movement going under the tents with respect to the reform of the courts, and I would anticipate that we would get on with it. It seems to me that regarding reform of the courts, there are basically only two areas that we could remove from the courts and place under special tribunals, or else disperse more widely than they are at the present time—I prefer the special tribunal—that is, if the area of divorce law and the area of automobile negligence cases were taken out of the courts I don't think there would be the delay, the burden, the chafing, a simple reform would be constituted by that.

I won't say Lang affirms it; he simply says it is something worth considering. It would certainly obviate most of the difficulties we are presently suffering from. I have faint hope of this minister doing that. He has taken his stance and dug his heels in on the automobile situation.

That wouldn't preclude him, of course, from setting up special tribunals to hear the cases because, as was pointed out, they are largely fact tribunals. What they are trying to do is determine the facts of situations and the interpretive side does not require the erudition of a common law judge to come to conclusions. As a matter of fact, all it does is irritate them. You got the sense of that irritation from Mr. McRuer time and time again in the course of his report.

I wanted to mention to the provincial secretary the legal aid matters. There he could do munificent studies again with respect to exploring the possibilities, to see what was being done in other jurisdictions in this regard. I think he has some responsibility; he can't delegate that, of course, to the Law Society in any way.

I have sensed, by and large, that is what the Provincial Secretary is trying to do; to let them do the basic digging because, he says, the administration is in their hands. That doesn't mean that the overall philosophy —the way in which legal aid should go; and

the business of community offices and legal offices and things of that kind—ought to be wholly left to them. The Attorney General and I will have an opportunity next week to explore its possibilities more deeply. Money can be saved there, incidentally, as it is being done in Manitoba by simply giving a block fee in, say, uncontested divorce actions and things of that kind. I think they saved up to $400,000 last year.

Let me mention under this head again—and not much mention has been made of this in this House thus far—that this ministry is getting alleviation from the federal government as of, I believe, this year to the tune of $4 million. It has been spending about $10 million to $11 million on legal aid at the present time; it is going to get $4 million from the federal government under that particular head as I understand it. Therefore this minister is left with some considerable room, without eating it all up, to get down closer to the poor and to those who are really in need of legal aid by way of the community officers, etc., than he has ever been before.

Even if he spends $8 million with the federal government's $4 million on top, he is still ahead of the game, with an extra couple of million dollars to play with in this regard, to make it more palatable, to make it more humane and to get down to things in that particular regard. Some of the money, I understand, is going to the victims of crimes; that is a contribution being made by the federal government, too. I am not clear as to what is the precise sum involved in that idea.

Another area, as I mentioned earlier, in which the previous minister who has lamentably departed the fold was dealing with was the area of syndicated crime. Are those investigations and that so-called project going on apace within the ministry at the present time? Exactly what is the score in that regard?

The only other area in which he seemed to take a great interest—and he had already done the major work in the field while still Attorney General—was the business of the racetracks' parimutuel betting. He worked himself a little trip to Australia on that occasion. He produced a tome that would shake the rafters as to the context of racing in every conceivable part of Uganda.

It is a most beguiling document, indeed, but what is happening? What exactly is taking place at the present time? Is the Provincial Secretary still attending upon the federal government? Does he find that his persuasive powers are so much in the bushlands that he is unable to move the monster? What is going on in that particular area?

Here is another area in which we find dereliction in the sense—not reposed exactly but like a settling tank, full of acetylene or maybe prussic acid or something. The Lord's Day legislation is my bedtime reading. Before I go to bed every night I pick up and read some section—perhaps on hotels and restaurants and the number of hours which they operate and the rotation system that is going to be involved. Is the minister afraid of it? If he's afraid of it I don't blame him a bit.

On the other hand, they say something fairly innocuous, they say that Sunday is a day which ought to be kept free and it ought to be secular.

Mr. Singer: Jeremiah had something to say about that.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): He wanted to make it Saturday.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, why not get on with it? The law is in a mess. It's getting worse and compounding itself by the larger stores and others staying open the full weekends and attracting more and more clientele. Read the Law Reform Commission report on it. I substantially agree with it. I think Sunday should be maintained in the way it is, with the exceptions and exclusions that the commission has set forth there, pretty well along the lines that it set them forth.

Anyway, that's not my demesne. I'm only here to carp and criticize and the minister is supposed to be moving in contemplation, almost Socratic contemplation. You remember, Socrates would stand on a corner for several hours completely lost, and they would say, "He's gone. He's started to think again." Has the minister ever found himself in a corner of the parliament buildings—say out on the steps—and suddenly stopped dead for several hours—even several minutes—and somebody says, "Oh, Kerr's thinking again"?

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): Is that too much to expect from a minister?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. Another area in which I find we're terribly deficient—it doesn't concern the little cabal of exquisite prototypes we have before us this morning, but it does concern the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld)—is the studies in environmental law. I mean, they're doing some kind of threadbare stuff over at Osgoode Hall law school.

I recently purchased a book on that—I think the least they could do is give members of the Legislature these things free, but there you are—since I'm trying to make some kind of peerless contribution to the ongoing life of this community. But in any event—I think it cost me 15 bucks—take a look at it. It's a bound volume on environmental law.

We're just going to have to make major inroads on that area of law. It's not going to be done by the minister himself, because he's not a lawyer and not that much aware of what the problems are. I'm thinking of class actions. I'm thinking of private actions taken, not even necessarily on a class basis, by individuals in the community, given legislative licence to do so, against corporations on the grounds of pollution. Even if they can't prove immediate and direct damage to their property, they do it as a public responsibility.

In many states in the United States they permit these actions, and I suggest to the Provincial Secretary that they've been highly beneficial in terms of an alteration of mentality on the part of corporations, industries and any other people who pollute the atmosphere, in having the matter brought before the courts, given public voice, given a context in which it can be really spelled out in a way that the press can pick up, and in a way that can be eventually brought into legislation. Do give some thought to the whole area of environmental law, which is the newest area of law—a mere sibling, quivering in the crib, ready, waiting for the nurture, for the bottle-feeding that I'm sure this minister is anxious to supply to the squalling child.

Mr. Singer: His anxiety is obvious.

Mr. Lawlor: Why does he not give himself an immortality in human history as a minister who made all kinds of inroads into environmental law? His name will be championed in ages to come. He really turned over on that—all three cylinders were going at once!

I was going to speak, but I won't bother at the moment—I may pick it up downstairs—with respect to the conferences on uniformity of laws. I suspect that the minister, or basically somebody under his bailiwick, would attend those conferences, because this has across-the-board features.

Another area in which I would stimulate the minister's thinking—give him a little shot of the adrenalin of truth—would be that of criminology. What work is being done? If the minister has these overruling supervising functions and he is giving policy direction, it means that there's some ideology connected with it, and some thought processes having to do with the formation of new groups and entities and new directions in society.

Is the minister working on criminology at all? Is he in liaison with universities? Is he studying it personally? Is he aware of the correctional aspects? The minister over there is too busy locking the doors and on some occasions actually opening them to get involved.

Oh, this persiflage and high-flown stuff about criminology! Ministers of the Crown are far more practical men than that. I mean their brows may be villainously low, but they know what their eyes are directed at down below. But not a minister like this minister. No, he is the thinking type. Let's get some subjects to think about. And that's a prime one, because it's changing rapidly.

We've learned from a series of articles in the New York Times, some of which for some reason were duplicated in the Globe and Mail here, about juvenile crime. Everyone now agrees, by and large, the institutions in which the government is placing these children are far more detrimental to them, repressive and regressive, and turn them into greater little monsters than anything that could be done if one left them to roam the streets. That's equally true, on an extended scale, about our whole penal system.

Mr. Lewis: The minister believed that several years ago but he changed his tune.

Mr. Lawlor: There's only one justification for the jails that they put them in, that there are individuals—damned few, but a few—who are better set aside from society. Some people call them mad dogs or whatever you want to call them. These people are so deeply wounded, and so deeply alienated that they just can't get along. They'll commit crimes either just to show off for vainglory, or because they are bitter and hatred is so very strong. You have to put them aside, and that's the purpose of a jail.

For all the rest, and that's 90 per cent, all you do is make them worse—fill them up with vim and virulence. They come out seeking slaveringly to take it out on society. They'll do it as secretly and as undercover as they can. They'll stay as far away from the police as they can. This is the kind of mentality the government system creates.

Reform institutions—what a joke! In this area of criminology, studies should be given

and the Provincial Secretary should adapt them in relation to his ministers as to what approach will be made in this regard. Together with the type of training given to the police forces and to the guards, that might bring about enormous savings to the public purse in terms of incarceration.

We've been over the insurance report that we have been recently given. I'm sure that the minister is deeply concerned, but it's more properly an area under consumer services.

Mr. Singer: Only an extract from the report. The minister is still considering whether we should be able to look at the reasons for it.

Mr. Lawlor: We deserve the whole thing. But still it's nice once in a while, even by way of an abstract, to see some punch and some truth, because somebody speaking truth usually is speaking punchfully at the same time. That report doesn't cut any corners. It's quite blunt and forthright about it, and that's what we need, particularly in stirring up the insurance industry. I hope that the government will immediately proceed to legislation on pages and pages of recommendations of alterations of the Acts involved. I trust it's under study, and I trust under study by this minister, and that he will bring forward changes.

The member for Downsview mentioned the chequerboarding decision. Again, that's such a serious matter that I would anticipate legislation immediately after Easter, if not before. I know how complex it is, I know how tricky, but nevertheless, that situation certainly cannot be allowed to continue. I've had two or three cases personally of people coming in who have been mulcted of their life's savings —well, most of the money that they have anyhow—over one of these illegitimate operators, playing against your system. The minister can no longer bow his head and remain insouciant to that need.

Another area—and I'm almost finished—that I would ask the minister to desiderate upon is the cost of legal services. They're atrocious. In some way or other, the minister is going to have to find ways in which to simplify existing procedures in order to keep those costs somehow in line. And while he is doing it I trust it will come to pass in registry systems and in land conveyancing, in those particular areas, in areas of the courts. It's multiplying and the effect can't be excused, so I think he should set up a task force or some group.

A good deal of talk goes on. Dalton Camp was on a committee the other day as a spokesman on the cost of legal services. Why doesn't the Provincial Secretary set up a task force and get something operating there to see what recommendations can be brought forward? I don't think the reformation of the courts is too likely to alter in any very searching way the cost structure. It may have some effect; but why not give a focus to that and see what can be done in the area of preserving the public and the legal aid scheme and even others with respect in this particular regard?

Finally, I would like the minister to study, if he hasn't, a very broad area which I think is the most deep reaching, for my personal purposes, and that is the effect of poverty on the courts and on the administration of justice and on people in jail. What are the relationships?

I am sure they are very, very deep. The minister's gestures toward alleviating their condition, commendable as they may be, are not getting very far. I'm thinking of legal aid and other things the government devised to assist individuals who are in conditions of poverty.

We hear from time to time that, despite duty counsel or any other things, that an overwhelming number of people who appear before the provincial courts and the criminal courts, are poor people. I would suspect up to 80 or 82 per cent would be in that condition. There is something damn strange about that. If the type of sentences and punishment meted out to these people are on the basis of the punitive measures, they are being punished for being poor.

This is happening all over the province. Would the minister please give it some consideration? Would he make a study and see what the incidence is on one side of the fence, and work towards solutions on the other?

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Do you want the hon. minister to reply?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, that's the normal procedure, to have each of the parties make their opening contribution and have the reply by the minister; then call vote 1101.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of similar comments by both of the opposition critics, pretty well to

the effect of what do we do and what is going on in the policy field. I think most people have read the COGP report. I think it was No. 3 which dealt with the various policy fields and the basic responsibilities of the policy secretaries and the various ministers.

I think a quick rundown is necessary. I am sure most of this is known to the members, but we meet at least once a week. The four ministers, for example in my policy field, meet at least once a week to discuss policy matters that could effect any one of the four ministries or the whole field of justice.

These could be matters that are immediate, matters that we feel should be the subject of legislation and introduced in this House, broad policy matters such as offtrack betting or the competition Act, or Sunday observance or uniform store hours. These are all matters which we are discussing from time to time. We are meeting people and delegations and reading briefs from people who are interested in these areas.

For example, the competition Act and uniform store hours have generated a great deal of public opinion and submission. We have met with these people from time to time in our policy field meetings; sometimes they may involve an extra meeting during the week because of the time taken to discuss these problems with delegations.

As I say, as we discuss and make decisions, many of those decisions then go to the policy and priorities committee of which each provincial secretary is a member. It is chaired by the Premier (Mr. Davis), and the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Winkler), of course, is present as well as the Treasurer (Mr. White). Then it goes on to cabinet, caucus and eventually to the Legislature. For example, I think both the members asked what we are doing in certain areas that involve the federal jurisdiction. I might say that since the first of this year I have had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Lang, Mr. Gray and Mr. Allmand on a number of occasions and on various matters. We have discussed offtrack betting. We have talked about bail reform. We have been concerned, naturally, regarding amendments to the Code and the apparent confliction between the Code and the Highway Traffic Act in respect to impaired driving and electronic surveillance.

Mr. Bullbrook: When is the minister going to resolve that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That has gone to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, I realize that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As you know, the Ross case has gone there for an opinion, and I would hope that that would be dealt with within the next month or so by the Supreme Court. It will be a constitutional question.

Mr. Bullbrook: Supposing the Supreme Court upholds the lower court's decision, what will the minister do?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It could be that we would amend the Highway Traffic Act in that situation. Again, as far as Mr. Gray is concerned I have talked to him regarding the competition Act. As the hon. members know, Ontario has submitted a position paper on that. The federal government has also released a report dealing with privacy and computers. This has been discussed with Mr. Gray.

The whole field of corrections particularly where there are conflictions, has been discussed with Mr. Allmand. The Minister of Correctional Services is concerned about those. There is confliction, for example, between our temporary absence programme and intermittent sentencing. There is also the question of parole, where there is overlapping. The federal government is involved in parole for those individuals who are sentenced to under two years to our institutions. These are all areas in which we have been involved.

As the member mentioned, the Law Reform Commission now is involved in studies dealing with the administration of the courts.

Mr. Lawlor: Take parole. What has the minister done about it? Either one or the other jurisdiction should take over the programme.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes. There has been an agreement.

Mr. Singer: It doesn't take any intelligence to identify the problems. Let us have some of the minister's thinking on the problems.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There has been an indication by Mr. Allmand that it makes sense for the federal government not to be involved in parole for people sentenced to our institutions, say, for under two years. But there shouldn't be overlapping. Ontario should have complete jurisdiction where

people are sentenced to our institutions for the minimum length of time.

Mr. Singer: Well, don't we? Don't we have that now?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No. There is overlapping.

Mr Singer: But under two years in an Ontario institution, I thought, was dealt with by the Ontario government?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: And the federal government as well.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): The federal government looks after those with definite sentences. We look after those with indeterminate sentences. We want to get that changed so that we will look after those in our institutions.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I agree, for example, on the question of divorce. I thought there were some very good submissions and opinions from the recent meeting of the bar association regarding divorce, particularly when consent is involved. If there are no children involved, of course, it should be much simpler than it is now. We'd have to be concerned about support for children; and this could be part of an adversary system, if necessary. But divorce by consent, by respect to two adults, I would think should be part of our future law.

I agreed when the hon. member for Downsview talked about negligence accidents which have been involving the courts for years. These involve maybe two, three or four automobiles in an accident, all started possibly by a split-second lapse of one driver. The whole idea of trying to have witnesses on the stand two or three years after the incident to recall the facts of that incident seems ludicrous. It has to be changed.

Certainly, I would hope that the Ontario Law Reform Commission would deal with this more fully. I must say that I was rather disappointed to be told that the question of the limitation period was considered by the Law Reform Commission and it didn't recommend any change to that. I can't understand that, because I think the questions of whether or not it should be there, extended or even abolished, are things that have to be considered.

Mr. Singer: The minister doesn't have to wait for it; he can take action on his own. The minister is not bound by what they say!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We sort of consider the Law Reform Commission as being fairly sacrosanct. We've been following it a great deal in the past, and I don't think there is any reason why in the future we may not disagree from time to time.

Mr. Lawlor: When did Leal become a panjandrum?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Gun laws—

Mr. Singer: The minister can agree or disagree.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, he is only one member.

In the matter of gun laws, again we are involved—as with reforms in the Rail Act, as the hon. member knows—with the whole question of the constitution here and the area of responsibility. At the present time the Solicitor General has a study under way.

We've discussed this in our policy committee meetings; and there is a study under way to see where we can effectively and legally move in; whether it is a question of registration, or permits or prohibition. There's a consensus within our committee that there should be some change.

At the same time I think it's important, Mr. Chairman—as the hon. member indicated—when you have the unfortunate situation where two police officers are killed within a matter of days, there is a tendency for us to overreact.

I think it is very important that when we consider legislation, such as gun laws or bail reform, that we look at it in the light of the whole field of law enforcement and the administration of justice—and don't react to unfortunate incidents.

I think the whole question of co-ordination between ministries was raised by the member for Lakeshore; whether it's the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations who is concerned, or the Solicitor General. As far as the Securities Act is concerned, for example, that involves law enforcement; it involves whole areas of white collar crime. Certainly there is great co-ordination between those two ministries.

Mr. Lawlor: There should be anyhow.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think the important thing here is that before, without the policy field, ministers had the tendency to operate by themselves. They tended to make decisions which sometimes conflicted and sometimes

resulted in inefficiency and ineffective results.

Mr. Lawlor: Is the minister really trying to justify his job?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In a way.

Mr. Lawlor: Incredible.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: At lunch hour.

Mr. Lawlor: I looked—like Diogenes—for an honest man, and finally found one; but the darkness has closed down again.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think the member for Lakeshore really has little sympathy for the whole idea of policy secretary. I know he wants to be convinced; so we've got about a half an hour for me to convince him.

Mr. Singer: The minister has got to convince far more people than the member for Lakeshore. There are a lot of us over here who are not convinced.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The whole question of criminal investigation is rather important.

Mr. Singer: The rest of them are upstairs.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member for Lakeshore referred to my predecessor and certain organizations that were set up. I didn't read the particular remarks mentioned by the hon. member, but the organization involving the Ontario Provincial Police, the police commission, the RCMP and the Metro Toronto force, still exists.

It's chaired by a law officer of the Crown, a senior member of the Attorney General's department. Those investigations are going on. They were investigating alleged illegal activities in a certain part of the construction industry in the province. They weren't satisfied that the investigation was going on in the way it should have been. They didn't have the evidence mainly because of the tirade of the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) last November. So now we have an inquiry.

These are the things that this particular committee is doing. There are other areas it is involved in. I don't think the hon. member wants me necessarily to reveal all these things but, believe me, as the former member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) said, "this committee is set up and it is carrying out certain investigatory duties."

Mr. Singer: The former member for St. George also said he couldn't stand that job any longer because there was nothing to it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, I don't agree with that.

Mr. Singer: That's what he said.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Lakeshore mentioned Mr. Lang and the question of making speeches. I agree that the policy secretary should have a stance. They should know how he feels, what he thinks, what's in his heart and what plans he has; also what he would like to see done in the administration of justice.

Mr. Lawlor: That's the secretary's job.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Unfortunately, only the local weeklies are reporting me these days, but I have made speeches on bail reform; I've talked about the whole question of police commissions and whether or not there should be judges on police commissions.

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister talk about it in the House? Why doesn't he talk about it here?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I got myself in a little hot water with the local judge, but fortunately I don't have to appear before him too often these days. We talked about the whole question—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, will the minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Singer: If he makes so many speeches outside, why doesn't he make a few inside? Why didn't the minister take the opportunity this morning to tell us what his policy thinking is?

An hon. member: The member was talking too much.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I thought perhaps the member wanted a little background information and some quotes. We're getting to the nitty-gritty now—I'll admit that.

Regarding the whole question of crime in the streets, which is a phrase we read in Newsweek and Time every week, and a comparison of the situation in the United States and Canada, the hon. member for Lakeshore talked about the idea of there being two philosophies of policemen, the British and the United States. I hope we are closer to the British philosophy, that of the policeman being an independent agent, almost a leading citizen in uniform. People look up to him,

whether it's for information about streets within a municipality or helping young children stay out of trouble.

I think the fact that the US had legislation resulting from the Miranda case, as an example, is one reason why the image of the individual policeman deteriorated in the United States, at least in the eyes of the public. I think it's improving, possibly because the balance now is more in favour of the defendant. But I believe that rather than being coercive, our whole system should be humanitarian, persuasive. The image of the policeman—as I read in this morning's paper about a poll that was taken in the schools—should be as high as possible, because he is one of the most important people in our whole society. I think it is incumbent upon us in the Legislature, particularly us in the Justice policy field, to make sure that this is so.

The hon. member also talked about constitutional issues. Again we go back to the situation with the Criminal Code and certain pieces of our statutory legislation—marketing legislation, the competition Act and so on. We think there's encroachment as far as the competition Act is concerned.

Regarding the proposed legislation for privacy in computers, as the hon. member knows, my colleague in this field is active in that area, particularly in respect to reporting agencies and retail credit agencies. We must make sure there isn't confliction, that we work together, therefore making the laws understood and more effective.

On the question of family courts, the members have been talking about the questions of judges, a new perspective and whether or not there should be lay people in family courts. This is something we are considering.

On the question of legal aid, as the hon. members know, at the recent bar association meeting downtown in the past week, there was the question of mixed trust funds and what should be done about that. Really, from the articles and the reports out of that meeting it looked as if the province and the Attorney General were in some way ignoring this, or that we were dragging our feet in respect to this area.

Mr. Singer: Oh, no! Did someone suggest that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The fact is that discussions have been going on for some months between the members of the Law Society and the Attorney General.

Mr. Singer: The Provincial Secretary hasn't made his decision.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The fact is that it is not a question that we don't want legal aid to get part of this. This has always been part of our argument and our stand on this. Legislation is just around the corner. The Attorney General will be dealing with.

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister tell us what his theory is? What is the principle that he wants to enunciate?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Without being rather personal, without revealing anything—

Mr. Singer: Well, the minister is doing a good job out of that. He hasn't revealed a thing.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —I would suggest that with mixed trust accounts and the whole system of legal aid—I believe the Law Society wanted money for research and libraries—I think at least half of that money should go toward legal aid.

Mr. Singer: That's fine.

Mr. Lawlor: Let's compromise.

Mr. Singer: Why didn't the minister say that? Why didn't he say that this morning?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As the member knows, to do that there has to be a bill introduced in this House by the Attorney General.

Mr. Singer: We don't demand instantaneous bills, just good legislation in good time.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We may still have that at our policy committee meeting. There has to be a consensus on the percentage—whether it's one-third, two-thirds or 75 per cent. It really doesn't hurt for me to stand up and say I believe that it should be at least 50 per cent toward legal aid.

Again, we have talked about uniform store hours and Sunday observance. As the member suggested, it is a very delicate subject but I think we will see legislation very shortly dealing with either one. We have a consensus now. We have opinions. A justice committee of caucus has dealt with this. We have seen just about as many people as we can.

Mr. Singer: Ah, there it is!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We have had many submissions. Now it is on the final route to caucus, cabinet and the Legislature.

The member mentioned environmental law. As the member knows, in this province we have the best environmental legislation of any in Canada.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister means of any in Ontario!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The Environmental Protection Act and its recent amendments are looked up to and followed by other jurisdictions.

Mr. Lawlor: There's that schoolboy type of boast that we hear so often. It's utterly ridiculous. Has the minister made noise regulations yet? He is still crowing!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In that Act, there is provision for noise regulations.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In the area of criminology we use the facilities and the great expertise that exist at the University of Toronto's criminology institute; and the same at the University of Ottawa from time to time. We have reports on the question of sentencing, of juveniles and penal institutions. These are all reports which have been published. We have money in our budget to increase our purchase of research from these two institutions.

I don't want to get into this argument now but I think the member's comments about our reform institutions being a joke is not fair. I think we are making headway.

Mr. Lewis: It certainly isn't fair at the juvenile level, below 16.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This is a very, very delicate field.

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, it isn't fair to say that about the juvenile level.

Mr. Lewis: What?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It's a very complex field.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There's no perfection here. I think with what the hon. minister is doing with our group homes, our foster homes, our aftercare, and probation—

Mr. Lawlor: The government is doing more harm than good.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —we are making headway. There's been a shortage of money. I will agree that it has been too short in the last five or six years in this area. We have got to get rid of certain dungeons that exist in this province, known as lockups or county jails. We have to have more detention centres. We have to have more assessment centres, such as we have in Oakville and Sudbury, to deal with young people. I think the whole area of psychology and psychiatry is more and more becoming involved within the Ministry of Correctional Services now. We are getting better trained personnel. I don't think the hon. Minister of Correctional Services has to feel embarrassed in any way with what is going on within his ministry.

Mr. Lewis: Certainly not! He will be speaking with pride and authority!

Mr. Singer: Yes, indeed!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: For anybody who has read the Valpy articles in the Globe and Mail, I don't think they were quite as critical as one would think in reading them. I think he was just pointing out a very complex problem and explaining in his way how Ontario is dealing with it. There were a number of backhanded compliments as far as the ministry is concerned and in the area in which we are working. There has been a lack of money and there has been a lack of properly trained personnel. We hope to cure that.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The minister doesn't take any responsibility.

Mr. Lewis: I am glad he is encouraged by backhanded compliments from Michael Valpy. It would hardly be enough to sustain me if I were the minister, I'll tell you.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You pick up what you can get.

Mr. Lawlor: I suppose those backhanded compliments are better than none at all.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As a final point, the hon. member for Lakeshore did make a good point, and that is the question of effects of poverty on our courts. Most people who appear, particularly in our lower courts, are considered poor people. I know there are probably reasons for this—no question about it. Some of the crimes that are committed are just a matter of crimes of survival.

Mr. Lawlor: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: But I think this involves more than—

Mr. Foulds: What are the reasons?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: –the administration of justice as the hon. member mentioned. I think with our legal aid system and with our duty counsel, with our storefront lawyers and the expansion of legal aid we are filling any vacuum that exists as far as the due process is concerned. The question is to eradicate poverty on all fronts.

There is a tendency, I will admit, to push the man around who really doesn't know what his rights are, who hasn't had an opportunity to know even the basic procedures in a provincial court, for example, when he is arrested for some crime, either statutory or under the Criminal Code. Sometimes they are dealt with like a bunch of cattle down there.

There is one duty counsel, and they mumble some name out and the poor fellow happens not to hear it, or is a little deaf in one ear. He is dragged forward and asked, "Why didn't you answer?" Or he may be there over the weekend because he wasn't told what to do.

There is a great deal of room for improvement in this whole procedure, but I think as far as legislation is concerned, maybe we have gone as far as we can go. It's a matter of the humanitarian instincts of those people who are in charge and the giving of basic advice to people who are charged with offences, particularly as to their rights.

So, just in summation, Mr. Chairman, we have introduced in this field, I think, in a matter of the three weeks that we have been here, some 20 bills. I think there are about 28 bills in all on the order paper. There are more to come. The meaty legislation that is to be introduced in this session is still to come, and I am hoping most of it will come before the end of June. Most of it will be the result of discussions and considerations and thinking that have been going on in the policy field. Thank you.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of comments which I very much hope the minister won't regard as gratuitous, because I have listened very carefully this morning and I am profoundly disappointed and very distressed at what I have heard.

It is extremely difficult for me to separate the personal factors in all of this, because I think the minister knows–and if he doesn't know I want him to know–that I and many members on this side of the House have a high regard for him and for his capacities. We have seen him in other ministries, at other times, perform with a strength and an authority which did him credit day in and day out, and there is something very distressing about the transition from what once was to what is now. It has nothing to do with the minister's capacities; it has everything to do with government reorganization, and maybe the internal politics of the Tory party–but I am not privy to that.

I think that my colleague from Lakeshore is right, that in this field at least, COGP was profoundly in error; it has made a really bad mistake, and it is absolutely illegitimate in every sense to have a so-called Provincial Secretary for Justice when it obviously isn't necessary. There is nothing which the Provincial Secretary for Justice has said in the last half hour which couldn't have been said by any of his colleagues with equal facility and equal knowledge. At the risk of being a little insulting, let me tell him that there was not so much profundity or originality attached to what he said that it couldn't have been encompassed by his colleagues.

I don't understand what it is that has got us into this sort of policy box. The minister comes in here with a statement–and surely the minister must be embarrassed by this statement? I know why the name Jeremiah occurs in this statement. Jeremiah is thrown into this statement because somebody got fantastically embarrassed after they had read it through, and thought they would invest it with some literacy substance. So they searched–somebody who reads the Bible, which is very interesting–for the only name they knew and came up with Jeremiah.

There are others they could have noted. It's rather interesting that in a statement from the Provincial Secretary for Justice there is no reference to any area of world-wide jurisprudence, or any of the great jurists or writers of the law, and one minor reference to the Old Testament.

And the kinds of things he says. He says on page 2:

> . . . in establishing the Justice policy field has provided an effective structure for developing and co-ordinating our many systems for the equitable resolution of conflict.

Oh what gobbledygook that is! He doesn't have to make a formal statement to the House for that. He says:

> We have to achieve a difficult balance, for in serving the needs of public protection we must to some extent affect the

> rights of the individuals who compose that public.

Have the members ever heard that before? What a striking revelation that is.

> In protecting society as a whole, we still must provide for the rehabilitation of the offender who sometimes threatens that society.

Imagine revealing that to the House on a leadoff speech in 1973. What cumulative wisdom of the centuries there is in that.

> In protecting the consumer we must ensure a recognition of the proper and reasonable needs of his supplier.

Doesn't that embarrass the minister? The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations raised his desk top so that his face couldn't be seen by members on this side of the House when you read that sentence.

Mr. Drea: He was having a drink!

Mr. Lewis: I mean really! He says:

> The thrust of the programmes which are represented in the estimates which you will shortly review, will demonstrate to the hon. members our endeavours to relate our principles and institutions more clearly to the people so that they may not only serve but be better served in our system of justice.

Ask a kid in grade 5 and he'll write that kind of stuff for you. It will be a little more colloquial and so it will be a little more impressive; it won't be so discursive and so self-serving.

A Provincial Secretary for Justice walks into the House as part of a reorganization of government and puts together this kind of stuff. No, he is just too embarrassed for words; he is too dignified a fellow to say so.

And then he describes his colleagues. He says:

> The estimates of the Attorney General will reflect new methods and approaches in the development of a court system and the management of the various aspects of that system.

Wow! You know, it is breathless. Imagine the Attorney General improving the court system! Who would have believed that we have reached the point where that might be discussed?

> The Solicitor General's estimates will reflect our concern for the protection of the public from the offender in a manner that is consistent with his reform and rehabilitation.

I guess the minister had to go to the institute of criminology for that one. No one in the department could have come up with it—

Mr. Singer: A task force.

Mr. Lewis: —or established a task on it.

> The ministers who are associated with me in our endeavour [he says on page 7, rising to heights of catharsis] will be reviewing their estimates in detail, but I did wish to illustrate for the hon. members, however briefly, the mutuality of principle [that's almost as good as "confliction"] throughout the ministries and the manner in which their programmes relate.

That is really nonsense. The statement is unutterable rubbish. It says nothing, it contains nothing, it conveys nothing.

How does the minister get himself into the position of standing up here, leading off the estimates in this policy field, and presenting this kind of stuff to the House? What this says is that there is something wrong with this whole reorganization of government; and for the first time, in a very explicit way, we are now seeing it.

With great respect, I say to the Provincial Secretary for Justice that there is not a thing of which he spoke that the Attorney General, in the normal conduct of his duties as an authority line member of the cabinet, could not deal with, explain to the House or handle. And if not the Attorney General, then one of his colleagues could do this. I don't know what kind of make-work project this is, but $358,000 is a lot of money to pay to sustain something that is indefensible—

Mr. Singer: He might even have a speech writer.

Mr. Lewis: Well, never mind a speech writer—a writer, someone who doesn't abuse the English language by reducing it to anonymity. I really feel that there is something very funny about the secretariat. If it is not possible to be handled by the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, or the Minister of Correctional Services, it can be handled by the Law Reform Commission.

If the Provincial Secretary's purpose in life is simply to act as the man who says to the ministers by way of memo, "We will meet on Wednesday afternoons at 5:30 to discuss the field of bail reform," with great respect

I know some secretaries who are less well endowed who could do the same thing.

One really sees nothing coming out of this secretariat which justifies its existence. That's what I found truly bothersome about this morning. There is nothing in the minister's opening statement or in his response that suggested the kind of review of the field of justice which makes one feel that his job is real.

That hurts, because the minister should be in the cabinet and have major ministerial responsibility. It is nuts that a minister like him has to be forced into a straitjacket like this. I just don't understand it. The Premier never listens to me when I want to promote people, but the hon. member would make a much better Minister of Health, let me say, than he makes a Provincial Secretary for Justice.

I have said what I want to say. It just reflects my own personal frustration; it only took me nine or 10 minutes, having sat here for this morning and listened to all of this. I think the member for Downsview is right; I think the minister's estimates should be reduced to $1; not as a punitive measure but as a symbolic way of the opposition conveying to the government that this piece of COGP reorganization is utter, indefensible nonsense.

If the government wants to co-ordinate those various aspects of the administration of justice, then there are some excellent senior civil servants—I see some of them sitting under the gallery now — who could do it easily and well. We don't have to create a post that is entirely irrevelant from the day it came into being. I don't know how the minister stands it; I just don't know how he stands it.

Maybe he has become a cerebral aristocrat; and he enjoys it. And he enjoys it. And maybe like "Michelangelo" Davis, he will one day be engraved outside the Legislature in a thinker's pose. Heavenward, right? Yes! But I really—

Mr. Lawlor: With a loincloth?

Mr. Lewis: With a loincloth, without question. After all, he—

Mr. Foulds: Or at least a long tie.

Mr. Lewis: He is, after all, in charge of censorship—

Mr. Lawlor: After all, it is Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: —public well-being. And it is Ontario, yes.

Mr. Foulds: Ontario is such a respectable place.

Mr. Lewis: I wish him well in terms of future judgements of him; but present judgements are not very kind. And these estimates should be cut to $1. Can I move that? Can I move that the estimates of the Provincial Secretary for Justice be reduced to $1? Do I need a seconder?

Mr. Singer: Not in committee; but if the member does I would be glad to.

Mr. Lewis: Do I have to write it?

Mr. Chairman: Well you can—

Mr. Lewis: But the chairman is sufficiently with it this morning to remember what I said. Thank you, sir. I so move.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, now that we're on to the vote, I had waited with some great interest to hear the minister outline to us how he proposes to use this paltry sum of $358,000; but he didn't give us any details. As I mentioned earlier, the details on page 9 are completely non-communicative.

It's been an interesting debate to listen to, because having listened to the introductory statement—which conveyed no information at all—and then the critical statements, I couldn't wait to hear what the minister was going to say in answer to the various criticisms put forth by the hon. member for Lakeshore and myself.

I gather that the minister has jotted down the problems. Some of them were mentioned by me; some by the hon. member for Lakeshore—and the minister has a careful note of the problems.

But I listened intently to hear one single declaration of policy. As close as we got was when—by interjection, I think it was—somebody asked about interest on legal trust accounts. The minister then got close to enunciating a statement of policy; but quickly said: "In my personal opinion—now, don't bind me, don't bind my government, don't think I'm talking as a Provincial Secretary for Justice, but—in my personal opinion what the Law Society is proposing is not enough."

Another gem of wisdom that flowed from his remarks was: "Well, we don't really have to agree with the Law Reform Commission." Well, who ever said he did? Whoever suggested that all the wisdom about legal re-

form in Ontario lay at the doorstep of the Law Reform Commission?

They've done a good job for Ontario. They've produced some reports that are better than others; some that I don't like at all; some that I'm sure that the various members of the Justice galaxy don't like. But who said we're bound to wait for their words of wisdom?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Nobody!

Mr. Singer: Well, that's what the minister implied. That's what he implied. And if he got so far today as to talk about the reform of the courts, why hasn't the minister shown us the Law Reform Commission report on the reorganization of the courts? Is that another secret that he shares with his colleague who sits behind him and who won't tell us about the insurance report—other than the recommendations?

These conferences really must be important because no one dares breathe a word of what happens inside them outside the confines of the minister's meeting room. Does the minister have one single idea of what direction Justice policy should be taking? Does he have anything new to add to the very serious problems that beset these four portfolios that he apparently is supposed to supervise and interpret for, and guide and direct? Just one! And the minister hasn't said one in the three hours that this debate has gone on.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They will be revealed in this Legislature.

Mr. Singer: The minister hasn't taken the opportunity that we invited him to take to tell us what he wants the $358,000 for. Another one of the tragedies, Mr. Chairman, is that unfortunately when they got volume 3 of COGP, they said: "Ah, we're really going to do something." So they extracted one of the best Justice civil servants I have known in the Province of Ontario and made him the deputy to the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He's a busy man.

Mr. Singer: Yes, he's very busy. I haven't seen him performing anywhere close to the ability and the capacity that he has to perform. It's really a shame that the minister hived off Randall Dick and he apparently has as little to do as the Provincial Secretary has to do.

Mr. Lewis: He's probably doing a great deal more than the Provincial Secretary is doing.

Mr. Singer: Well, whatever it is, I don't know.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the best analysis of this secretaryship was given by the former member for St. George, Allan Lawrence, when he left. He admitted publicly and candidly that it was a nothing job. There was nothing to do; no one would listen to him. He had no opinions so he thought it would be of more interest and more of a challenge to go to another place. Where he has gone, at least every now and then we hear his voice; whether we agree with him or not we don't know.

We never hear the present Provincial Secretary's voice. I'm sorry I can't keep up with the local issues of the Oakville Tribunes Gazette Record, but if the Provincial Secretary has something of importance to say, perhaps he could bring himself to say it in the House.

I will gladly support the motion moved by the member for Scarborough West. I think it's only proper because I think that this minister, if he really had some feeling for this place and the task that he is apparently supposed to do, would have admitted long before now that he is in a nothing job and he does nothing. I don't think we have any alternative, Mr. Chairman, to voting that these estimates be reduced to the sum of $1.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Provincial Secretary wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, if the members have any questions about any of the items that are shown in the estimate book, I'd be happy to try to answer them.

Mr. Lewis: What are they for?

Mr. Lawlor: Just one question on the item having to do with the services. The 1972-1973 estimates indicated $39,100, and it's been increased to $54,000. This is just an example. Why the increased sum in that area?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I could go down the individual items here, which total $54,000. There's equipment rentals, $3,500 — that would be copying equipment; repairs and maintenance—this involves two automobiles—$1,200; conferences and receptions, $3,500—that's receptions and conferences we

have for staff meetings. The next item is educational assistance which is $800; that's extension courses and night courses for staff.

Mr. Lawlor: How large is your staff?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Altogether it would be a complement of 16 people.

Mr. Lewis: About 16?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: So the minister holds receptions for them to give them a sense of—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, the conferences and receptions involve not only other ministries but also representatives from other governments and other jurisdictions.

There are special services; this involves investigating committees, particularly the Cartwright committee that we referred to earlier. It also involves the Ontario Provincial Police, the RCMP and Metro. This figure is $16,000.

We have outside printing; that is certain finer printing such as the manual of practice that my predecessor published last year dealing with the Statutory Powers Procedure Act and the Judicial Review Procedure Act. That amounts to $4,000.

Consultant fees are for outside studies such as in the area of criminology, at the centre of criminology at the University of Toronto and the one at Ottawa—that was $20,000.

Mr. Lewis: It was $20,000 for consultants' fees?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, that's for studies.

Mr. Lawlor: That's where that criminology thing disappeared to. I thought the Attorney General was so upset with that in previous years that he cut off the programme.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This is not the entire expenditure by the government by any means. I think the members will find funds, for example, in the Ministry of Correctional Services for studies of this kind.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, there are.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: I know that may be legitimate, but look at Hansard in previous years. The minister will see Prof. Edwards very much under fire and the intention was to cut those funds off.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The idea now, Mr. Chairman, is that rather than an outright grant, as has been the practice in the past for the centre at Toronto and the centre at Ottawa, we will be purchasing services. Right now there is a little discussion about who has publishing rights—whether or not everything we acquire or purchase should automatically be published by the centre. I think that will be resolved.

I don't think it is a big enough problem in any way not to have us use the centre for this type of research. Sometimes the grant came from one of the ministries in this policy field; I believe at one time the Department of University Affairs was also involved in allocating funds for that. But we are still going to be using both centres in Ottawa and Toronto.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it is past 1 o'clock. Since we have finally got the minister started to talk about what this $358,000 is, he is going to be quite a while on it. We certainly aren't going to finish this vote today, so I would suggest that perhaps the committee might rise.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the House leader would entertain a motion that the committee rise and report.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): It doesn't matter to me.

Mr. Singer: The rules of the House are that we can't sit, except on unanimous consent, past 1 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is quite right but we happen to be sitting. Do members want to adjourn the debate?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I would adjourn the debate.

Mr. Chairman: I don't think there is any adjournment required.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs leave to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would like to say that on Monday we will be in committee of supply and we will hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon). We will then continue on with the present consideration of estimates.

An hon. member: The budget debate?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I am sorry. That's right.

Then as far as the private members' hour is concerned, if the Leader of the Opposition has not concluded his remarks by 5 o'clock—

An hon. member: On the budget debate?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's right. I would hope that the House would agree to allow that debate to continue and the private members' hour would follow immediately. If that happened to be the case after 5 o'clock, then on Tuesday we would continue on the same debate.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): We sit Monday night, do we not?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Tuesday night and Wednesday to 6 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:05 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 13, 1973

Cyanide discharge to sewage treatment plant, statement by Mr. Auld 921

Use of government aircraft, statement by Mr. Winkler 921

WCB official, statement by Mr. Guindon 922

Operating grants to universities and colleges, statement by Mr. McNie 922

Student awards programme, statement by Mr. McNie 923

'Budget Highlights,' statement by Mr. White 924

Sales tax on energy, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Singer, Mr. G. Hodgson, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Stokes, Mrs. Campbell 924

Municipal grants, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Singer, Mr. Cassidy 927

Question period, Speaker's ruling 929

Mining revenue payments, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Germa 930

Funds for purchase of Niagara Escarpment, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 931

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward County, questions of Mr. Auld and Mr. Snow: Mr. Lewis 931

Pollution problem at Canadian Gypsum, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Good, Mr. Young 932

Threatened Armstrong epidemic, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Stokes 932

Air pollution in Toronto, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Shulman 933

Rumours of Inco layoff, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Laughren 933

Huron county cottage survey of sewage disposal systems, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Gaunt 933

Natural gas explosion in Peterborough, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Burr 933

West Bertie sewage scheme, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Haggerty 934

Natural gas explosion in Peterborough, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Burr 934

Effect of energy tax on geared-to-income rents, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. B. Newman 935

Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Carton, first reading 935

Estimates, Provincial Secretariat of Justice, Mr. Kerr 935

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 958

No. 22



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 16, 1973

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to welcome visitors to our Legislature. In the east gallery this afternoon we have students from the Madonna High School at Downsview, and from George Brown College in Toronto; and in the west gallery, from Carlton Public School, St. Catharines.

At 8 o'clock this evening we will have scouts from the 44th Mississauga Boy Scout Troop in Mississauga; the 158th Boy Scout Troop in Toronto, and the 214th Cub Pack in Islington.

I know also that the members of the Legislature will be very happy to welcome another special guest whom we have underneath the press gallery to my right. We have with us this afternoon Timmy for 1973. Timmy this year is Richard Ware, a 10-year-old student from Scarborough, Ont.

ESTIMATES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I have here a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By his own hand, W. R. Macdonald, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1974, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, April 16, 1973.

Statements by the ministry.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF METRO TORONTO'S INCORPORATION

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the 20th anniversary yesterday of the incorporation of Metropolitan Toronto.

We are honoured today by the presence in this chamber of some of the members of the first Metropolitan Toronto Council. We are also honoured by the presence of the three men who have successively and successfully presided over Metro council in the course of its 20-year history. I refer to its first chairman, Mr. Fred Gardiner; its second chairman, Mr. William Allen; and its present chairman, Mr. Ab Campbell. In bidding them welcome, Mr. Speaker, I should note in passing that my colleague, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman), was also a member of the original council.

Also present and part of that council are Mr. Oliver Crockford, who was then reeve of Scarborough; Judge C. O. Bick, who was then reeve of Forest Hill; Mr. William Davidson, alderman, Ward 7, Toronto; Mr. F. W. Hall, reeve of York; Mrs. Dorothy Hague, who was reeve of Swansea; Mr. Allan Lamport, who was then mayor of the city of Toronto; Mr. John MacVicar, alderman, Ward 3, Toronto; Judge McMahon, reeve of North York; Mr. Fred Gardiner, whom I have referred to; and, of course, the present chairman, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's also important to point out that the members of the first Metro council embarked on an experiment that was the first of its kind in North America. In spite of the controversy, the opposition and the dire predictions which marked the development and passage of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act under one of my predecessors—and even today I hear some of this kind of discussion relating to other areas—it has led to one of the most successful attempts at local government reform on this continent.

This recollection is useful for us now in considering other proposals to reform and restructure municipal government elsewhere in the province.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The government has done its best to destroy it since, though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The lesson is that reform is not an end in itself. All governments—federal, provincial and municipal—exist only as vehicles to serve the needs of the community.

Metropolitan Toronto has been successful because the structure which this Legislature gave it 20 years ago was designed to meet the specific needs of Toronto and its surrounding neighbours. As these needs have changed, the structure of Metro has changed. That is how it must be.

Within the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, citizens have found a sense of well-being and a sense of urban identity in a community of interest.

The contribution which this assembly made 20 years ago, and continues to make to the health and strength of Metropolitan Toronto, is reason for our pride in this anniversary. We have equal pride in the remarkable pioneering contributions that were made by our distinguished visitors today. We congratulate them, Mr. Speaker, and on behalf of the members we say thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier.

Further to the statement made by the Chairman of Management Board on Friday relating to making public the logbooks of the aircraft used for government service, would the Premier not agree that the use of the aircraft by ministers and those outside the ministry should be reported to the Legislature, since it has been a matter of some public concern that the aircraft might in fact have been used for unauthorized purposes, as was pointed out by the Provincial Auditor?

Would the Premier not further agree with me, to make it interrogative, that it is not expected that every flight taken by the aircraft would necessarily have to be logged publicly and tabled here in this House, but only those usages that might be questionable under the terms put forward by the Provincial Auditor a few weeks ago?

Mr. Singer: Good question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course the auditor's report reflected on a policy that very frankly was not as defined as it should be. The policy governing the use of government aircraft has been defined—I think it was enunciated very clearly by the House leader on Friday—that it will continue to be the policy not to have the logs tabled here in the House. If the Leader of the Opposition has any questions about this situation, Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to listen to his observations, but the policy now is clear-cut; it has been transmitted to the Provincial Auditor so there is complete understanding as to the use of government aircraft. I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, the policy that has been enunciated is in the public interest and certainly, as far as the ministers or the ministries are concerned, this policy will be observed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the Premier give some further consideration to making the information public that is presently in the logs of those planes under the previous policy, which policy evidently changed a few weeks ago? I would suggest this to the Premier because of the undermining of the confidence of the people of Ontario due to the alleged misuse of those planes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't know there was an allegation of misuse, per se, at all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was very clear!

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): What does the Premier have to hide? He must have something to hide.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There was a reference as to the policy, or lack of policy.

Mr. Speaker, the policy has been established. It has been set, it is understood and it has been transmitted to the auditor. Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the government to table the logs from 1970-1971.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier must have something to hide.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, just a matter of policy.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay was on his feet first.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, if they are going to change the policy of making aircraft available to certain people, will he consider making them available to members of this Legislature who have settlements in their ridings, where there is legitimate government business, which are many hundreds of miles away from any road structure and the only access to them is by air?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am quite sympathetic to the problem the hon. member raised. I think my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) expressed the same concern. I think it applies—to be very frank about

it—to a limited number of members in this House.

It is my thought or hope that perhaps when the Camp commission report comes in, with some consideration of the problems of all members in servicing their constituencies, this matter may be referred to. I can't speak with any authority on this, Mr. Speaker; I just say perhaps it will be.

If that matter is not referred to in that report, I would be quite prepared to discuss with my colleagues and the Minister of Natural Resources the concern expressed by the hon. member. I fully appreciate the great geographic area he has to cover and the problem that he just can't do it by automobile. No one is going to quarrel with this; we shall see if any ground rules could be established.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview?

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Premier really believe that changing policy is sufficient to close the door on what has gone before, and that the public is not entitled to a full and complete explanation of how government or public money has been spent in relation to the use of government-owned aeroplanes by persons who obviously, no matter whether the government had a policy or not, should not have been using them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I have stated what the policy is. It has been the policy of the government for many years that the logbooks have not been made public and, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to change.

On the points of the Provincial Auditor, there were three that were made, and we are without any question resolving the problem to suit the recommendations in the auditor's report.

The other matter, in my view, is basically an administrative one, and that is whether or not the Ministry of Government Services, I believe it was, or the Ministry of Natural Resources, is charged for the operation or maintenance, which I think is basically an administrative problem.

But I just restate it once again, Mr. Speaker, the policy has been very plainly enunciated and it is the one that is governing the activity of the ministries in this government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is a lot more than that to be answered!

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. Singer: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Premier really believe that we have no right to know?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The member for High Park was on his feet first.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, would the Premier at least be willing to give the identity of those ministers who used our planes outside the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to do this. I would only observe this, that the member's reference to "outside Ontario," that is use by ministers of aircraft that go beyond the boundaries of Ontario, should not mean that this was not for government business.

Mr. Singer: How can we tell?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I just say that it is not the intent—

Mr. Singer: Give us the information!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not the intent to table the logbooks.

Mr. Reid: If I were the Premier I wouldn't do it either.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the members are wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the member for Scarborough West with the last supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: It is so simple that I am almost embarrassed to ask it, but perhaps the Premier would take a moment and explain, as a Premier who boasts of an open government with accessibility to information, why will he not, in the interests of the House and the public, table the logs as he has been requested to do by colleagues in the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of policy. In the same way, and there is some parallel I don't table my appointments —I am just speaking personally now—that is where I travel in a government car or who travels with me.

Mr. Singer: The Premier is going from bad to worse.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, with great respect, there is some similarity.

Mr. Reid: No justification!

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): There is no reason, it is government policy.

Mr. Singer: We have a right to know.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition has further questions?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Why is the Premier causing himself such embarrassment? Why doesn't he just do it?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It will be dug out piecemeal.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier has a death wish; that is the problem, a political death wish. His Treasurer (Mr. White) is digging the grave.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The smiling gravedigger.

Mr. Singer: Did the Premier turn down the thermostat before he left home?

Mr. Lewis: Alas, poor Yorick over there.

Mr. Singer: We have no right to know!

RYERSON FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs. Is he going to instruct the president of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute to make available to the staff and to make available to the public, information relating to the financing of that institution, so that some of the difficulties that they are experiencing in the administration there will at least be laid to rest?

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I was speaking to the chairman of the board of governors as recently as this morning. He assures me that all of the information is going to be made available to the board of governors that has not already been made available. I see no reason why that information won't be made publicly available.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did the minister say it "would be" or "would not" be?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Excuse me?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I didn't hear the last part of the answer. Did the minister say, whether the information "would be" made available or "would not" be?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Why it would not be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a supplementary, has it been the policy at Ryerson and the community colleges that that information was restricted to just the executive committee of the board and the president? Surely there have been indications that government policy was to make that information publicly available? It is all public funds, every nickel of it.

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of anybody consciously keeping figures from anyone.

Mr. Singer: Is it government policy to do that? Is it government policy not to tell?

Hon. Mr. McNie: I do understand that the financing of these institutions, the same as the financing of government, is very complex. In respect to what information is made available, I have discovered, as I have sat in between our own financial people in the ministry and the financial people at the institutions, there isn't always agreement as to whether or not all the information has been made available. As far as the policy is concerned, the policy is that that information should be made available to the public.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a further supplementary, has the minister some kind of a group advising him, which is also available to the administrative leadership of these various post-secondary institutions, that would at least attempt to help them keep out of trouble by establishing certain uniform minimum requirements for making information available and having an established understanding of what administration is and what are fairly the prerogatives?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken just as recently as two weeks ago in Belleville to boards of governors and reminded them of the guidelines that are available to them, which I think would satisfy the hon. leader if they were to satisfy themselves in this respect.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Available? Aren't they supposed to use them?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the minister willing to instruct the board of Ryerson to reinstate the 48

fired employees, or dismissed employees, subject to the president's report on his financial disbursements as of May?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that the decision at this moment is in the hands of Ryerson and the board of governors. I am satisfied that they will make the right decision.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does not the minister recognize that even in the board's arrogant decision over the weekend it has managed again to offend the faculty association and the student association; and that the situation at Ryerson will continue to deteriorate unless the question of the 48 fired employees is legitimately resolved? Does he not think that he himself should intervene?

Hon. Mr. McNie: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I don't accept the member's description of the discussions of the board of governors as being arrogant. I know they met for some 13 or 14 hours over the weekend.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): With themselves.

Mr. Lewis: With themselves. They don't consult with the Ryerson community.

Hon. Mr. McNie: The board of governors met and discussed the whole subject thoroughly. I am not at liberty at this particular time to discuss the outcome of their conversations, but I know that the member will be satisfied. I am prepared to acquaint him and the Leader of the Opposition afterwards with what transpired after that meeting. I am satisfied that they did the humanitarian thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions? Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have questions?

SALES TAX ON ENERGY

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the provincial Treasurer a question? Is he prepared to make a public undertaking, either by way of regulation, legislation or clairvoyance, that large landlords in the Province of Ontario will not pass on his seven per cent energy tax to tenants?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to see senior officials from Ontario Hydro this week to see how complicated and expensive it would be to encourage individual meters, not only so that matters of this kind can be dealt with more equitably, but so that a tenant wishing to conserve scarce energy resources and drive his own costs down, will be enabled to do so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second, just a second—

Mr. Stokes: Just a cotton-pickin' minute.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Ask him to withdraw the whole tax.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Deans: He is a disgrace to politics.

Mr. Lewis: No, no. He's the Walter Gordon of the Tory cabinet. May I ask the Treasurer what prompted him to choose so obviously unpopular a tax on energy resources as opposed to an equivalent amount of money from the resource sector, which is surely the more logical sector?

Hon. Mr. White: As you know, Mr. Speaker, from the budget presentation Thursday, we are in fact going to revise the Mining Tax Act and certain other resource Acts next fall—

Mr. MacDonald: And maintain the existing level.

Mr. Lewis: Maintain the level, he said.

Hon. Mr. White: —in time to replace the federal legislation, which I guess expires at the end of 1978. I would be very glad, Mr. Speaker, to take the opportunity to quote from the budget statement—which does in fact give the reasoning behind the changes referred to now in the question of the hon. leader—if you'll forgive me for a moment, and if it's very brief.

Mr. Reid: He sounds like the Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: One might have thought the Treasurer would have committed the reasons to memory. It isn't too much to ask.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): It is too much to ask.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I'll provide the reasons without a text, if you like.

Mr. Foulds: The minister is giving us his best view—bent over.

Mr. Renwick: Ask him if he's deducting this time from the question period.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Is this coming off the question period?

Mr. Renwick: Is this coming off the question period?

Hon. Mr. White: No. This is a serious question. I think it deserves recapitulation, if the House will forgive me.

Mr. Foulds: He just happened to have it up his sweater sleeve.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The smiling gravedigger.

Hon. Mr. White: I quote:

> Even after the increase in retail sales tax, I found it necessary to secure additional revenues to meet the target deficit. Accordingly, I am proposing to apply the retail sales tax to all forms of energy which are presently untaxed in Ontario. This would be a seven per cent value tax, to be collected primarily under the Retail Sales Tax Act. Because gasoline, diesel fuel, propane and some other energy fuels are already taxed on a unit basis, however, it will be necessary to integrate these existing forms of energy taxation within a comprehensive system.

And then there are illustrations given.

Mr. MacDonald: There is nothing new in that.

Hon. Mr. White: Continuing:

> When these fuels or forms of energy are used directly in manufacturing, they will not be subject to tax.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): This isn't an explanation.

Hon. Mr. White: I think this is a very important aspect of the tax.

Mr. Lewis: If the Treasurer had been listening the other day he would have absorbed this.

Hon. Mr. White: I said:

> This means that the electricity used to operate production machinery will not be taxed while electricity used for lighting will be taxed. It also means that the energy sources which are used in basic production processes—such as natural gas—will be exempt.

Then I mentioned certain changes affecting machinery of one kind and another.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Just turn your thermostat down to 33.

Hon. Mr. White: I said on Thursday:

> Let me point out some of the positive benefits of this new tax policy, apart from generating increased revenues. First, diesel fuel used in mining and manufacturing and forestry will now bear no tax as compared to the present eight cent tax.
>
> This represents a substantial tax cut which will lower costs to all users, particularly in northern Ontario communities.

Mr. Renwick: It doesn't improve with a second reading.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. White: I'm almost finished.

Mr. Speaker: Is the answer much longer?

Hon. Mr. White: I'm almost finished.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Continuing:

> Second, the taxation of all energy sources used for the same purpose eliminates the bias—

Mr. Renwick: This is repetitious.

Mr. Foulds: He is playing games.

Hon. Mr. White: This is an important matter, it's only going to take a moment.

> Second, the taxation of all energy sources used for the same purpose eliminates the bias in favour of formerly untaxed energy sources. Third, by taxing energy, there will be an incentive to prevent waste and to achieve the most efficient utilization of this vital resource. I think it is not too much to hope that pollution will also be diminished somewhat.
>
> Finally, let me emphasize again that I am proposing to enrich Ontario's tax credit system. The additional tax credit I am proposing will more than offset the additional costs of heating and lighting on the average residence resulting from the taxation of energy.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: Since it will so clearly raise rents around the province,

since it so clearly discriminates against low- and middle-income earners, since it is clearly the most unpopular aspect of a totally unpopular budget, why doesn't the Treasurer withdraw that part of his budget? Why doesn't he withdraw it?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Why doesn't he resign? It would be easier.

Mr. Speaker: Does the leader of the New Democratic Party have further questions?

GENERAL WELFARE RATES

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Community and Social Services: Now that he has raised the shelter proportion of the general welfare allowance for an individual to $57, can he tell us where, let us say in Metropolitan Toronto, an individual should be directed to find an apartment or accommodation for $57 a month? Could he give us an address, a location, a municipality?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my statement, this would be of considerable assistance. At the same time, I also indicated that this was not the end—that at the end of this month there will be a three-day conference in Ottawa and the whole subject of income maintenance will be discussed at the federal-provincial level.

Mr. Lewis: I see. By way of supplementary, the minister wouldn't have any suggestions as to where the accommodation for $57 a month could be found in the interim?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that Ontario is probably the best jurisdiction in North America for looking after housing for disadvantaged people.

Mr. Lewis: For high rents.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West finished?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. George.

MUNICIPAL GRANTS

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): I would like to address my questions to the Treasurer and they pertain to these grants to municipalities.

I should like to know when the grants are effective. I should like to know also what is the stage of budget processing by municipalities across this province and how they will accommodate the formula as spelled out in this volume? They will have already, I assume, rather finished with their budget review—certainly in the city of Toronto, which is waiting undoubtedly for Metro to assist in setting the mill rate. How can they then accommodate this and the timing of it as proposed? I don't understand it.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think the questions are pertinent. The hon. member will recall that in my budget statement I said we are contemplating changing our own fiscal year to coincide with the fiscal year of the municipalities; that is to end on Dec. 31 instead of March 31. We have invited comments on the pros and cons of such a change from municipalities, affected institutions and other organizations.

In the meantime, it is always troublesome for municipalities and similar agencies to deal with the budget year which we have. This was exaggerated this year because my coming on the scene rather late, namely Jan. 15, made it necessary for the budget to be somewhat later than usual. It is the custom in this House to have the budget before the end of March ordinarily. I am not minimizing the nuisance to our municipalities this year. I think that's more than offset, if I may say so, by the greatly enlarged grants and this is the message I am getting from across the province, too.

In London, Ont., to take an example I am most familiar with, the mayor seems to think that they can hold the expenditure level which they themselves decided upon some weeks ago, and the $5 million in additional grants will go into a full reduction of property taxes. Some number of other municipalities no doubt will be able to put all of the additional grants into the reduction of mill rates.

Some municipalities with limited resources will probably find it necessary to take a portion of the additional grants and expend it on pressing public needs. I think perhaps it is not too late for that course of action to be taken. My hunch is that a great many municipalities will apply a very considerable portion of the grant to the mill rate reduction and perhaps leave themselves something on the expenditure side for critical public works.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, yes.

Mrs. Campbell: Of course, the municipalities in estimating revenue do try—I think the Treasurer would agree with me—to estimate with reasonable accuracy. Now, I suppose at this point—

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mrs. Campbell: I would like to ask at this point—take the city of Toronto with which I am more familiar—could they at this point estimate on the basis of the maximum, or would they estimate at half the maximum, which is usually the position they find themselves in? How can they do this?

Are they holding back because of this and doing interim financing, and how will that affect their position? Or does the Treasurer know?

Hon. Mr. White: It was my understanding from what I read in the paper over the weekend that city council or its financial experts would today be deciding the full impact of these changes insofar as Toronto and other Metro communities were concerned, and that they would very quickly be able to alter their mill-rate stand.

On Friday we did provide to the member, I think, and other members of the Legislature a full list of these additional grants, and this information will be available to the municipalities also.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer: Since the purpose of the budget provisions for municipalities was to reduce mill rates, and since more than half the low-income families in the province are tenants rather than owners, what steps is the Treasurer prepared to take in order to ensure that the benefits of mill-rate cuts are passed on to low- and moderate-income tenants?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the people who are having the most dreadful time of all, it seems to me, are those people in the lowest quartile, who are hardworking citizens with rather meagre incomes—

Mr. Cassidy: Sure!

Hon. Mr. White: —and who are trying to hold on to a home of their own. This will benefit them directly.

Mr. Cassidy: Half of them are tenants.

Mr. Lewis: But at least half of them are tenants.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, this will benefit them very directly through mill-rate reduction, through the enrichment of the tax credits.

Mr. Lewis: There will be no mill-rate reduction.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, let's wait and see.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, we will wait and see.

Hon. Mr. White: The returns will be in in a week or two. The member for Scarborough West will apologize, I trust, if a mill-rate reduction takes place.

An hon. member: The member means he hopes there won't be.

Mr. Lewis: There won't be.

Hon. Mr. White: In addition, the tax credits will shift taxes significantly from the least prosperous citizens to the more prosperous citizens. This is even more true of pensioners of moderate means.

The average pensioner in my town this year is going to get a tax credit of between $110 and $115. That tax credit next year will amount to $240. I think this will be true across the province as a whole.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister seems to be saying that this—

Mr. Speaker: The supplementary was well away from the original question on that, of course.

Mr. Cassidy: No, I think it is still on the subject.

Mr. Speaker: It is the New Democratic Party's turn for a new question.

Mr. Cassidy: No, this is a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The question of the minister is: What proportion of the $180 million directed to municipalities will be to the credit of corporate, industrial and business taxpayers who provide 43 per cent of municipal revenues?

Hon. Mr. White: I don't know that answer. I'll look into it though.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the Treasurer has done very nicely for them in his budget. He has helped them very nicely.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

MERCURY TASK FORCE

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. How long has the Minister of Health had the task force report on mercury pollution in the English River system? Could he indicate to the House today what he intends to do about it? Has he done anything about the fact that Indians are still eating mercury-contaminated fish in that area?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have done a complete study of the task force report and I expect later this week I will likely be making a statement to the House on the stand my ministry has taken on this.

Mr. Reid: I could hear hardly any of that answer. Did the minister say he had the report and the Premier will be making a statement?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I said we have the report. We have studied the report and I will be making a statement to the House later this week as to what action I will be taking from my ministry's standpoint.

Mr. Reid: By way of supplementary, the minister will be making a statement to the House leader? Does that mean he will also be making one to the House?

An hon. member: To the House later—later, not leader.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

STUDENTS' TRAVEL EXPENSES

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet: Why is it that most of the ministries do not even offer to pay, let alone pay, travel expenses to Toronto to graduating students considering full-time employment with this province? Does the minister not think this is being discriminatory to those students who live considerable distances from the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Would the hon. member repeat the first part of the question, please?

Mr. Bounsall: Why don't the majority of ministries even offer to pay, let alone pay, travel expenses to Toronto to graduating students who are being interviewed for full-time employment with the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Probably because the balance of the opportunity that is granted to them is sufficient to offset that particular purpose.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, that's nonsense. What a fatuous statement!

Mr. Foulds: That's a discriminatory remark.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary—

Mr. Foulds: They are going to lose every seat in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I have a question of the Treasurer—

An hon. member: Ask the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot); he'll agree with that comment.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

GASOLINE TAX REBATE FOR FARMERS

Mr. Gaunt: I have a question of the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the Treasurer to discontinue the gasoline tax rebate to farmers? I had understood that it would be continued, but at least one news report said that it would be discontinued.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the rebate will be continued at the rate of 17 cents a gallon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

ALLEGED ACTIONS OF REEVE OF KINGSTON TOWNSHIP

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs: Has the minister had an opportunity yet to investigate

the allegations in the Kingston Whig-Standard that the reeve of Kingston township is using his position as reeve to enrich his own coffers by making certain changes in the local township rulings in connection with his own lands?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think I've had no communication from the complainant, but I did read in the newspaper that a letter was being sent to the Premier's office—

Mr. Shulman: That was last month!

Hon. Mr. White: —and it was my understanding that a reply was going forward to the complainant, describing to him how he could pursue this according to rigorous legal methods available to him through the courts of law.

Mr. Cassidy: But the minister is washing his hands of a flagrant conflict of interest.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: Does the minister not feel there is a responsibility on his shoulders in his role as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to take some action here, and not leave it up to individuals in the area to spend a great deal of money going to court?

Hon. Mr. White: We have a study going on within the ministry to see what obligations we have in the matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Another study!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Education—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Singer: No, I have a new question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: Would the minister inform us?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, I have said.

Mr. Speaker: Now the member for Downsview.

SCHOOL BUDGETS

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Minister of Education. Since the Minister of Education believes that the North York Board of Education treated him so badly, could he advise us whether he is going to take advantage of the invitation extended to him to be present and meet with the North York board on Wednesday next at 3 o'clock?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I don't ever recall saying that the North York board treated me badly.

Mr. Singer: Well, the minister said it was a snow job.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's quite different from being treated badly—

Mr. Singer: Yes, that's nice treatment.

Hon. Mr. Wells: At the present time my commitments here in my ministry and with the Policy and Priorities Board will prevent me from attending the meeting of the North York board on Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I'm sorry to hear that. The minister might get another snow job.

An hon. member: Is the member going?

Mr. Singer: Yes, I'll be there.

Mr. Speaker: The member for—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre has a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friends are going; my colleagues, the members for—

Mr. Singer: They can't speak for the minister; they don't know his policy.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for York Centre—

Hon. Mr. Wells: They'll handle themselves well.

Mr. Deacon: Supplementary: In view of the problems that Toronto is having, as expressed by the North York board, is the minister considering bringing in a special provision so that Toronto will not have its school system destroyed because of the lack of special grant consideration to meet its special needs?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member who has just asked me this question has been definitely snowed by some of the propaganda that is floating around—

Mr. Singer: Everybody is mean to the minister all the time!

Hon. Mr. Wells: —because I've seen nothing to indicate that any of the kind of restraints in increases in spending that have been suggested by this ministry and this government will wreck any school system in this province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur—

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary then.

Mr. Deacon: In view of the fact that this suggestion was made by the chairman of the school board of Ottawa, why does the minister feel it is not well justified, based on the arguments she presented.

Mr. Lewis: It was not a him.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would like the hon. member to give me the exact words and time and place when the chairman of the Ottawa school board said this kind of thing, because she and I—

Mr. Deacon: In the minister's office.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —have talked many times and, in fact, I'm led to believe that the Ottawa school board has prepared a budget which is within the spending guidelines for that board.

Mr. Deacon: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Minister of Education: Has the minister had time to consider my letter to him of March 22 outlining some of the regulations of his department regarding correspondence courses which apparently discriminate against the students in Catholic high schools, and particularly the case of Jean Edith Lowry of Central Catholic High School in London?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have an answer to the hon. member sitting on my desk on that particular problem and it will be given to him very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? Yes.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Will the minister kindly convey his answer to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) so that he could forward that to me, because this was asked of the Minister of Labour some weeks ago?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York-Forest Hill.

ALBERTA NATURAL GAS

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): A question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: What is the government doing about the virtual embargo that the Province of Alberta has slapped on the sale of gas to companies? Is it doing anything about that?

Mr. Reid: He's not doing anything about anything.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): I'm not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Has the provincial secretary rethought his programme for flood control, recognizing that there is a likelihood for further flooding today and tomorrow? Is he prepared to consider an announcement within 24 hours which might make money available on a low-interest loan basis to citizens who would like to avail themselves of it, and to provide the diking necessary to hold back the waters?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I can't assure the hon. member whether the announcement can be made tomorrow or on Wednesday. My hope is that a concrete statement of policy will be available within a couple of days.

Mr. Deans: That's very well said.

Mr. Cassidy: Not before that time?

Mr. MacDonald: We hope it will be before, rather than after, the flood.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

PROBLEM OF FARMERS IN UXBRIDGE AREA

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is he contemplating immediate action, or action soon, to eliminate the problems that have arisen whereby farmers in the Uxbridge township area are sitting on their land to which they have no legal right and are losing their mortgages? What action is the government taking to correct this situation, which was detailed in my Throne debate speech of last week?

Hon. Mr. White: The matter is under consideration at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Good: Well, a supplementary: This is the answer these farmers have been getting from the government for two years.

Mr. Speaker: Question!

Mr. Good: Now, can't the Treasurer do something better than that and give them some definite word—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Good: —as to when he will amend the Planning Act?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Good: Can't he give them some more definite answer than that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Can't the member sit down?

ACTIVITIES OF HOLIDAY MAGIC LTD.

Mr. Stokes: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Since we do have laws in this province prohibiting pyramid selling, will the minister investigate the activities of Holiday Magic Ltd., of 15 Rolark Dr., in Scarborough, the company that is under charge in the Province of Quebec at the present time? Will he satisfy himself that their activities here are not afoul of any legislation passed here recently?

Mr. Laughren: Satisfy us too!

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has said, the company has been charged in the Province of Quebec, along with two principals of that company and some 35 distributors acting for the company. They've been charged with a breach of the lottery legislation contained in the Criminal Code.

My ministry is well aware of the company's activities within this province, and is working closely with Metro and the Ontario Provincial Police. I should add they do not have a licence or are not registered under the Pyramid Sales Act at this time. The company has been dealing very closely with the registrar of pyramidic sales in an attempt to have it registered but, as of this moment, it is not registered. We're well aware of its activities.

Mr. Stokes: As a supplementary, does that mean that they aren't duly licensed to carry on activities in the province at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Clement: The company is not licensed in the Province of Ontario at this time. The provincial police and the Metro police are aware of that because we have advised them, and their own investigations have confirmed that too.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

DIAL-A-BUS SYSTEM

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In light of the fact that a dial-a-bus system is contemplated in the Toronto area, is the minister, as this time, prepared to provide sufficient funds to other municipalities so that they could study the feasibility of adapting that system to their areas?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, this particular project in Metropolitan Toronto is a demonstration project. The answer to the question the member asked would be that if there are funds available for studies—there are funds available for transportation studies—dial-a-bus probably could be part of this study that would be

made. There are funds 75 per cent–25 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

ASSISTANCE FOR WELFARE ACTION CENTRE

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): A question of the Minister of Community and Social Services: Is it the minister's intention to provide assistance to the Toronto welfare action centre as has been requested by me and by the action centre on at least four occasions—to which he has not replied in over a year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member could repeat his question. I didn't hear it.

Mr. Martel: Is it the minister's intention to provide financial assistance to the welfare action centre in Toronto, for which requests have been made by me and by the centre on at least four occasions over the past year and to which we haven't received any acknowledgement, either yes or no, to date?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member probably knows, there are very many worthwhile groups. I would say I have an average of at least two delegations a day. This came to my knowledge only last Wednesday, I believe, when this group came in and submitted its submission to me with a copy to my deputy. This was last week, either Wednesday or Thursday; this was the first time, to my knowledge, that I had heard of its request.

Mr. Martel: Would the minister have someone in his ministry check his mail because, in fact, I've written about this on at least three occasions and have not received any acknowledgement.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

USE OF MARKET VALUE ASSESSMENTS

Mr. Good: A question of the Minister of Revenue: What prompted the use of market value assessments in the year 1973 for taxation in 1973 in Bruce county?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There were some difficulties with respect to some of the municipalities in the area where there was a great imbalance, as I recall. We had a special request from the county council and it seemed to be wise to make the change there immediately. The last report I have received is that the assessment has come along just fine and there has been very little complaint about it.

Mr. Good: A supplementary: Does that means that the government policy of using market value assessment in 1974 for 1975 taxation will be changed and that there will be an earlier implementation in other areas across the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, not necessarily. I don't know whether the hon. member is aware of it but there is quite a number of municipalities which are now taxing on the new system of assessment.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Certainly, if it appears advisable to do that because of circumstances in some of the municipalities, of course we will do everything we can to accommodate them. The original plan of the government to bring in the new system in 1974 for taxation in 1975 still applies and hopefully we'll be able to meet it.

Mr. Good: One final supplementary: Could the minister tell me how many hundreds or how many thousands of appeals there have been to the assessment now that the appeal date has passed? Would he have a total number of appeals in Bruce county?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information at my fingertips. I'll be glad to get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

FRENCH SCHOOLING IN ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education, before he leaves; he's hiding behind the dais right now.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): No, he never hides.

Mr. Lewis: Alas, that's true!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that the French schooling situation in Elliot Lake is now assuming some of the proportions of the situation in Cornwall or previously in Sturgeon Falls? What is he prepared to do in order to resolve that situa-

tion quickly rather than letting it continue and fester?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, of course I'm aware that there are concerns in Elliot Lake. As a matter of fact, I was late arriving at this House today because I met some of the group from Elliot Lake. They are at present carrying on very good and, I hope, productive discussions with the Council on French-Language Schools, which is meeting in the Macdonald Block at the present time with the group of students from Elliot Lake.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister prepared to ask Dr. Symons to intervene in that situation in order to resolve the situation quickly, rather than letting it last and last?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It would be very premature to suggest that at this point in time, Mr. Speaker. The Council on French-Language Schools is a very competent group of francophones. They are, as I say, at present meeting with the group. I think we should give them an opportunity to assess the situation and at least get back to me with their report and considerations of what is going on.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Martel: We could always provide them with a cab.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, yes.

Mr. Foulds: What deliberations has the Council on French-Language Schools taken with regard to the situation at Elliot Lake, seeing that the group which is presently outside the Legislature had contacted senior levels of government over six months ago about the problem in Elliot Lake?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I'd be very pleased to outline for my friend all the different contacts that have gone on. I think for the past six months or so that the Council on French-Language Schools, the assistant deputy minister in my department and many people were involved with Elliot Lake.

I just remind him that in all of these things these problems have two sides. They involve talking with two groups of people, the French-language committee and the school board. Really, it's a case, I think, of not inflaming passions on both sides, but getting people to talk in a cool, collective and constructive way to solve their problems. That's what the council is dedicated to doing, and it has been attempting to do that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Foulds: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: There is a pretty basic matter of French-language rights which the government always ignores.

Mr. Speaker: This is the final supplementary then.

Mr. Foulds: Wouldn't the minister agree, though, that the delay in action at Elliot Lake has, in fact, already led to a polarization in that community which is extremely unfortunate?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think I'd be willing to agree to that at this point in time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Which part doesn't the minister agree with?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE COSTS OF EDUCATION

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

In light of the fact that on Dec. 4, 1972, the minister tabled in this House the second report on the costs of education dealing with capital costs and construction, when will the minister table the first report on the costs of education dealing with teacher training?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I hope that we'll be able to table that within the next three or four weeks.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask the minister if he would care at this time at least to provide the House with a summary of the recommendations of that report?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Snow presented the annual report of the Department of Public Works for the year ended March 31, 1972.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that, nothwithstanding the previous order, the House will sit on Wednesday, April 18 at 2 o'clock, p.m., and that when it adjourns that sitting, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 24.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, if I may provide a short explanation, this bill raises the general rate of paid-up capital tax from one-tenth of one per cent to one-fifth of one per cent.

The dual rate of capital tax payable by banks is raised to a uniform rate of two-fifths of one per cent, and the special tax on banks and the office tax on them are repealed. The special taxes, under part 4 of the Act, on corporations other than insurance corporations are repealed, and the corporations that pay these repealed special taxes will now pay the general capital tax. The taxable paid-up capital of corporations will now include all bank loans.

A proposed amendment will prohibit the deduction from income of a part of management fees, rents, royalties, other similar payments, and payments for the right to use films or videotapes when those payments are made to a non-resident person with whom the paying corporation does not deal at arm's length. This replaces the present provision in the Act that prohibits the deduction of only management or administration fees.

The bill provides that the rate of refund to which mutual fund corporations are entitled is increased from five per cent to six per cent in order to refund the full amount of capital gains tax paid to Ontario. This change applies to 1972 and subsequent fiscal years of these corporations.

Fraternal societies will become liable to the insurance premiums tax with respect to contracts entered into after Dec. 31, 1973.

Most of these changes take effect on April 13, 1973, and the bill provides specific provisions to deal with the changes for fiscal years that include that day. Other minor amendments are proposed to clarify the existing provisions of the Act.

SECURITY TRANSFER TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal the Security Transfer Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, this bill will repeal the Security Transfer Tax Act effective April 13, 1973. Ontario is the only province imposing such a tax and it is hoped that its removal will have a positive influence on the acquisition of equity ownership by Canadians, and by residents of Ontario in particular.

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this is essentially a housekeeping bill; it provides for the refund of Ontario income tax on the capital gains of mutual fund trusts. The provisions avoid the double taxation of these gains, both in the hands of the trust and the hands of its unit holders to whom the gains are distributed.

The bill will also amend Ontario's property tax credit plan to ensure that where the occupancy cost of the principal resident is paid out of a trust, the principal taxpayers for whom the money was paid will be able to take those payments into account in calculating his property tax credit.

Amendments are also proposed to exclude foreign diplomats from the definition of principal taxpayer, and to meet certain requirements under our agreement with the government of Canada for the administration of the property tax credit plan.

CITY OF LONDON BOARD OF EDUCATION ACT

Mr. Walker moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Board of Education for the City of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes there will be some very delightful apples distributed to each and every member.

Mr. Stokes: How about some cheese to go with it?

Mr. Taylor: As members know, Prince Edward is famous for its cheese as well as other agricultural products, but today, through the courtesy of Harold Bonter, president of the Quinte Fruit Growers, members are going to have, as I say, these well-polished apples. I hope that members enjoy them and think of Prince Edward-Lennox and all of the people of the Quinte area as they munch away.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day there is one point that puzzles me and I would like to get confirmation from the House leader. Am I correct in assuming that we are going from here to the budget debate and thence into committee of supply, at which point we will continue with the estimates of Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr), and that the estimates committee will not be sitting at the same time dealing with other aspects of Justice?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is true.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, sir.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Except for one proviso; that is that if the Liberal contribution to the budget debate goes past 5 o'clock, I would hope that we will have the courtesy of the House to allow the private members' hour to take one hour of today.

Mr. Singer: We are pleased to co-operate as always.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, as the opposition critic of the Treasury and Ministry of Revenue I am pleased once again to bring the comments of the Liberal opposition on the budget presented by the Treasurer on Thursday last.

Before I begin my remarks, however, I must compliment the Treasurer (Mr. White) and thank him for involving the critics from the opposition parties and the staff members of our respective offices in the presentation made to the news media on Thursday afternoon. For the first time we were able to review the contents of the budget before its actual presentation in the chamber.

The Treasurer has been most considerate in providing this facility to the opposition and now I believe the comments that can be made immediately after the presentation of the budget come, of course, from somewhat greater study than has been the case in years past.

As a result of the studies which we have done over the past several days, it is clear to me that the sales tax increases announced in the recent budget are not really necessary. They are not necessary to achieve the presumed goals of the administration. The basic criticism which I have to make of this budget is that the Treasurer could have achieved his presumed result if he would do but two things.

The first thing that he must do is to forecast properly the revenues of the province, especially in the time of a buoyant economy.

The second thing he must do is to use the examples of waste and inefficiency and mismanagement as set out in the most recent Provincial Auditor's report in order to cut out the unnecessary expenditures which have been made by this government.

If the Treasurer were able to add those factors together, we believe that the increases in revenues and the lowering of expenditures would have given Ontario the result for which it now has to pay dearly.

In the only part of the budget that was the slightest bit funny, the Treasurer decided not to apply retail sales tax to the purchase of household pets. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that he stated, "I find it abhorrent to put a tax on these lovable creatures which become in effect members of the family."

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He was not funny at all. He was deadly serious.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Treasurer has decided, however, to tax all the rest of the apparently unlovable creatures in the province, namely, all the citizens of Ontario. The increase in sales tax to seven per cent is regressive and

it harms those who really cannot improve their incomes. It will have the effect of hurting pensioners and the wage-earners with the lowest incomes.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all the hocus-pocus and sleight-of-hand and transfer from one pot to the other which the Treasurer proposes will not in effect shift the burden from those who have to carry it now. The approach which the Treasurer has taken has made a mockery of the claim of government responsibility and good management within this province.

By this increase in taxation alone, we expect that a family of father, mother and two children under 16 years of age, with a total income of some $10,000 per year, will probably pay at least $52 more a year in sales tax alone. On a quick calculation, we would presume that such a family would have, after income taxes, a disposable income of $7,500.

With housing at $200 per month and food at least $100 per month, it seems reasonable that there would eventually be the sum of $3,000 to be spent on taxable consumer goods. The tax at five per cent, of course, was $150 and the new tax at seven per cent will be $210. So this then gives the Treasurer $60 more per year from this family.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we are informed in the Treasurer's own words that a tax credit amount of some $36 can be expected, but the family I have used as an example is likely going to have to pay that $28 to which he also referred for its heating supply for the year. The net result therefore is this figure of $52, or a dollar a week taken away from each of the families within the province. I put it to you that this example is indeed modest, perhaps paltry, when compared with the mathematics of the editorial writer in today's issue of the Toronto Star.

The greatest failing of this government is its inability to forecast revenues and expenditures. A year never goes by when revenues and expenditures do not exceed the original estimates. The Legislature is often asked to approve supplementary estimates, and last year alone these amounted to the sum of $200 million. But what is even more appalling, and is pointed out in the Provincial Auditor's report, is that some $114,856,000 was spent in the fiscal year 1971-1972 through Management Board and Treasury Board orders, and that this money was spent without approval or review by this Legislature.

It seems that the government is unable to take into account the effects of supply and demand in its tax increases. In addition, this government cannot visualize the economic activities of the coming year when trying to determine its needs each year at budget time.

The interim report on Ontario's finances dated Jan. 31, 1973, indicates that the upturn in the economy, brought about by federal initiatives in the fiscal and monetary fields, resulted in some $45 million more revenue from personal income tax than expected. There was also $35 million more revenue from retail sales taxes and $160 million from corporation income taxes. These represent increases over expectations of 3.9 per cent, 4.1 per cent and 4.5 per cent respectively. And if we look at last year's budget and see where the tax increases came, we see that the government failed to take into account the effect of increased prices on the demand for goods and services.

Last year gasoline taxes were increased and the government collected $7 million less from this source than it expected. Fees, licences and permits were almost all increased and the government collected $3.4 million less than expected. Liquor prices were increased and the profits from trading operations of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario increased only by $4.1 million. This was an increase of 1.7 per cent over expectations while consumer consumption generally increased 4.1 per cent as related by the increase in retail sales tax.

It should also be pointed out that the government's deficit for the fiscal year 1973, which is now estimated at $476 million, was originally standing at a figure of $800 million. This was reduced by a guesstimate of the Premier (Mr. Davis) to $600 million and was further helped by the fact that additional revenues were received from the government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this administration seems to have fallen on bad political times. The decisions which are made by the ministries seem to go from weakness to weakness as the cabinet tries to cope with the fiscal problems of this province. It is clear that their manner of coping has set up inappropriate policies, which have clearly been the trademark of the Davis administration. The largest deficits in the history of the province have been added to the burden of our provincial debt since William Davis became Premier two years ago. The harsh decisions in this recent budget are simply an indication of his

attempts to set the provincial fiscal house in order before complete chaos envelops us.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, the most important note in looking at this budget from our point of view, is that the Province of Ontario did not really need a tax increase. The federal initiatives in reducing taxes will ensure bouyant economy in the coming year, and we are all confident that the revenues from personal and corporate income tax in the coming year will far exceed those forecast by the Treasurer. Indeed, I might say that consumer consumption will probably increase as much in the coming year. The revenues from sales tax would have been more than enough to reach the goals of this administration, if the rate had been left at five per cent.

The Treasurer has predicted the budgetary deficit of some $400 million in the coming year. I am confident that his inability to forecast revenues will mean that we probably will find in the final analysis that we have in fact almost a balanced budget.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He's building up a nice surplus for election year.

Mr. Breithaupt: We have all condemned the use of sales taxes as regressive taxes. This is because they bear most heavily on the low-income wage earner and take a greater proportion of his income to pay than they do from the wealthier citizens of our province. The Treasurer's attempt to offset the regressive nature of this tax is another example of this government taking away with one hand and giving back part with the other.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A small part.

Mr. Breithaupt: This is done, of course, at all times with the attendant inefficiencies and the waste of an increasing and expanding bureaucracy. In this case also, we believe that the part that is returned to the poorer citizens of our province is completely inadequate.

And in addition, Mr. Speaker, at a time of inflationary price increases—especially those dealing with energy resources—the extension of the retail sales tax to include electricity, gas and home fuel works a great hardship on our people. The Treasurer's comment that a family man could reduce his taxes by turning down the heat is certainly cold comfort.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He'll have fun at the Tory caucus this week explaining those remarks.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, there is clearly a lack of control over the expenditures being made by the present administration. As we look at the additional $280 million which the government plans to gain through increasing the provincial sales tax by two per cent, we wonder why the public must continue to pay for mistakes made by this government.

For the first time in the history of this province, the Provincial Auditor's report catalogues the millions of dollars of waste which occur under the mismanagement of this administration. The Provincial Auditor's report probably represents only the tip of the iceberg. When it is multiplied by 30—that is, when it is multiplied by the number of years of Tory mismanagement in Ontario—the amount must be truly staggering.

Let's just look at a few items which occur in the Provincial Auditor's report. Provincial student aid loans are now in arrears by $336,507, and of this, some $14,413 are deemed uncollectable. The cost to the province of the outstanding $336,000 at today's interest rates means approximately an additional $33,000 per year while these accounts are in arrears.

In section 97 of the auditor's report, we are shown the over-stocking of publications by the Department of Education. With an inventory on hand of $106,000 valued at retail rates, the department managed to sell $13,816.95 worth of those publications. What we probably have here is between $30,000 and $40,000 worth of publications, valued at cost, which in fact will never be sold.

Item 102 in the auditor's report relates to the uncollected fees in the companies branch in the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. This amounts presently to $750,000. We do not know how much of that amount will ever be collected. But again, at current interest rates, it is probably presently costing the province some $75,000 a year to maintain these outstanding fees, since moneys have to be borrowed elsewhere or funds committed from some other source. The Department of Health had about $750,000 in surplus and obsolete stock. Of this amount, $30,500 worth was just thrown away. About half of the remainder was given to the Pakistan relief fund—and we certainly can't argue with that kind of an approach in ridding ourselves of obsolete stock—but then we see the remainder of some $378,000 dis-

tributed to other departments, probably to sit in their inventories also as obsolete stock.

The provincial courts have $10 million in unpaid fines. At current interest rates again that's costing the province perhaps almost $1 million a year to maintain, and how much of it is uncollectable remains to be seen.

The Ontario Municipal Board fee structure was initially set up so that the fees would be commensurate with costs and expenses incurred. In 1961 everything seemed to be under control, when revenue was $317,000 and costs were $269,000. By 1971 revenue was $515,000 and the costs had escalated to $897,000. This means that the OMB was costing us in excess of $382,000 in 1971 to operate, although it was originally envisioned to be in a balanced position or possibly producing a slight revenue for the province.

Then there was that duplicate payment to pensioners. Over $21,000 was paid out as duplicate payments due to the mismanagement of this programme. Of this amount, about $15,000 was recovered, which obviously created a hardship for the pensioners in receipt of these funds. They certainly wouldn't have known that a duplicate payment had been made and that at some time the money would be recalled in a way similar to the way that General Motors recalls its automobiles. The remaining amount of almost $6,000 is unlikely to ever be recovered.

The mismanagement of licences and permits in the former Department of Lands and Forests meant that almost $43,000 worth of licences had to be written off because they were reported either to be lost or inadvertently destroyed. Who knows how much of those funds went astray into the pockets of persons who shouldn't have received them? Who knows how many hundreds of fishermen enjoyed their sport free of charge that year?

One of the better fiascos pointed out in the Provincial Auditor's report was the federal-provincial special development loans programme. The federal government had made available $17 million to the province to be used in municipal capital projects. Of this amount, just over $5.6 million was applied for by the municipalities.

Why the province did not make a concerted effort to see that municipal projects around the province were found so that all of the $17 million was put to use is just another example of mismanagement. Surely $17 million fully injected into the economy of Ontario, which would have provided jobs and increased consumer consumption, could only spur our economy. This would also mean higher revenues for the province in terms of increased personal income tax and both corporate and sales taxes. However, Mr. Speaker, of the $5.6 million, none had in fact been disbursed by year end, March 31, 1972. By July 31, 1972, only $75,000 had been disbursed. Surely the Treasurer of this province or someone in the government must realize that there are time lags between the injection of money into the economy and the economic benefits which are to be derived from it?

Then item 126 of the Provincial Auditor's report tells us of the empty leased premises within the Department of Public Works. The leases have been entered into and the premises are now standing vacant with no hope of subletting. The net cost for that is some $15,000. Item 128 tells us that a delay in the construction of phase 2 of the Queen's Park project, which many refer to as Disneyland East, costs us some $448,000 in storage charges for inventories alone.

There have been various comments made in this chamber with respect to the operations of Ontario Place. The estimated cost of $14 million escalated to an eventual cost of $29 million just for the construction of this project. The operating deficits continue; and the restaurants of Ontario Place operated at deficits of almost $105,000.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): And not a cabinet minister in the House.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Six members out of 76!

Mr. Breithaupt: One can only presume that the $40,000 advanced as working capital to these restaurants will never be recovered.

The most important single item in this area, of course, was the $50 million that we found out was lost because of the decision not to collect premiums under the health insurance plan. In addition, another $5 million was lost because premiums were underbilled. One wonders how many millions of dollars in disbursements to doctors were lost where services were either not rendered or where the patient was overserviced.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if you feel that it is appropriate that this debate continue when there is not a single representative of the ministry here for the lead-off budget criticism from the official opposition.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it was a shameful circumstance during the Throne Debate that is now being repeated, that the government of Ontario, which is supposed to listen to people, hasn't got the good sense to at least listen to the comments from the opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs): On the point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am glad to be here to hear the criticism, although it must be said it is not dealing with the budget, it is dealing with the auditor's report. However, I myself have sat here. I was called out for just a moment where I was able to listen on the intercom.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): One out of 23.

Hon. Mr. White: I was curious to see there were only 12 Liberals here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the Treasurer, it is true, has been here. But surely with an administration as large as we have here it is time that they understood that it is at least part of their responsibility—and in my view their prime responsibility—to be here in the House to hear the debate as it comes forward. Surely it is totally irresponsible that they would absent themselves day after day.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They are never here.

Hon. Mr. White: Where are the Leader of the Opposition's members?

Mr. Speaker: May I remind the Leader of the Opposition that, so long as there is a quorum in the House, the debate goes on.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): He knows that that is not a point of order.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It sure is.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): All right, so we made our point.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: It shows the disrespect of the government to this House.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are many other items in the Provincial Auditor's report where dollar value is not placed on the government's mismanagement of affairs, particularly in the area of cash management. An example of that is the Ontario Development Corp. placing over $1 million in term deposits earning less than 5.75 per cent, while it had outstanding advances from the Treasurer costing a rate of 7.5 per cent.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an acceptable figure for the total of errors pointed out in the Provincial Auditor's report is probably $100 million. When we add to that figure the additional $50 million voted in supplementary estimates last year for additional health costs, we come up with almost one half of the total benefits that are to accrue by the province by the raising of the sales tax from five per cent to seven per cent. Surely, this additional $50 million, which was voted in supplementary estimates must be added in, because of the government's failure to adapt the package of constraints and checking which Dr. Kinloch had suggested to the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter).

The general mishandling of the Medicare programme within Ontario has, of course, been the subject of broad discussion over the past several months. When we see this mismanagement focused within one particular ministry, it becomes apparent to those of us in the opposition that the minister has either no desire to change the situation or no ability to deal with this problem.

There are, of course, Mr. Speaker, other examples of waste through mismanagement, which have not as yet appeared in the Provincial Auditor's report. We can think within the last several weeks of the cancellation of the proposed development east of Bay St. in Toronto. Some $250,000 was spent for architectural proposals and then the plan was killed immediately after those proposals were received.

In addition, the cutbacks in the use of hospital and educational facilities are further examples of poor planning. All of us would agree that cutbacks in spending are commendable when services are not impaired and where there is justification for these changes. However, we must remind you, Mr. Speaker, that schools and hospitals were built at great cost, and hundreds of thousands of teachers were trained at enormous cost to the province. Now we have hospital beds being closed down, and classrooms, and even whole schools, empty.

It would seem that planning school facilities, in particular, would be fairly easy. We have readily available statistics which indicate the number of children in each age group.

However, the arrival of the post-war baby boom, as it moves into the primary schools and secondary schools and then into the universities, seemed to come as a big surprise to this government. In this situation the government can really blame no one else, because it has had the responsibility of governing this province for the full term of the lives of all the students in question. Even worse are the sums of money which have been spent on community colleges and universities while duplication has obviously resulted and while classrooms in the primary and secondary schools were being emptied.

Of course, we have had to have educational facilities at all levels for those members of our population born since 1945. We knew that these children were coming into the classrooms and we also knew, as the projections were apparently with us, that the numbers following would be greatly reduced. Once again, there appears to be a clear lack of planning for facilities. Once again there appears to be an inability to shift the use of classroom resources from one level of education to another as the student mix within our population changes.

Another example of mismanagement by this administration is the approach that has been taken by the Attorney General's office concerning the interest paid on money left in trust accounts by the lawyers of this province. It would appear that the inability of the Attorney General to act on this particular problem has allowed some $11 million of free income each year to go to the banks and trust companies which are operating in Ontario.

As has been pointed out, the interest on these moneys goes to those institutions by default. The lawyers have no right to these funds, as agreed by the rules of the Law Society of Upper Canada. Further, it is certainly impractical to divide the interest up among the various clients as these funds flow in and out of trust for the purchase of properties or on other projects for clients.

There is surely no reason why the interest from these accounts cannot be used for the general benefit of the public. A portion could be used to cover some of the costs of the legal aid plan which is now a charge to the province of about $11 million a year. A further portion could be used for research in legal education and in law reform. All that we hear from the Attorney General (Mr. Bales), as a representative of this government, is that the matter is being studied. We have not seen a task force appointed as yet; we have not seen a board of review. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have not as yet even had a royal commission. Perhaps all of these things will be coming to us in the fullness of time.

What must be done, and it should be done today, is that the Attorney General ensure that the funds which are going by default to institutions that have no claim to them should be put to public use. Here again, we have an example of failure to act. Mr. Speaker, this example in this area once again points to the mismanagement of funds which are available and should be used to benefit all the people of this province.

Now that another year has gone by since the last budget within Ontario, there is a further area which must once again be pointed out as an obvious saving of expenditures for the citizens of Ontario. This, of course, is the situation which exists in the continuation of grade 13 within the Ontario secondary school system.

Both the Hall-Dennis report on education and the report of the commission on post-secondary education in Ontario have recommended the elimination of grade 13. Recommendation 22 of the report called "The Learning Society" states:

> The present grade 13 standard of education should be attainable in 12 years, allowing individuals entry into all forms of post-secondary education after 12 years of schooling.

The draft report of the commission says:

> We view a fifth year of secondary education as being educationally unnecessary and a socially undesirable barrier to wider accessibility of post-secondary education. Much of the social screening that is now attributed to post-secondary educational institutions occurs, in fact, by grade 9 when the streaming of students starts. By abolishing the 13th year and without diminishing the quality of education we will be increasing the educational opportunities of our students and decreasing the social distance separating the different kinds of post-secondary educational institutions in our province.

In September, 1972, there were 50,712 students enrolled in Ontario. The cost of educating one student per year in 1971 was $1,303. If we multiply the number of grade 13 students by that cost we can get a total cost of educating these students for one year which is $66,077,736.

It would, of course, be incorrect to say that the province would save this full amount by eliminating grade 13, because administra-

tive costs and specialty costs would still have to be incurred for grades 9 to 12. But certainly we could save many millions of dollars per year by moving immediately to cancel out the grade 13 system.

Another major source of waste of provincial government funds is the continuation by some agencies of government of using the proposal system for acquiring building space. I think I know why the system persists—at least I have my suspicions. Not all of the government backbenchers may understand the difference between the proposal system and the tender system, so let me explain it briefly.

With the tender system, the purchaser specifies in detail his requirements and then asks the suppliers to submit their prices for providing the goods or services which are required. The purchaser then chooses the lowest price.

With the proposal system, the purchaser mentions his requirements in a vague and general way and would-be suppliers work out their own detailed specifications and prices. The purchaser then has to give out his decision as to which package of specifications and items is the best. The decision the purchaser then has to make is a most difficult and subjective exercise. It attempts to decide which specifications are adquate, which are excessive and how much each aspect of specification is worth to the purchaser.

Since this exercise is subjective there is a potential for awarding lucrative contracts to one's friends, and this prospect becomes even more tantalizing if one's friends can be encouraged to make political donations to one's own political party.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It becomes irresistible for the Tories.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How differently do the Liberals work? It's precisely the same pattern.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, we presume that the provinces in western Canada may be able to improve upon that. Time alone will tell.

The Ministry of Government Services now uses only the tender system. This wasn't always so, but of late the ministry has seen the advantages. It is now ministry policy to invariably tender for goods and services and for this policy, I must say, the ministry is to be commended.

In light of this government policy it is fascinating and most curious that certain government agencies do not invariably use tenders. I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, how tendering can be good for the government but not good for the agencies and emanations of this government.

For example, when the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education built its office building on Bloor St. it used the proposal system, and with that building comes a $2.1 million price tag each year. With the proposal system no one can tell with certainty whether OISE office requirements could have been more cheaply satisfied, but one can tell with certainty that this OISE building is the most imposing edifice in Toronto, with the possible exception of the John Robarts Library.

Then there is the curious example of Ontario Hydro. As we look out the front doors of this building we see construction going on before our very eyes. Here is a commission which usually tenders for everything, even when it buys pencils. If Hydro can save money by calling for tenders to buy pencils, it could save an awful lot more by calling tenders for a $45 million head office building.

Mr. Reid: But Kelly wouldn't like that.

Mr. Breithaupt: Of course, that is presuming it's needed in the first place. But if you thought so, Mr. Speaker, you would be right—a lot of money could be saved.

My leader has shown how much money Gerhardt Moog and his organization will make on this deal. For an initial investment of some $6 million, Gerhardt Moog will be rewarded with a rental income of $6.1 million each and every year for 30 years. And even as he goes around his home in Ontario—if he has one—turning down the lights and wearing a sweater, he will have benefited greatly from the people of this province.

Further, if I may be allowed to straighten out the Premier's earlier comments on this point, after expenses and after mortgage payments, Mr. Moog would still recoup his initial investment in less than two years, he will double his money in less than four years, triple his money in a little over six years and so on and on—

Mr. Good: That's not bad.

Mr. Breithaupt: —and the profits will pile up over the 30-year life of the lease.

If I may further illuminate the earlier comments of the Premier—and I won't charge him seven per cent tax on that illumination—I would refer to his comments concerning the concept of present value. In our view, Gerhardt Moog's annual discounted rate of return on his investment will be a shocking 38.7

per cent, and Mr. Speaker, this 38.7 per cent is after expenses and after mortgage payments for a guaranteed first class tenant for 30 years.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thirty-eight per cent profit.

Mr. Breithaupt: What investment could be safer? What investment could be more lucrative?

Mr. Lawlor: Where is the entrepreneurship?

Mr. Breithaupt: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this building had been tendered it would have been cheaper and it would have eliminated all suspicion that has gone on with respect to the view that this contract was awarded because of friendship with this administration.

These suspicions have arisen in the mind of the public for two reasons. The first reason is because of the extremely high profit accruing to Mr. Moog. The second is that Hydro had intended to build this new head office on its own. Hydro has built its other buildings and it started out to build this one by itself. Hydro had architectural drawings worth $1.5 million made up and was prepared to go ahead, then all of a sudden all of this was set aside.

An hon. member: Here comes Moog!

Mr. Breithaupt: The end result was that Mr. Moog was going to build this building no matter what the cost—and that is exactly what he is doing now.

So, Mr. Speaker, given these kinds of goings on, is it any wonder that many of Ontario's citizens are suspicious of this deal and of how and why Mr. Moog got into a position to make so much money? And, Mr. Speaker, isn't it curious that all of this mess could have been cleaned up simply by abandoning this proposal system immediately for all government agencies and invariably moving to use the tender system? This is a further and another example of government waste and inefficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer has made much about his comments concerning the changes which will result to the benefit of municipalities because of the proposals in this budget. When we think of areas in which this government has with no good reason, or with poor results, flushed taxpayers' money down the sewers of mismanagement, we must obviously think of this government's regional municipalities.

The point has been made by many observers of this mad scheme and by every poor citizen who has been "regionalized': Regionalization makes municipal government more remote from the citizens. It makes it less responsive to their needs and their requirements and it makes it more impersonal. In fact, a municipal copy of the unmoving and unmovable bureaucracy of Queen's Park seems to be imposed upon all of the areas when they become regionalized.

If this is the effect of regional government, why does the government press ahead with its plans for further regionalization? The government speaks of regional planning as the benefit of regional government, but surely planning can be done on a regional basis without meddling with the existing local governments?

All that is needed to make regional planning work is a programme of assessment equalization, and the Treasurer has shown in this budget that even he can devise such a programme. Well, if regional planning can be done without regional government, the only possible reason for imposing regional municipalities on a vigorously resisting citizenry is that it is a more financially efficient means of local administration.

Mr. Speaker, the data on regional government so far does not bear this view out. Quite to the contrary, the data shows that regional government increases cost.

For instance, the total expenditure of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton went up 88 per cent in the four years since it was formed. Niagara's total expenditures have risen 85 per cent, in the three years since it was formed—and its costs for general administration are 164 per cent higher. The regional municipality of Yorks total expenditures are up 180 per cent in the three years since it was formed—and its general administrative costs are up 250 per cent.

The evidence is clear. These regional governments are caught up in their own administrative Queen's Park-type bureaucracy. This is evident and it brings the usual financially disastrous results for the average citizen. The province has pumped $90 million into these sad ventures and the annual injection of money is not declining. Quite the reverse; it is in fact escalating at a terrifying rate.

When these so-called transitional grants run out, local taxes will skyrocket. I'm sure the member for Waterloo North and I share that view within our own region of Waterloo.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for the imposition of these municipal catastro-

phes. I reiterate now our party's call for a moratorium on further regionalization pending a full review of the whole programme. We must see the true facts and figures that emerge from the sad mess which has been created. And I point to the $90 million of provincial moneys poured into the regional municipalities to help them stay afloat. That $90 million may well prove to have been moneys which have had no benefit for our citizens but only increased burdens upon them.

The Treasurer has made much of his presumed attempt to co-operate with the federal authorities in not imposing a greater income tax on the people of this province. While he denies that any commitment was undertaken with the federal Minister of Finance in this matter, he does say that there was an understanding by which the moneys granted through a reduction of federal income tax would not be taxed away by the various provincial authorities.

But the end result of this budget does not prove these statements. It is true that there is no increase in personal income taxes, but a net increase in revenues of well over $200 million will still result. This will be the net result of the rise in retail sales taxes from five per cent to seven per cent and the further extension of these taxes to household energy sources, less, of course, the reductions resulting from the establishment of the two new tax credit schemes and other minor reductions in taxes.

The federal Minister of Finance has pointed out that the equivalent of this additional $200 million of increased revenue by sales tax is an income tax increase of about 16 per cent.

Hon. Mr. White: That's completely incorrect.

Mr. Breithaupt: Now, this of course does not take in account the expiry of the temporary three per cent personal income tax reduction at the end of 1972, which matched the federal three per cent cut.

Certainly if the Treasurer of Ontario accepts the logic of his federal friends in Ottawa, this would represent a further increase in taxation of Ontario residents of approximately $35 million.

Mr. Good: My friend is confusing the Treasurer with facts.

Mr. Breithaupt: As a result, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, the effect is to increase Ontario's taxation by the equivalent of an increase in personal income tax of roughly 19 per cent on the present total figures.

The Treasurer of Ontario argues at some length that neither the federal budget of 1973 nor previous budgets have provided sufficient economic stimulus to Canada. I think we should recall, Mr. Speaker, that the reduction of personal income taxes which had been proposed by the federal authorities would be equivalent to an across-the-board reduction of from 12 per cent to 13 per cent. This surely must be compared with the gross reduction which the Treasurer himself proposed in Ottawa of some nine per cent and a net reduction of only five per cent, after making allowance for the four percentage points which the Treasurer wanted the provinces to acquire.

It is curious, Mr. Speaker, for us to see the federal Conservative Party complaining that the federal budget has been insufficiently expansionary, and especially to look at that in the light of the fact that the Ontario budget is far less expansionary this year than it was last year.

Hon. Mr. White: Why, our deficit is larger than theirs per capita.

Mr. Singer: Oh, is that the test of expansion, the bigger the deficit? Or is that the test of good management?

Mr. Breithaupt: While the federal Conservatives—

Hon. Mr. White: Ours is 12 per cent of revenue and theirs is 11 per cent; so ours is slackening.

Mr. Singer: The bigger the deficit, the better we're doing. That's a good theory; the Treasurer must tell us more about that some time.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): It is, with that kind of government up there.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Good: If we ran our businesses the way this government is run, we'd have been bankrupt years ago.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, while the federal Conservatives have been calling for the abolition of the federal sales tax on building materials, the effect of the present Ontario Conservative budget will be to increase the Ontario retail sales tax on those materials from the present five per cent to seven per cent.

Mr. Ruston: That's great logic, isn't it?

An hon. member: At the retail level, a tax on tax.

Mr. Breithaupt: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hike in provincial sales taxes and their extension to household energy consumption is of course highly inflationary.

Mr. Good: Shameful!

Mr. Breithaupt: It is inflationary because it will act directly in increasing the prices of a wide range of consumer goods.

Mr. Reid: Especially in northern Ontario.

Mr. Good: It will blow up in the government's face.

Mr. Breithaupt: Surely we must contrast the approach taken by this Conservative administration in Ontario with the avowed concern of the Conservatives in Ottawa over inflation, and all the attendant problems that come from it.

It will remain to be seen whether the economic optimism that is predicted by the Treasurer of Ontario, in effect, takes place in 1973. He predicts real growth in the province of six per cent. We shall see whether in fact he is successful.

We can note as well that he states that employment grew strongly in 1972 and is expected to continue doing so in 1973. He fails to mention the benefits of any federal initiatives in these areas, but I presume that is to be expected.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I knew the members opposite would look after that over the last weekend.

Mr. Breithaupt: There is another area in which the federal Conservative friends of this government have once again been let down by their colleagues. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the federal Conservatives criticized strongly the fact that the temporary reduction in corporate tax generally of seven per cent was allowed to expire last year. Here we note that the five per cent investment tax credit provided by Ontario as a companion measure to stimulate, was also allowed to expire at the end of the last fiscal year. While one group sees merit in the actions of Ontario, the other wing of the party sees disarray and problems at the the federal level. When the left wing doesn't know what the right wing is doing it must indeed be a difficult situation for those who are in the middle of the bird.

Mr. Reid: It's all chicken in between.

Mr. Good: It will never get off the ground.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas with respect to specific tax proposals in this budget on which my colleagues will comment. I am certain that as this debate continues many other inadequacies of the present administration, especially through this budget, will be brought to light.

There is, however, one further point that I should bring to the attention of the House. I note that much consideration is now being given to the naming of unorganized and unopened township areas within the northern part of this province. As the Treasurer reminds us, we are living in times of provincial stress when all of us are required to turn down our lights and, to use the words of that old song, "put on our old White sweaters."

Mr. Ruston: And Stanfield underwear!

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Stanfield will be happy about that.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is only fitting that we give some thanks and consideration to a small group of martyrs who are struggling to keep the expenses of this government as low as possible. I am referring, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the seven government supporters who are not receiving any benefits from this Legislature beyond their sessional indemnity.

This happy band of brothers seems to be taking upon itself all the sins of commission of the other 69 government supporters. I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the naming of these townships some mention might be made in the history of the province of the sacrifices which these members have all made and are making. I do look forward to seeing it announced in the next short period of time that new townships will bear the following names: Belanger; Lane; MacBeth; Morrow; Parrott; Timbrell; and Turner.

Mr. Singer: Good fellows. They should have townships named after them,

Mr. Breithaupt: Now it may be, Mr. Speaker, that some of the detailed information that has led me to make this suggestion may not be entirely accurate. I have accordingly prepared the information to the best of the knowledge we have been able to gain as to the benefits received by all of the other supporters of the government. If any of them wish to advise me of any inaccuracies, I shall be more than happy to correct the list.

Of course, if any of them would rather have a township named after them than receive these benefits, I am sure the Treasurer would be happy to make the arrangements if the additional funds are returned to the Treasury of the province.

Mr. Singer: A very good suggestion.

Mr. Breithaupt: Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Robert Nixon, that all of the words after "that" be struck out and the following added:

This House regrets the regressive and inflationary increases in the retail sales tax and the inadequacy of the tax credit to offset the regressive nature of this tax;

This House regrets the extension of the retail sales tax to include energy which will work a particular hardship on families with low or fixed incomes, as energy consumption is as much a necessity of life as food;

This House regrets the imposition of tax increases of any kind which counteract the initiatives taken by the federal government to spur the economy through the reduction of taxes;

This House regrets the inability of this government to control costs, particularly in the field of health services, and the failure of this government to adopt the tender method for the granting of government contracts for building construction which could save millions of dollars annually;

And this House regrets the failure of the government once again to provide adequate proposals to assist in the economic development of northern Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

ESTIMATES OF THE PROVINCIAL SECRETARIAT FOR JUSTICE

(*continued*)

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): On Friday, when we adjourned, I was answering a question from the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) regarding the figure of $54,000 indicated as services in the estimates. I believe I had given him about seven items which totalled $49,000. here is just one more item of $5,000, which deals with a transfer from the Ministry of Natural Resources, entitled the use of government aircraft. This is a journal entry. Rather than have all these set out in the Ministry of Natural Resources, any charges from this secretariat will be billed directly to this secretariat.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I think on Friday we might have got started a wee bit in trying to find out what the secretary really does. Notwithstanding a few, I thought most pertinent remarks from several of the members here, we weren't able to elicit any information.

For instance, I asked the minister, I would say three or four times, what this $358,000 is really going to do, and he didn't answer. It was only when the hon. member for Lakeshore picked specifically the $54,000 item that finally we have got the beginning of an answer.

Before I ask the question about what the $242,000 is going to do, there are three other topics at least on which I want to hear the minister's views.

His predecessor, who was equally a great thinker as the Provincial Secretary for Justice, after two years and some odd months finally thought out a policy on offtrack betting and eventually it became, apparently, an item of government policy. I would like to hear the views of this Provincial Secretary for Justice as to whether or not he adopts or rejects his predecessor's opinions about offtrack betting and if he still goes along with them; the extent to which there have been conferences with the federal justice people, particularly Mr. Lang, the Minister of Justice; when we can anticipate that there will be a plan for the taking over by the government of Ontario of offtrack betting and the extent to which an administrative setup has been prepared, anticipating a review to the Criminal Code. In other words, when are we going to get at it?

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that the provincial Treasurer (Mr. White), had he really believed that what Al Lawrence used to tell us about offtrack betting was going to come about, could have indicated how he was going to save us all money just by collecting more taxes from offtrack betting.

I've seen some estimates along this line, and I would think that there is probably a billion dollars available annually across

Canada if an offtrack betting scheme—somewhat along the lines outlined by Al Lawrence—came into effect in the province of Ontario.

Not all of that money would come here; but a substantial number of millions of dollars would have been available to the Treasurer if the province had been able to move into this field; and perhaps the minister could have avoided some of the horrible incidence of increased taxation that he's gone along with at this point in time.

But I would like to hear a complete statement from the Provincial Secretary for Justice about his views on offtrack betting; the extent to which he is having success, if at all, with the people in Ottawa; and a summary of what has been doing in government circles to get ready for the day when it comes. Has he got computers, has he got key personnel trained, has he got draft legislation available; has he perhaps got sites in mind—either by the proposal system or by tender system—just how is he going to do it? Has he got a whole bunch of people available to go in and manage these shops as government employees—who might or might not have been active in the last provincial campaign?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): They've got Charlie MacNaughton.

Mr. Singer: Yes; what is the minister going to do about offtrack betting?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Point of order, Mr. Chairman, before we go on. On Friday the minister was surrounded by his coterie of pari passu advisers. Now this has completely dissipated.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Is committee going on?

Mr. Lawlor: Where might they be?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, there is another committee—a legislative committee.

Mr. Lawlor: Isn't a single one left?

Mr. Chairman: I don't think there is a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) is—

Mr. Chairman: The minister is responsible; so he will have to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The Attorney General is chairing a legislation committee. If I'm not mistaken, with the exception of the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps) the other ministers are members of that committee.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I think a very valid point of order was made. I would certainly like to have the House leader's view on it.

When the House leader made his statement on April 9 about the revised method of introducing the estimates, he indicated quite clearly at that time that it was the proposed procedure that we would deal with the policy questions, to the extent that that was possible when the policy minister's estimates were before the assembly.

Now if that is the case, then it would appear to me that there is no way that this one minister can deal with the policy question in the absence of the other ministers who support it.

I rise to support my colleague's point of order simply because in this initial stage of this new way of dealing with estimates, if we're going to evolve a meaningful way of dealing with estimates then we've got to start off in the correct manner.

I was, unfortunately, due to the delays in the court system administered by the minister's colleague, the Attorney General, unable to be here on Friday. But I had the benefit of reading what the minister said and what my colleague, the member for Lakeshore and my friend the member for Downsview had to say. It was quite clear that we were not making any progress in evolving a significantly new way of dealing with this question of estimates, if the debate on Friday was of any consequence or of any significance in that evolution.

I would like to hear from the House leader, and I would like to hear from this minister as to what his conception is of what we are now engaged in doing in this committee meeting.

Mr. Singer: Good question!

Mr. Chairman: I think the member's point is well taken; but it is still out of order—

Mr. Singer: Hodgson for Speaker!

Mr. Chairman: —asking the House leader to reply during the estimates of the Justice policy secretary.

Mr. Renwick: As far as the point of order is concerned, Mr. Chairman, in the sense that I tried to involve the House leader in ex-

plaining what we are trying to do, I will now direct my remarks to the minister whose estimates are before the assembly.

Mr. Lawlor: Because the House leader doesn't have a clue.

Mr. Renwick: Does the minister agree that what we are doing in this particular meeting of the committee is affording him an opportunity, in the words of the House leader, to elaborate on various aspects in the broad field of justice policy? Is that what we're doing at this particular meeting of the committee?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, the main purpose, I would think, of supply, is to deal with the estimates and whatever moneys are set out in the estimates and to approve those.

Mr. Singer: Ever heard it said, "don't pay any attention"?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I realize that during the estimates we do get into a very broad discussion of the ramifications and the duties and the functions of the various ministries. I would say that the hon. member's statement is a very fair one.

As the member for Lakeshore said, on Friday the four ministers were here. We did have a quite thorough discussion at that time, for about two hours. It's quite possible that they are otherwise engaged at the present time.

Mr. Singer: We didn't have a thorough discussion. We had thorough questions but no answers.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I really can't vouch for them at this point nor require them to be here.

Mr. Singer: They don't vouch for you either.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It was our understanding that I would be going on right after the orders of the day were called, at approximately 3 o'clock. However, that was changed to allow the Liberal critic of the budget to make his presentation. It's quite possible that the other ministers are therefore otherwise engaged at this point.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister care to answer the comments of the member for Downsview at this time?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lawlor: Didn't your colleagues hear what the House leader said? I don't understand that. Maybe we need another committee to get them together and to decide what we are supposed to be doing.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, the member for Downsview referred to the question of offtrack betting. As the member knows, there was a task force set up by my predecessor to study this whole area. That task force has reported to the government and made certain recommendations. One of the recommendations was that the Criminal Code be amended to provide that all offtrack betting would be unlawful except as authorized by the province or by provincial law.

The bill that was introduced last year by the Minister of Justice in Ottawa did not, in fact, do that. That bill died on the order paper. Fortunately, we have made representations to the Minister of Justice and as a result of a meeting that was held in January, he has agreed that that particular prohibition would be put in.

Mr. Singer: Yes. That is what he told me on the weekend. I wonder what you are doing about it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If there is any hold up, it's all very well to tell us that they are going to do that, but we'd like to see the bill. We'd like to see the federal government introduce the bill doing what he says he will do.

In the meantime, there are one or two other areas in the old legislation which we were not happy about and which the federal Attorney General (Mr. Lang) has indicated he may not change. That concerns us.

One other area is the role of the Department of Agriculture and the fact that the federal government, in the bill, would in fact be imposing regulations and really running, or telling us how to run, an offtrack betting system in Ontario. In view of the role of Ontario and in view of the size of horse racing in this province compared to other provinces—it's all very well to have such regulations for other provinces in the country—with the sophistication we have here we don't feel it's necessary. We don't feel that the federal Department of Agriculture should share in the offtrack betting tote as it does in the parimutuel. I think this is the same objection that my predecessor had, and we are still hoping that when the new bill is introduced there may be some adjustment or compromise in that area.

Another area is the suggestion that we would like to have an offtrack betting pool on

races other than in Ontario. The bet would be made here, with the odds based on the amount of betting in Ontario, but that we could in fact bet on a race in New York or some other jurisdiction. The indication from the federal government is that this won't be allowed.

As far as what we are doing; we haven't, as the hon. member suggests, acquired sites for shops. We are proceeding to establish a board of commissioners as recommended by the task force.

We have, during the past couple of months, been meeting various organizations which are opposed to offtrack betting—such as the harness people—trying to indicate to them that their concerns are not as legitimate or as serious as they seem to think, that the system of offtrack betting in Ontario operated by a government agency will not appreciably affect the attendance at B and C tracks and that the betting will be confined mainly to this part of the province. I think if we can convince them, for example, that what we intend to do is not what has happened in New York, where it has been a serious failure, they will, we hope, see the advantages of an offtrack betting system to not only the government but to the racing industry as a whole.

So that's basically what's going on. We are proceeding to set up the structure, but we are concerned that we go too far until the federal government carries through with its intention of introducing new legislation and until we have satisfied whatever legitimate objection there is in this province at the present time to an offtrack betting system.

One of the things the task force did reveal, and I am sure the hon. member is aware of this, is that the income from an offtrack betting system will not be quite as great as we anticipated and what the hon. member implies. It would be a good source of income, but in the early years certainly not what had been anticipated by the people in the industry and by the government.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I found the remarks of the secretary very interesting. You are proceeding to think about setting up a board of commissioners, in advance of course of any statute, which is only prudent. I was wondering which defeated Tories or resigned Tories you have in mind for that job. Elmer Bell already has a job. So has Charlie MacNaughton. Perry Ryan has a job. Have you got some other defeated Tories in mind to be the board of commissioners of the offtrack betting?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman Management Board of Cabinet): We are going to make you an offer, it's all right.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is either the bench or the board of commissioners!

Mr. Singer: Well, it all depends. All right!

I couldn't understand either, Mr. Chairman, whether, when the minister spoke about the opposition to this, this means that he is something less than firm in his resolve about carrying through his predecessor's statement of policy. Does that mean you are marking time until you see whether or not the opposition will disappear, or that you are still committed to the policy laid down by your predecessor, Al Lawrence? Are you backing away from the offtrack betting proposal if you cannot convince the people who have expressed opposition to it, or do you continue firm and resolute in your determination to carry this out?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Was that hypothetical, facetious, or legitimate?

Mr. Singer: Well I just want to pause to let you keep up with the questions.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, certainly I am not bound by any statements that my predecessor made regarding this whole area. Most of the statements made by my predecessor were made prior to the issuance of the report from the task force on offtrack betting.

Mr. Singer: And subsequent; the policy statement came subsequent!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't believe it did.

Mr. Singer: Well, he certainly formed it at the time the report came forth.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The last few remarks by my predecessor that I was aware of were in respect to the bill that had been introduced in the House of Commons, particularly when Mr. Lang said the bill is exactly what Ontario wants. Then I believe Al lost his cool on that one and tried to correct him.

Mr. Singer: Yes; and he said that Ontario doesn't need that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That also gives an idea, as I have indicated, of the influence of the federal government.

I must say I am really not sure whether or not my predecessor did in fact comment on the task force report and whether he agreed entirely with it or not. But I certainly

agree with the recommendations in that report. So, if he did, we are ad idem.

Mr. Singer: Whoever might have agreed or didn't disagree, apparently the minister now agrees. Could I ask him a further question: Is this still government policy and does he intend to implement it when he gets the necessary amendments to the Criminal Code?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As far as we can see now, Mr. Chairman, this is our plan. Based on the amendments we want to the Criminal Code and the recommendations in the task force report, we hope to be able to proceed and implement a system of offtrack betting.

Mr. Singer: I was interested, too, Mr. Chairman, in the secretary's comment about the serious failure of the system in New York. The reading I have done about it indicates that Mr. Samuels, I think it is he who runs the system down there, has run a very successful system. He has made a lot of money for the city of New York out of this system. I hadn't noticed anybody saying at any length it was a serious failure, although I did notice some opposition from some of the bookies and so on. I hadn't noticed anyone concerned with the increasing revenue that was pouring into government who felt it was a serious failure. There were some administrative difficulties. Perhaps the minister could tell us of the breakdown and the reason he called this a serious failure.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, there has been a report issued from the New York Racing Commission which held an inquiry into the system because of complaints and as an anniversary inquiry, after a certain number of months, to review the system and make some comments and changes if necessary. The inquiry indicates that it hasn't been working because, as the hon. member says, these are being run by cities in the United States. The attendance at tracks, particularly at upstate tracks, has fallen tremendously as a result of betting shops that were available, mainly on the big tracks, around New York City.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Downstate ones!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: So what the inquiry of that state racing commission is now recommending is a system somewhat similar to what is recommended for Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Well, it is interesting. Has the minister spelled out, for instance, in draft legislation, the method by which we are going to proceed, because I noted in the minister's comments that he had a promise from Ottawa last January that it is going to implement the necessary amendments, and I think one could presume that that is probably so. I have talked to a few people up there over this past weekend and that was the indication I got as well.

I would think that there is a sufficient commitment there that the minister at least can have in mind a skeleton outline for the system as it might come into being. At least he could have in mind what his target date might be within X months after he gets the enabling legislation. How soon will the government be in business?

Is it going to have it in many locations? Are there going to be 10 shops in Toronto and a couple in Owen Sound and one or two in London? What sort of system does the minister envisage he is going to bring into being? How is it going to be run? Are the commissioners going to be given complete control over the thing? Is it going to be taken entirely out of the Legislature's hands? Is the minister or one of his colleagues going to be responsible to the House for it? What kind of thinking has he done about it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I can say that there is a skeleton proposal or skeleton legislation; it is by no means in the area of draft legislation at this time. Our target date is some time this year, depending on the introduction of new federal legislation. At first, I would assume there would be shops in the larger urban centres, probably in those areas where there were the offtrack messenger shops—Burlington, Oakville, Milton and places like that; probably the same sites. Who knows?

Mr. Singer: We might even make arrangements to take over their leases. Some of them aren't doing so well.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That's right. I would assume that we would move fairly slowly because we won't be completely mechanical, shall we say? We won't have computerization of the whole system at first by any means. We will move gradually and open shops in that way. If you read the recommendations indicating the makeup of the board of commissions, I would assume that there will be, as the report says, representatives of all facets of the industry.

Mr. Singer: You could probably work Southcott and McMurtry in now.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Again, as the recommendation says, the system would initially employ manual ticket selling procedures. There will be a central computer which will be used for collecting bets. You can envisage them a little bit like our liquor stores in Ontario, as far as the milieu or environment is concerned of these government-operated or controlled outlets in the various communities.

As I say, I think it won't take that long, really, to implement a system once we have the skeleton or the framework we want in light of whatever changes are made in federal legislation.

Mr. Singer: I have a couple of other fields apart from this that I want to explore but I don't want to monopolize the time.

Mr. Lawlor: I have a question in this one field.

Mr. Singer: Okay.

Mr. Lawlor: What do you see as the role of the Jockey Club in all this? I trust, from your analogy, that it won't be like brewers' warehouses run by the beer companies. Have they any role?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't believe they do have, not in the recommendations. No; there's a representative of the Canadian Standardbred Horse Society; the Horsemen's Benevolent Protective Association; Ontario Harness Horsemen's Association. It could be that in one section—for example, they are recommending three members appointed by the government of Ontario upon the recommendation of the racetrack operators, with one member nominated by the largest operator—the Ontario Jockey Club—one member nominated by the rest of the A class tracks and one member nominated by the B class tracks. They would nominate one member.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister about the small track operators, who are very concerned about offtrack betting in this province. If I understood you correctly you are meeting with them at the present time. We know in this province there are some very fine small tracks operating and they've spent thousands and thousands of dollars to build up their small racetracks.

I would like to ask the minister—in the United States where offtrack betting is permitted, are these small tracks going out of business? Do you think that—I understand you are in favour of bringing in offtrack betting here when the legislation is passed by the federal government—this will affect these small tracks more than the larger tracks?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, that is a concern of all the horsemen in the harness racing area of the sport in Ontario. The correspondence that I'm getting from their association, for example, always points to New York as an example where attendance at the smaller tracks has gone down substantially.

As I indicated to the hon. member for Downsview, this was because of their system, which was not entirely operated on a statewide basis but at the city level. Because of the very large purse, many of the upstate people were staying away from the smaller tracks and betting on the offtrack system, where outlets were available pretty well all over the state.

I don't think that would be the case here. I think a great number of people, particularly north of southern Ontario, still enjoy going to the tracks, and can easily reach some of these B and C tracks where offtrack betting services won't be available. I feel that under our proposed system the concern as to attendance shouldn't be as serious.

I think, for example, that the revenue we can generate with a system of offtrack betting will not only help the thoroughbreds and the larger tracks, but will also help the harness racing people. With the split we may be proposing, everybody will get a reasonable share of the tote.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to turn to another topic briefly.

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute. Are you still on this same question?

The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Chairman, on the question of offtrack betting, I would hope that we would be extremely wary of having anything to do with the OTB from New York State.

First of all, it's a matter of record that one of their ploys—and I presume they're going to try to do it again this year—is to try to steal the revenue this province obtains from the two meets at Fort Erie and the two harness track meets at Garden City in the

Niagara Peninsula. I presume Erie county will be given the go-ahead again to try to siphon off our revenue by having offtrack betting on those races.

It is not the goodwill of New York State or its offtrack betting authorities that has stopped this. The only reason it has been stopped is because of the Jockey Club in this province. The way in which the Jockey Club do it—and I don't know whether it's common knowledge or not—is that if Erie county or other offtrack places in New York State try to siphon off revenue from this province, they will not release the names of the horses that are running prior to five minutes before the race. They have the right to do so, and of course this would foul up the attempts of Erie and Niagara counties to siphon off our funds.

Secondly, the fundamental reason that New York State has failed, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest this is a moral consideration that is not confined to our party but certainly for the House as a whole—I know the member for Kent would be very interested in this particular one—

Mr. Lawlor: How can anybody bet if they only get the names of the horses five minutes ahead of time, whether in Erie, here or at the race track?

Mr. Drea: Just a moment now, we'll get to the member for Lakeshore in a minute.

The particular problem is that New York State books its own bets—

Mr. Lawlor: The member is explaining things to us—well explain!

Mr. Drea: Well just a moment!

New York State books its own bets. They were tempted, very early on, not to work through the parimutuel operation or to give track odds; they started booking their own bets, and on races that were not held in New York State. They started booking bets on particular horses in the Kentucky Derby, the Preakness, the Belmont and other affairs. This became very widespread; in other words, they were running a service where they were taking revenue from what was done by other states.

They also have a system of credit. I think one of the things we have to be very careful of in this province—and I hope you'll be very cognizant of it—is that offtrack betting may be a source of revenue—I agree with you, I think it should be tapped—but at the same time it is also a danger. There are certain considerations on which I think we have to be extremely careful, particularly in regard to Class B tracks and the ability of country people to function in the harness field as they have done for a great number of years.

I think this brings us around to the particular point that this is why your ministry is there. It seems foolhardy to me to divert it to the Attorney General, who is charged with the responsibility of making sure there is no offtrack betting at the moment under the Criminal Code, for the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko), who is charged with making sure the police enforce the Criminal Code, for the Minister of Correctional Services, who is there to try and reform the bookmakers when they become guests, and for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Clement), who has the lottery field under his jurisdiction.

I think that in this one area alone—offtrack betting—this seems to answer the great many perplexing questions that were revolving through the mind of my friend from Lakeshore the other day when he wondered why you were there at all. I suggest that even on a thing as basic—and I think it is government policy—as offtrack betting your ministry is performing an excellent function, because without you we would be unable, at the cabinet level, to discuss the implications of offtrack betting, because the other members of the Justice Secretariat, the other ministries, are specifically charged with responsibilities to curtail that at the moment.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): They should be charged with irresponsibility.

Mr. Drea: Well I think they have done a very excellent job. I think that if you looked, Mr. Minister, at the number of offtrack locations this year as compared to last year—and I can assure you that while I am fairly well known at racetracks I have never placed a bet with a bookie or a messenger service yet—you will find that for every 10 that were operating last year there are less than one-half operating today; and I think the other ministers are to be commended for that.

Mr. Singer: You are aware of how long it took until the police started to go into those places? A year and a half. I think it was a year before they looked into them at all.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I could turn to another topic, if the discussion on

offtrack betting is completed for the moment, are the minister and his colleagues able at this time to give a considered view of the government of Ontario on the question of the effect of the retention or abolition of capital punishment on the enforcement of law in the Province of Ontario, or alternatively the prevention of violent crime in Ontario? I take the position at the present time to be that since the end of 1972 capital punishment may be awarded as the ultimate punishment for certain offences and that the moratorium is now past. The minister will be aware, as I'm certain his colleague the Solicitor General is aware and others engaged in the administration of justice are aware, that there is substantial pressure from the police associations in the Province of Ontario to maintain capital punishment in certain limited areas.

I'm not asking the minister to express his particular, individual moral viewpoint on the question. I'm asking whether or not it is the considered judgement of those charged with the enforcement of the laws in the Province of Ontario that the enforcement of law is enhanced or affected in any way by the question of the presence or non-presence of capital punishment in certain areas?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, first of all, as the hon. member knows, although the federal government in 1968 amended the law to provide capital and non-capital degrees of murder, and indicated that capital murder was in fact killing of a police officer or guards, there have in fact been no executions for these charged and convicted of capital murder since 1968. So this makes it very difficult to in any way assess this so-called trial period. Because there is no question that those who are embarking on a life of crime, or professional criminals, are aware of the fact that all convictions of capital murder will be commuted.

So this sort of clouds the issue; this makes it impossible to have a fair analysis as to whether or not capital punishment is in fact a deterrent; and what effect it would have on the rate of crime in this province.

There are figures that the Centre of Criminology will make available which will indicate that up until the end of 1972 there has not been a marked percentage increase in the number of capital crimes.

But then you can get another set of figures. I believe these have been presented by the police association and retentionists and show in effect that in spite of the increase in population there has been even a substantial increase in the rate of murder in Ontario; and in the rate of what would be classified as capital murder.

So, really, without sort of revealing a personal position here, there has probably been more evidence to support the retentionists than the abolitionists. But at the same time we have to be aware of really the uselessness, I think, of the so-called trial period and any figures that relate to that trial period, in view of the number of commutations.

I think there has been an increase in the rate of violent crime—for example muggings and armed robberies and victim crimes. Many of these, of course, are attributed to the increase in drug trafficking, particularly in hard drugs and narcotics. In this way, of course, there is a certain number of people involved in this whole milieu who end up committing a capital or a non-capital offense—such as the case with the Toronto policemen and their deaths.

But this is a debate which, in my opinion, will rage on. You'll have abolitionists and you'll have retentionists; you won't really change the minds of either one. There is the argument, of course, of the police association in line with the idea of swift arrest and sure punishment; that this would be a sufficient deterrent to cut down on the increasing violent crime rate.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may suggest to the minister, the question is not one which can be allowed to simply rage on—to adopt the minister's phrase—as a continuing debate among the abolitionists and the retentionists. It is, as everyone knows, a sensitive and very highly emotional topic.

What I am suggesting to the minister, Mr. Chairman, is that it would be important from the point of view of law enforcement in the Province of Ontario if, in whatever objective way it were possible to do so, that the resources of this government be directed toward evaluating—with all of the qualifications and assumptions and corrections that need to be made—of evaluating the various positions which are put forward; the statistical information, with again whatever qualifications or presumptions have got to be used, related to the Ontario experience over the period of the last 10 years so that there will be some effort made, objectively, to provide this information.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly clear that for those who are concerned with abolition as well as those who are concerned with reten-

tion, the legitimacy of their motives is not the matter which is under consideration. All of the people who speak for representative organizations speak in good faith and for specific interests. It is very important, because of that, that this ministry, and particularly the minister in charge of this area of development, should direct attention toward the development of some adequate method of evaluating the arguments pro and con, to the extent that they are based upon police experience in the Province of Ontario. I used the particular example of capital punishment because it is one which is paramount in many people's minds when one speaks of law enforcement.

I might say that I noticed that the minister fell into the same habit that most of us do of making unqualified statements about the relation, for example, of robbery and the drug trade; the relation of violent crime to the drug trade. All of these areas of police statistical information, which is provided on a non-qualitatively assessed basis, lend themselves in my view to the kind of study which this ministry and this secretariat should undertake.

If there is one thing which is lacking in the Province of Ontario it's any real responsible assessment of crime statistics and the extent to which they can be classified in varying and different ways. For every classification which is put forward to support one view, criminologists and others who are concerned about this question are able to evaluate the statistics on a much sounder basis and to put them forward as, at least, either trends or as alternative methods of assessing the information.

It seems to me that if we are going to come to grips with the question of the protection of society, and on the other hand the rehabilitation of the offender and the process by which those two goals are achieved, one of the most valuable tools available to us—away from the emotional context in which most of these discussions take place—is for sound evaluation techniques to be applied in this field.

I would suggest, with great respect for the limited statistics which are available and which one looks at from time to time, that there is a great field of study which, with the resources of this government, could be carried out and help and assist the consideration being given by us, in the fashionable language of the day, to the arguments in favour of law and order as against the arguments in favour of individual rights, procedural protections of accused persons and other such essential elements in the criminal process, right from the very inception to the end of the course in which one person or groups of persons are involved in that system.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I find myself in substantial agreement with the remarks of the member for Riverdale. I had hoped when we had first heard about the new kind of organization—because some of us did read COGP No. 3—that there was an opportunity, particularly in the justice field, for some new thinking or some leadership on behalf of one minister, who is not going to be bogged down with the day-to-day detail of running the police or the day-to-day detail of looking after the jails or looking after the Crown attorneys or looking after the grab bag of Consumer and Commercial Relations; an opportunity at least for one minister to sit down and do some thinking and to have some opinions.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of these estimates, I was so disappointed in the nine pages of pap that the minister brought forward. I read it again after I left the House on Friday just to see if my quick assessment was faulty. I kept returning again and again to the quote from Jeremiah, which certainly impressed me no end. Now I have tried, the member for Lakeshore has tried, the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) has tried, and the member for Riverdale has tried, to draw the minister out on some of his ideas.

I think it would have been very helpful to the current raging debate about capital punishment that it rage as little time longer as possible. I thought, Mr. Chairman, it would not have been unreasonable to expect that the Provincial Secretary for Justice of the Province of Ontario, with all of the resources at his command, could have given us some idea of whether or not his colleagues and he have done any thinking about this.

Unfortunately, again we get another five or 10 minutes of the same thing. He says it is a difficult problem. Certainly it is a difficult problem; no one disagrees with this.

If you want my personal opinion, I will be very happy to tell you I do not believe in capital punishment; but I would like to hear the government's opinion, if there is one. I would like to hear the minister's personal opinion, if he hasn't yet discussed it with his colleagues. What does he think about it?

It is an important debate and a lot of people feel very strongly about this for a variety of reasons; and I don't question any of their motives. But surely, Mr. Chairman, at this time, when we get the Provincial Secretary of Justice here, he can and should have an opinion on everything.

Let me try a different subject. Let me talk about the constitutional question. I addressed some questions to him about the constitutionality of the suggested action of the government of Alberta in fixing two-tier price levels for natural gas. We got one of those convoluted answers from the Provincial Secretary which said: "Well, yes, it is an important question; and yes, we might have thought about it. It should warrant looking into. It is difficult, and certainly we will have it under consideration."

I found great difficulty in rationalizing that kind of an answer, which was a non-answer, with what the Premier (Mr. Davis) told us a few days later. I don't know if the Provincial Secretary for Justice listens to what the Premier says or reads what the Premier says. I suspect that the Premier knew far more about the constitutional aspects of it, as did the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough), and neither one of them had bothered to take him into their confidence. My suspicion is, and if he will go back to Hansard I think he will find it in the Premier's words, that they had given very serious consideration to the constitutionality of the proposed measures that Premier Lougheed is thinking of taking, or probably is about to take.

Now let me ask the minister again, and as politely as I can, what studies has he done in the Justice galaxy about constitutionality? Has he done any? Has he been invited to share in the discussions about energy from a legal aspect? Has he been there? Have any of his colleagues been there? Have any of his senior civil servants been there? Does there exist in the Justice ministries—any one of them—a written opinion by one of the competent people who might write such an opinion about what might happen and the effect, I think it is of section 121 of the BNA Act, on what Mr. Lougheed is proposing to do?

Or is my suspicion correct that for some reason best known to the Premier and best known to the member for Chatham-Kent, they have chosen to bypass the Provincial Secretary. And that while they may have their own opinion, they haven't sought an opinion of the Justice ministry or the Justice Secretary or the Attorney General?

If that in fact is so, which is my suspicion, I wonder why? In the Throne Speech there was some strong indication at long last of a principle that many of us have been espousing in this House for a long period of time, that the Attorney General—or you can transpose it as the Secretary of Justice—should be all the law for the Province of Ontario. Those words in the Throne Speech were completely meaningless.

If we take at face value what you said in answer to my questions about constitutionality in this natural gas dispute, and compare it at face value with what the Premier said, and my interpretation of the nods of the member from Chatham-Kent, then I suggest you were bypassed. Could you elucidate on that, tell us if you played any role in this and perhaps what your opinion is about the constitutionality of Mr. Lougheed's proposed action?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, if I remember the question that the hon. member for Downsview asked me, it was more than had we looked at that or had we an opinion on this, but whether in fact we were going to make representations at that time, immediately, on the constitutional matters with the Premier of Alberta. And I had indicated to him that, yes, our policy field was in fact involved in discussions with the Resources Development policy field and, I would assume, with the parliamentary assistant to the Premier, on the ramifications of the two-price system as enunciated by the Alberta government. An opinion had in fact been given by a senior civil servant of the Attorney General's department—

Mr. Singer: You didn't tell us that. That's not what you said.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, I didn't say that. That's right; I didn't say that. But I said that we were involved in this area—

Mr. Singer: You thought that perhaps you should get involved; that's what you said.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I said we were involved in the consideration of the constitutional aspect but, the hon. members know, I believe the question was asked when the Premier of Ontario was in Alberta discussing this with the Premier of Alberta; it was a question simply calculated to embarrass the government in some way.

Mr. Singer: Oh come on!

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The idea that—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order; the hon. minister is attributing motives to me, that I ask questions simply calculated to embarrass the government of Ontario. As you know, I wouldn't do that, Mr. Chairman; besides, it's against the rules that he should impute motives to me.

Mr. Chairman: Go ahead, Mr. Minister. He has no point of order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Hear, hear!

Mr. Singer: Calculated to embarrass, I believe, is a motive; I wouldn't do that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the question was asked when the two Premiers were discussing this; there was no intent at that time to issue a writ of summons or mandamus or anything else, because it was hoped this could be settled on a high plane, as two provinces should settle it.

Mr. Singer: Who is the issuer of mandamuses this week?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There is no question that the constitutional question is something that has been and will be discussed between the two provinces. However, even at this stage there is a question of whether or not the two-price system is a matter of rebate or whether in fact there is a dual charge in two different areas. And I assume that the Alberta government, in withholding fuel from its customers or in some way not doing business with its contractual customers, is acting in some legal way under legislation that has been passed and approved by the government of Alberta—for example in respect to the conservation of its resources. This may be one of the reasons why there is some claim of right to propose a two-price system and the negotiations that are going on at this time.

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. secretary has thrown so much light on the situation. I wonder who is the issuer of mandamuses? Do you have an officer down there? Is he the same one who stamps things "obscene"?

It has always been my impression that a mandamus is an equitable remedy, which the courts might or might not grant on an application. I don't think the Provincial Secretary for Justice should be so loose with his legal phraseology as to talk about the issuing of mandamuses as though you just picked up the right form of paper and sent it out. He should be aware that there are procedures.

He might even be aware that the divisional court has certain procedures—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: As usual the hon. member for Downsview is misinterpreting the remarks attributed to some member of the government. All I said was, by way of a very broad example, particularly in reference to people in transmission companies that happen to have contracts with the government of Ontario, that maybe mandamus could be a remedy.

Mr. Singer: No! Mr. Chairman, I think that it is incumbent upon the Provincial Secretary for Justice, of all people in this House, to be sufficiently familiar with legal procedures that he could use the correct legal terminology. And he should know, if he doesn't, that you don't issue a mandamus like issuing a new stamp—that you go to court and ask for an equitable remedy. And if you happen to go to the right court, and your argument is reasonable, the court might, in fact, issue an order of mandamus; but the Provincial Secretary for Justice doesn't.

I would commend to him, a brief study of certain legal tomes that will familiarize him with what processes there are available.

But let's get back to the real point at issue. I don't deliberately want to embarrass this minister.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): You don't have to!

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): He is convicted out of his own mouth on that.

Mr. Singer: If he embarrasses himself, I can't help it. I can't help it, and I'm sorry.

But I still would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what their approach is. Does the minister really mean what he is saying—if Lougheed is acting in a certain way one presumes he is acting legally and that's the end of it?

Did the minister know, at the time I asked him the question, that a senior official had been asked for an opinion and had given it without the knowledge of the minister? Because that's what the Premier told us and that's what you've now admitted; and you said you didn't know because the Premier was away.

Well, if senior officials of yours are giving opinions to people in government, one would presume that you knew. And if he knew, Mr. Chairman, if the Provincial Secretary knew, then he misled the House. I wouldn't use the other word that goes with it, because I've had to withdraw that on another occasion. But if he knew that there had been an opinion—

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member for Downsview get back to the vote?

Mr. Singer: Oh, I am. I am on the question of the role of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, and so far—

Mr. Chairman: Is there any information you want about his role?

Mr. Singer: Yes there is; there is indeed.

I want to know, Mr. Chairman, what is happening about the constitutional problem relating to natural gas; what this minister is doing about it; what kind of opinions there are; and what effect, in his department's opinion and in his opinion, section 121 of the BNA Act has on what Mr. Lougheed is suggesting he is going to do. I think that's simple.

And when I take that, and try to put it into context with what the minister said to us a few weeks ago in answer to questions, and what the Premier said, and what the minister now says to us, it leaves the whole thing up in the air.

Is it worthwhile at all, Mr. Chairman—and this is really the thrust of my question—asking this minister anything about constitutional questions? Does he know how they get before the courts? Does he know how they are resolved? And what are you doing about this particular constitutional question? Can you tell us?

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think the minister just answered—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: No he didn't. He didn't at all. He didn't at all and he doesn't need your help.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): You don't need to be an apologist.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: He doesn't need your help at all.

Mr. Chairman: Well, that's all right.

Mr. Singer: All right, let him try.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the danger of having my words further twisted, I will just simply say, and reiterate, that an opinion has been submitted, by a senior law officer of the Crown, to the Premier and to his parliamentary assistant with respect to constitutionality of the proposals of the Alberta government in respect to the two-price system that is being studied by the Premier and by those people who are involved in negotiations with the Province of Alberta.

I would think that until these negotiations are completed, that would be sufficient for me to say, as far as my interpretation of the constitutional position of the Province of Alberta is concerned, or whether or not the stand of the Province of Alberta is unconstitutional and whether or not we should take action in light of those facts.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I guess we have got to the stage now where there is an opinion. I presume the minister isn't going to tell us what that opinion is. Would you care to table that opinion? Would you let us have a look at it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would suggest you ask the Premier for that. It was given to the Premier.

Mr. Singer: Well, it came out of your office. Surely you have control over what goes on in your office, or one would think you do.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, the person who gets the opinion has control.

Mr. Singer: Oh! All right, if you won't tell us what is in the opinion, could you tell us if the government, or the Provincial Secretary, is satisfied with that opinion and whether or not you sought outside opinions in addition to whatever opinion came out of your office?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We haven't sought outside opinion. The opinion we were asked for has been supplied to the Premier's office. We don't have any reason to disagree with that opinion. There is a consensus and if the Premier or his parliamentary assistant feels that another opinion is required, I would assume he will get one.

Mr. Singer: Without consulting you?

Mr. Chairman: There is an amendment to the—

Mr. Singer: No, we are not ready for that for a long time yet.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I am asking for a bit of advice from you or from the Provincial Secretary for Justice. Would this be the proper place to take up something about the grand jury?

Mr. Chairman: At the present time I think we should adjourn this debate.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Kennedy moves second reading of Bill 12, An Act to amend the Highway Act.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy: (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, in 1971 in Ontario there were 1,282 drivers and passengers fatally injured in collisions and 71,455 were injured, so said a Star editorial of March 7 of this year.

The editorial went on:

> Australia has shown that compulsory safety-belt wearing can bring about a dramatic reduction in road deaths and injuries. In two years, traffic deaths were decreased by 20.2 per cent the first year and 23 per cent the second. Seatbelt usage increased from one-third to about two-thirds by passengers and drivers.

Lap belts have been fitted to all new motor vehicles for quite a number of years; first in the front seats, then in other seats and now in all seating positions. Shoulder harnesses have been fitted for the two outside front positions in addition to the lap belts since 1968.

In Ontario, at least two-thirds of the drivers and passengers in motor vehicles equipped with seatbelts don't use them. In the year following the introduction of legislation making seatbelt use mandatory in the state of Victoria, Australia, seatbelt usage reached 75 per cent in metropolitan areas and 64.1 in the rural areas.

This information states the number of fatalities dropped by 14 per cent as against the Star comments I made earlier. There is some disparity in these figures. They go on to say that there was an increase of three per cent in other Australian states that did not have the legislation. Now, all Australian states have accepted the mandatory seatbelt-use legislation.

I might say that as this programme developed which resulted in the legislation, a select committee was established in the State of Victoria. It held hearings over a number of years. I have a great deal of material that has been sent forward to me from this state and also from the national capital, Canberra.

A few other general statistics, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned initially that in 1971, in Ontario, there were 1,282 deaths. In addition, one out of every 4,300 deaths in Ontario resulted from a motor vehicle accident. One person out of 94 of the population was injured in a motor vehicle accident. This is fairly simple mathematics. I was astonished by the figure of 71,455 injured that was contained in that Star editorial. So we can see that our chances are about 1 in 100; that is not very big odds.

One passenger vehicle out of each 1,325 registered in Ontario was involved in a fatal collision. One out of 15 passenger vehicles was involved in a reportable collision. In the United States, one new passenger vehicle in every 200 built will be involved in a fatal accident in its lifetime. Another projection: One new passenger vehicle in six will be involved in a disabling injury accident in its lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members might ask how my interest in this subject developed. I can state that I went to Australia and landed in Sydney on the day that mandatory seatbelt usage came into effect in the state of New South Wales, which is equivalent to a province. I rented a car. As I started to drive away, with some irritation at the buzzer on the belt, which everyone suffers, I was reminded that it was necessary as of that time to fasten the seatbelt, which I did. After two or three days it became as automatic as turning the key on.

This car had not only the lap belt but the shoulder harness as well. There was a little discomfort initially, but it didn't last.

This was two years or so ago. Why didn't we do something then? I don't know, but in January we were over with our select committee at Dearborn to the Ford safety laboratory, and there we saw some demonstrations of the tremendous damage that can

be done in a collision. They had a vehicle that moved, if I recall correctly, at 5 mph and hit an immovable wall. The devastation, the damage to the car and the shock to the model that was inside were just unbelievable —at 5 mph. It would give anyone quite a jolt.

As additional evidence of seatbelt effectiveness, Cornell automotive crash injury research programme established that there were 50 per cent fewer dangerous and fatal injuries to the belt wearer compared to the non-belt wearer. Again the statistics don't always jibe, but on balance the members can see there are many pluses. A study at the University of North Carolina of 8,822 cases of 1967- and 1969-model cars involved in accidents shows that through the use of lap belts an overall reduction of 43 per cent in serious and fatal injuries was observed. Serious and fatal injuries in frontal collisions were reduced 32 per cent and serious and fatal injuries in single-car, off-the-road accidents were reduced 49.5 per cent, just about half, through the use of the lap belt.

The American Medical Journal of March, 1968, has an article, "Causes of Deaths in Automobile Accidents," and in summary states:

> One hundred and thirty-nine automobile accidents in which 177 occupants died were studied over a four-year period. Ejection of the occupant from the car was found to be the leading cause of death. At least 50 per cent of the drivers at fault had been drinking prior to the collision.
>
> Collisions at the door caused a significant number of fatalities by collapsing and compromising the passenger compartment. Impacts with the steering assembly and instrument panel ranked high as causes.

It is postulated that 40 per cent of those killed could have survived had seatbelts been worn and an additional 13 per cent if seatbelts and shoulder belts had been used.

And this should appeal to my hon. friends opposite; In Sweden, a study was made by Volvo of 28,000—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They're so far ahead of Ontario, it is not even funny.

Mr. Kennedy: The member is listening, I see.

Mr. Martel: Right!

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): All of us are.

Mr. Kennedy: A study was made by Volvo of 28,00 accident cases involving pre-1967 cars.

Mr. Martel: It is the member's government that won't let us vote on his bill.

Mr. Kennedy: In the 6,870 cases where the driver or right front passenger was wearing both the lap and shoulder belts, there were no fatalities at speeds below 60 mph. In contrast, where the occupants were not wearing seatbelts fatalities occurred at speeds as low as 15 miles per hour. So I think our impressions of the exhibit at Dearborn were pretty accurate—there are fatalities at 15 mph; you can get quite a jolt at 5 mph.

Another American report on lap-shoulder restraint effectiveness in the US lists 160 cases where lap and shoulder belts were worn in passenger cars. There were only two fatalities in the 160 cases, and both were as the result of intrusion into the passenger-occupied space—a tree in one case and a part of a colliding vehicle in the other.

Mr. Speaker, there are other studies; two from Cornell. There's a statement on a 30-mph head-on crash:

> The passenger in a vehicle travelling at 30 miles an hour, if unrestrained by a seatbelt, is not likely to survive in that his head may experience forces of approximately 120 times the force of gravity on impact.

There's a Chrysler Corp. study with respect to multiple impacts.

> In about 50 per cent of the multiple impact accidents, the subsequent object struck is another motor vehicle or a pedestrian.

Now there were some debates and discussions that I read with respect to this. The seatbelt not only enables the driver presumably not to be so severely injured, but it enables him—or could enable him—to keep control of the car. Thus, there is a significant feeling that were he able to keep control of the car, this could probably or possibly prevent multiple impacts.

In estimates of the use of seatbelts, I mentioned 30 per cent in Ontario; in the US they range from 2.5 to five per cent. The Journal of Safety Research reports that 81.5 per cent of children use seatbelts when both parents use seatbelts and both parents are highly educated, whereas 3.1 per cent of children use seatbelts if the parent is neither highly educated nor uses seatbelts.

I've had several letters come to my attention since the introduction of the bill, Mr. Speaker. I would like to quote two or three of these which are in support. They weren't all in support; some were violently opposed, for some reasons I'll go into later.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Did the member send them to the minister?

Mr. Kennedy: Pardon?

Mr. Stokes: Did the member send them to the minister?

Mr. Kennedy: I haven't yet. I'm accumulating them, then I'm going to turn the whole thing over to the minister.

This letter is from a Mr. and Mrs. Sherk of Mississauga, in support of it. They refer to something that has been mentioned before: "There are three elements involved—the road, the car and the driver." The driver is the one we're speaking about. They quite rightly say that if education won't work, which it won't, then they support mandatory use.

Mr. Webb writes, to register support for the bill: "In my opinion, it's long overdue and would reduce crash fatalities overnight."

I mentioned the availability of seatbelts, Mr. Speaker, and this has evolved since 1962. In my car, which is a 1971 model, there are six belts.

Mr. Martel: That's just one of the member's six cars.

Mr. Kennedy: Pardon?

Mr. Martel: That's just one of his six cars.

Mr. Kennedy: Restraint systems are now available or installable in nine out of every 10 cars on the road. I might mention too that if the buzzer bothers people now, in September, 1973, a starter interlock and sequential warning system will be installed in all new cars. This requires every front seat occupant to latch his seatbelt in order that the driver can start the engine. Also, each belt must be unlatched when the occupant leaves the car in order to repeat the starter sequence the next time the seat is occupied.

When the lap belt is worn, the shoulder belt automatically must be worn. There is a Globe and Mail clipping—I don't have the date on it but I think it's fairly recent—where a U of T study tested 10 cars and mentioned the danger in shoulder belts. That's the heading on it anyway. But it seems to refer to persons other than average who are driving cars, like short people or tall people, and I think the item can be challenged, or perhaps the news article isn't quite complete. It's by a Prof. Patrick Foley. He said some women would not even be able to start their cars. Well, if you can't start a car with a seatbelt on I think you shouldn't be driving with or without a belt.

There is some claim that the seatbelt doesn't prevent death, it causes death. I've heard this and I think we all have. But I think on balance you've got to say that there's just unrestricted argument in favour of support for belts.

I want to touch for a moment on the matter of the idea of people using belts on a voluntary basis. As we know, it's 30 per cent here and something less in the States apparently. But in the States a recent campaign was conducted at a cost of $51 million by the National Safety Council and no appreciable result was obtained.

In all fairness—I've read two letters in favour — I've had some correspondence against and some leave it optional! "If we want to kill ourselves or injure ourselves we can." Incidentally, the minister himself has taken a survey in his riding and the response isn't all that good for the legislation. I'm not sure of the terminology he's using in his questions, but many people apparently want to leave it on the optional basis. The Canada Safety Council is on record as being in favour of total use while the Ontario Safety League and the Motor League encourage the use.

We have this argument against the use—it is my life. Driving licences now are not obtained as originally they were when it was one's right to get one. Now it is defined as being a privilege. There are implied consent laws with respect to alcohol and drugs—to use them or not to use them—but there is a law against their use. Attempted suicide is illegal and may lead to arrest and confinement.

Workmen are required to wear protective clothing and safety helmets on the job. We have to put them on if we go around to look at construction sites. I think we have all experienced this. There are safety steel-capped shoes required in some factories and I suppose one could object to that as being an intrusion into one's privacy.

There is a reference here, too—and I wanted to touch on it—to the burden imposed on society by persons who are killed or injured in auto accidents. The Consumer

Association speaks of this because if victims of car accidents go into hospital, of course it's a public charge. A lot of these confinements in hospital are lengthy, and some persons are then forever on a public pension. I don't accept the validity of the comment that it is my life and it's up to me. We must think of the suffering of the families and, as I say, the burden on society.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other items I could touch on, but perhaps other members will speak on them.

The matter of enforcement, again, is a difficult thing. Somehow or other the State of Victoria, since the inception of its legislation, has laid 800 charges in nine months.

I would hope that the matter of compulsion and compliance and applying the law would not become an issue. I hope that there will be enough public support that everyone would buckle up and wear his seatbelt.

I'm grateful to the coroner's office which provided some material for me. I think if everyone could see and become familiar with some of the evidence we have in support of this, all the traffic out on the street would stop right now while those who didn't have their seatbelts affixed would do them up, because there are so many advantages. We could save something in the order of 250 lives in Ontario if we had this legislation, Mr. Speaker. I hope other members will support it, that the public will take it up and accept it as being a very excellent and worthwhile bill.

I can add that the States of Georgia and Colorado are seeking this legislation and that it's called for in Ohio. It is something that we are going to hear more about. As I say I hope the members here will take this up and, of course, the government; and that the public support which is so necessary will be forthcoming.

Mr. Stokes: Not much enthusiasm over there.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I rise to take part in the discusison of Bill 12, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, one dealing with making the wearing of seatbelts mandatory, I support the bill with mixed reservations.

Were you, Mr. Speaker, giving the bill an opportunity to come up for discussion in the committee, we would ask that certain amendments be introduced to the legislation. It does not go far enough especially when we deal with individuals under eight years of age and the tiny tots.

It's nice to hear the member introduce a bill like this but we wonder—this is supposed to be a government that listens. It doesn't even listen to its own members, Mr. Speaker. Here we have had the member from the government side who is only 15 or 20 ft away from the minister involved; he could very easily whisper to the minister some sweet nothings plus the comments here and we would have this legislation. But, apparently, members over there aren't even on speaking terms with one another.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Plus listening terms.

Mr. B. Newman: Back in March 12, 1963, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview, (Mr. Singer) in his discussions of the estimates of that time, asked the minister of the day the following question. I am quoting now from page 1681 of Hansard, March 12, 1963. The minister will note that that is 10 years ago. A government that listens but doesn't act!

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): It listens but doesn't hear.

Mr. B. Newman: The member for Downsview said:

> The other point I wanted to ask—and I don't know whether I am under the appropriate vote—was about seatbelts. Insofar as seatbelts are concerned, I think the hon. minister said during his main remarks this afternoon that he would answer later whether or not they would be made compulsory. Is the "later" now, or does he want it under another estimate?

The minister of the day, Mr. Speaker, made the following comment:

> *Hon. Mr. Auld*: I think it is late enough now. As far as I am concerned, I would not want to make the installation and use of seatbelts compulsory for the very good reason that it would be impossible to make people use them.

So, you can see, Mr. Speaker, that the government is not interested in acting. You will find likewise that, even though we are discussing this bill here today, there will be no action whatsoever on the part of the government.

The bill does attempt to legislate safety and, as the member had made mention in his remarks, we do legislate safety. We do legislate safety when it comes to employment; we do legislate safety by means of inspection when it comes to construction; we even legislate safety when it comes to entertainment as far as the amusement rides on a carnival are concerned. Likewise, the

member made mention of a series of statistics in an attempt to prove the validity of the making of the wearing of seatbelts compulsory.

We have heard those statistics time and time again in the past, Mr. Speaker, so I don't intend to repeat them. We know that the wearing of seatbelts can have a beneficial effect.

The big difficulty in automobile accidents is not so much that the individual flies out of the vehicle, as it's the fact that he hits some part of the vehicle. The internal accident in the vehicle comes from the fact that he is not strapped down, either by means of a lap belt or by a combination shoulder belt and lap belt. As a result of not wearing these, being thrown around the inside of a car, he is confronted with a series of injuries that very often are fatal.

All one will have to do will be to listen to the radio on Friday of this week and we will hear a series of statistics as to the number of people who are going to be killed this weekend, being a holiday weekend. It does send chills down one's spine when we can avoid a lot of these deaths, accidents and injuries, or avoid a large number of them, by mandating the wearing of seatbelts. But I don't foresee any action whatsoever on the part of this government.

Some people always say that the wearing of seatbelts is one's own business, if he wishes to wear them or not. That's not true, Mr. Speaker, because when the individual doesn't wear a seatbelt and gets involved in an accident, then you and I have to pay for his injuries by increased premiums to the Ontario Health Insurance Plan.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): And higher car insurance.

Mr. B. Newman: Plus the fact that we have a higher car insurance premium to pay. So the individual, who says he doesn't have to wear a seatbelt and that we're taking away his rights by forcing him to wear a seatbelt, does not take into consideration that he is likewise penalizing us by not wearing the seatbelt and by not taking necessary safety precautions.

I would like to read a short excerpt from a letter by a John A. Kany, an engineering consultant in Dearborn, who wrote to the Detroit Sunday newspaper concerning the wearing of seatbelts. He says:

> With seatbelts, the heart-breaking tasks of emergency crews and medical staffs who must patch up the maimed bodies brought in from the wrecks would be greatly reduced.
>
> No [and he is replying to a previous individual], you are not alone in that driver's seat without your belt. A lot of other people are sitting on your lap, and we will all suffer if your selfishness results in a needless injury to your person.

Mr. Speaker, one of the amendments that we would have made in the bill if it had come up for discussion in a clause-by-clause study, would concern the fact that the legislation excludes those under eight years of age. This is discriminatory because buses carry a lot of students under eight years of age, and they would not have to provide seatbelts for the students riding in those buses. Likewise, even in a car an individual under eight years of age would not have to wear a seatbelt. If we are going to make it compulsory, I think we have to make it compulsory throughout the spectrum of the years.

Consumer Reports published quite an elaborate article in its August, 1972, issue concerning safety restraints for children. I don't intend to read their report, but they make a very good case for the compulsory use of this type of a restraint, even for children only a month old. One of the unfortunate things was that up until the time this article came out there were only three safe seatbelts available for children—and I'm referring to tots, not older children.

However, we in Canada don't let that stop use from working; and, as a result, we have a company in Weston, Donlee Plastics, which manufactures the Guardwell child safety seat. This company has been able to do something that even the American companies couldn't do: it has developed a safety restraint for children that meets all US specifications and surpasses most of them; and it is looking forward to being able to get into the US market to provide that type of belt to the Americans.

Another problem in the wearing of seatbelts is today's new shoe styles. Women wearing big platform shoes, some of them 4 to 6 in thick, find it extremely difficult to drive cars; they find their knees practically under their chins when they remove their feet from the pedals—

Mrs. Campbell: Has the member seen the men's shoes?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, I shouldn't discriminate against the women. Even the men have

gone from the ridiculous to the sublime in the wearing of the platform or elevator types of shoes. That type of shoe is a real hazard when it comes to driving a car. Some consideration has to be given to that.

The hon. member mentioned the study undertaken at the University of Toronto. That study was called "A Human Factor Study of the Man-Machine Interface in Automobiles." It was conducted by a Miss Nancy Ireland, a Miss Steffan Hermsdorf and a Mr. Malcolm Norman, students who presented the thesis in conformity with the requirement for a degree of Bachelor of Applied Science from the University of Toronto. The supervisor of the study was Professor P. J. Folley.

They conducted an extremely elaborate study and found that there is a vehicle—it happens to be Japanese—that can accommodate any size of individual. But the Canadian auto makers don't do this: for some unknown reason they do not design the car with safety as one of their prime objectives.

I hope the members of the House get an opportunity to read this report. Likewise, I hope that the manufacturers read the report presented by these three people. Once they do, they should be more than pleased to design their cars with safety in mind, so that an individual wearing a lap belt or shoulder belt still is able to reach all of the controls. One of the problems with the shoulder belt is that with the physical structure of some individuals, it acts as a garotte and tends to choke.

Mr. Speaker, I have used a little more than my time, and I would like at this time to conclude by saying that we will support the legislation introduced by the member, and hope that the government will take it to heart and follow through with the recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, sometimes in this House we get glimmers of hope. When I look back over the past several Parliaments and realize the struggle that some of the members of this House have put up to get even some consciousness of safety, as far as the motor car industry is concerned, coming from that side of the House, then I say that today is a monumental event when a member of that party, if not that government, has introduced a bill relating to the safety of people who are driving motor cars.

I know that the member who has introduced this bill has been interested, as a person, in safety for some time. I grant him that. But somehow it has never got through to the members of the Treasury benches over there who primarily deal with legislation. So this is hopeful, and all I can say is that we wish this member well in his new crusade in the whole safety field, because it is desperately needed.

Going back over the years, many of us were talking of seat belts, then introduced by the State of New York because the United States government wouldn't touch the issue. The enlightened members in the State of New York decided they were going to pass the legislation and they did, making the placing of seatbelts mandatory in all mortor cars. That was a revolutionary step at that time, Mr. Speaker, and because the motor car industry finally had to make cars this way for the State of New York, and because it was such a very large market, it was very easy then to extend it, particularly when California began to demand standards. Then it spread across the United States.

But as far as Canada was concerned, when we talked safety in this House, in all its aspects, the answer we got from the minister was, "Well, we are not sure where the responsibility lies, whether it is here or in Ottawa."

We got along with that for some years and we kept pounding away at it, and finally Ottawa did accept the responsibility for setting safety standards in the motor vehicle industry. But unfortunately all Ottawa did—and this I draw to the attention of the member who has just spoken—was sort of look to Washington and say, "What is Washington going to do? What has Washington done?" and then slavishly follow the standards that Washington set.

Instead of giving leadership in Canada in field after field after field, leadership that would have been followed south of the border, we waited until they made a little stroke of the pen and then we followed them in making our own little stroke of the pen.

Of course, that has been a slow process and it is still a slow process. So I say to the hon. member who has just spoken that the primary responsibility for setting safety standards is now in Ottawa, and so Ottawa ought to be acting in this field, and ought to be mandating that seatbelts should be worn right across this country, rather than

leaving it to provincial governments to have to set those standards.

So I say to my hon. friend, let him go to Ottawa and talk to the minister there, because I think that is where the first action ought to come, since that has been the pattern in the years gone by and still is. But failing Ottawa action—and I agree that we are not likely to get it there—then this province ought to be moving, and moving quickly, to do the job.

I am in the position today, Mr. Speaker, of being the third speaker on a subject on which I think there is very little disagreement in this House, and also of having the documents that I have here on my desk already used so that I have very little left to say.

Mr. Stokes: The member says it much better.

Mr. Young: But members of the Legislature generally find no difficulty in filling up the time allotted to them. I want to say this to the member who introduced this bill; When he pointed out that 80 per cent of children use seatbelts if their parents use them, the document which was quoted a moment ago by my friend from—where is it?

Mr. Gaunt: Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Young: Windsor-Walkerville—my hon. friend quoted from a document which is put out by the Consumers' Union—Consumer Reports—August, 1972. This document points out this fact, that according to medical experts, children under the age of four or weighing less than 40 lb should not wear the conventional lap belt, and this my hon. friend stressed. Also, children shorter than 55 in. should not wear a shoulder belt because of the obvious danger of choking from that belt. The webbing would ride too high and could injure the child's neck and, of course, choke him.

Facing that fact and facing the reality of the situation which my hon. friend pointed out—that we can't afford to incorporate in this bill that children under eight should be excused. Facing those facts, we should add to this bill compulsory wearing of devices designed to protect children. And those standards have been set.

My hon. friend mentioned certain devices which are now known and I call the attention of the House to a recent publication by Washington, "What to buy in Child Restraint Systems". It outlines what kind of systems should be used for children, infants, for smaller children, and children up to four years of age. They are different because the needs of these children are different.

I'm not going to put on the record today what this pamphlet says, but it points out a fact which is backed up by Canadian figures, that about 10 per cent of the people killed in automobile accidents are children; and 10 per cent of the people injured in automobile accidents are children.

That points out the defect in the bill which we are discussing here today. We cannot afford to leave a gap which has reference to 10 per cent of the casualties in automobile accidents. My friend should amend this bill before it comes to the next stage in the House, to include the devices which are designed for the protection of children.

I mention this booklet because I don't know of any similar one issued by Canadian governments although I have articles here written by Canadians. Since we so slavishly take our lead from Washington in this whole field of automobile standards, I think it is perfectly right for me to call the attention of the House to this document, and to say that it is one of the best things which I've seen in the whole field. In detail, it gives the standards which should be set out for the restraints used for babies, for very small children and children up to the size which I have already mentioned.

The member should, of course, lead this House in making that amendment. Even though government members seem to be very averse to doing that kind of thing, I think this member should do that before he brings this bill to the next stage in the House, of clause-by clause examination. Since he is interested and the government is interested in this we hope it will reach that stage before too long, and that he should make that kind of amendment to protect the children in automobile accidents.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time is out, but I say here today that this province, since Ottawa will not give us a lead, should lead Canada. Just as the State of New York led the United States in the installation of seatbelts and making their installation mandatory, so this province should lead this country of ours in making it mandatory that effective seatbelts for all ages of passengers should be installed and should be worn by every passenger in motor cars in this province and in this country. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the bill put forth by my colleague from Peel South. I think it is of extreme importance to us to see this safety step taken in the Province of Ontario. I think we just have to be on the highways from day to day to come across accidents and see situations where, if a driver had been wearing a seatbelt perhaps his life would have been saved, or perhaps he would have been saved from serious injury.

It is interesting to note that there is a project going on in car safety research in Saskatchewan at the Regina campus of the university there. It's a joint project between the federal Ministry of Transport and the University of Saskatchewan. They have written to the member for Peel South to get a copy of his bill, to see what steps he is suggesting be taken in safety.

An hon. member: The member should send Hansard along too.

Mr. Eaton: I think we will send copies of Hansard out to them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Eaton: I think it's interesting to note that in many parts of the country they are taking a serious look at trying to bring about some type of compulsion that will make people wear their seatbelts. It's great to go out on a campaign of education to try to encourage people to wear seatbelts, but it's another thing to really get them to do it.

I had an experience of working for an organization and spent a lot of time on the road for them, and it was mandatory that when you drove your company car, you wore a seatbelt. Otherwise you weren't covered for several things and you could get quite a reprimand from the company. You got in the habit, because you knew you were supposed to do it.

It's a habit that certainly has stuck with me because of that. And it's one that I think you can get people to develop, if they know they have to do it, then they'll do it. It's much a case of carelessness when they don't put the seatbelt on.

It's interesting to note that in many other parts of the country they are pushing legislation to do the same thing. I have an article here from the Toronto Star:

LAWYERS ASK LEGISLATION TO ENFORCE USE OF SEATBELTS

> An organization of US lawyers has called on Congress to pass a law requiring motorists to wear seatbelts and shoulder harnesses while they are driving. "When our drivers are forced by law to use these devices," said an editorial in the Journal of American Trial Lawyers Associations, "they may demand the further improvements which could be made available now." The 23,000-member association is outranked by the 150,000-member bar association.

The article set out a four-point programme to reduce murder by motorists, in which it demanded that drunk drivers be banished from the nation's highways. Perhaps this is something that could proceed on from this member's bill and which might be another bill that could be introduced.

Fifty thousand people were killed in automobile accidents in the US last year, 10 times more than in Canada. I think that if the members look at the statistics on the accidents—whether the drivers were wearing seatbelts or not—they will find that in numerous cases they were not wearing seatbelts. Yet many other accidents happened where people were wearing their seatbelts, and were saved.

Here is an article on some researchers from Ann Arbour, Mich., investigating causes of death in automobile accidents. They point out the statistics of lives that were saved by seatbelts. With seatbelts, 63 per cent were saved, who quite likely would have been killed in the same accident if they had not been wearing their seatbelts. With shoulder harnesses as well, another eight per cent were saved. I think these statistics certainly speak for themselves when you see the number of lives being saved.

I believe there is another article—and I don't know whether this was quoted before or not, but it states in Ontario alone it could have meant 250 lives saved if the occupants of the vehicles had been wearing their seatbelts in accidents in the past year.

Mr. Young: If this government had acted sooner.

Mr. Eaton: Well, I'm not sure that it's the kind of thing that we should have to act on. It's the kind of thing that—

Mr. Stokes: What is the member talking about it for, then?

Mr. Eaton: —we should be able to do without compulsion. But because the public won't react, sometimes you have to move to these things.

Mr. Young: Well, let's move a little.

Mr. Eaton: It is a shame when we have to enforce these things all the time by legislation—by doing it by force. But when we see the deaths and we see the need for it, then the far-sightedness of the member in bringing this bill in, as he has done today to suggest that it takes place, is evident.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would support the bill the member has introduced here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Eaton: I think it's easy for the members on the other side to sit there and say the government should have done this or done that, but they would probably be the first to criticize when we tried to do something like that. They would fight against the compulsion.

Mr. Stokes: We are on the record.

Mr. Eaton: You know, it is easy to speak out of one side of your mouth at one time—

Mr. Stokes: We are on the record!

Mr. Eaton: —but when the government tries to do it, they speak out of the opposite side of their mouths.

Mr. Young: The member should have been around a few years ago.

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that in this case they are supporting the bill. I hope that if we get an opportunity to bring it in as a government they will show the same support for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the bill of the member for Peel South.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, the reasons for supporting this concept are so obvious and manifest that it's a shame to have to spend a whole hour — whether it's a charade or whatever it is, I really don't know. This is another indication of a private member's bill being brought in by a member of the Conservative Party where the government itself should have acted and should act right now.

It seems to me the motor car appears to be the last vestige of rugged individualism there is, for even your home isn't your castle today. You have to abide by certain zoning bylaws, certain regulations and certain land uses and a certain standard of building bylaws; but when it comes to your motor car, oustide of the external thing such as driving at a proper rate of speed or not being drunk or not being impaired, they are still manufacturing cars that have defects and we are still reluctant to inhibit drivers who cause accidents and drivers who put themselves in positions of danger and become public charges. Even with respect to liquor—we won't get into that now because that in itself would be a subject that one could talk about for hours.

It seems to me governments are afraid to act because they feel that a man, in driving a car, is still a rugged individualist until the last. I feel that unless the carnage becomes absolutely tremendous, 72,000 being injured and a few thousand being killed doesn't seem to mean a thing and governments won't act. And they should act!

We keep on talking about statistics of people who get killed. You know, I never concern myself about the guy who gets killed. That probably sounds awful; but the person who gets killed in a car accident is through with his troubles. He may have imposed troubles on others. His death may be a burden to his widow and his children and his family and his associates, but as far as he is concerned he is through with it.

I am more concerned about the person who is injured and the person who contributes to somebody else's injury. As a matter of fact, when I get my car insurance, and I have done this for all the years that I have been driving, my first concern about my insurance policy is what happens in a public liability accident rather than what happens if I get killed. I am more concerned in that regard.

And that's not because I feel I am my brother's keeper, but I feel that you create more damage by injuring a person than by killing him; because in the latter instance his life is over and the loss that's incumbent on the person who has been killed is minimal compared to that in the person you injure and whom you harm for the rest of his life. I am more concerned about the over 70,000 people who are injured because of the fact they hadn't their seatbelts on when they were driving.

There is no question in my mind that seatbelts are effective. There have been judicial decisions. There was one recently in the

Supreme Court of Ontario when Mr. Justice J. H. Osler reduced damages by 10 per cent because the person who was injured did not have a seatbelt buckled on at the time of the accident. It was the first time such a decision has been made. Undoubtedly this would be an important precedent, that failure to wear a seatbelt was considered to constitute negligence on the part of the driver by the Ontario Supreme Court. If it isn't negligence it can also be contributory negligence on the part of somebody else.

Everybody in this chamber knows that courts are very small-c conservative. Courts are reluctant to act in the absence of legislative enactments because they feel that they shouldn't be imposing their will on legislatures. When a judge feels that it has been proven to him, to the extent that this judge does, that seatbelts are that effective and that if the seatbelt isn't used it should constitute contributory negligence, then there is only a step that a legislature can take and that is, make it mandatory.

We have a lot of ornate cars today. People are driving big cars and smaller cars with all kinds of chrome and all kinds of fancy accoutrements connected with them. I think that we should force manufacturers to see to it that more safety devices are put in, and make it mandatory that people who have these safety devices should use them, otherwise they are no good.

We do so, not because we are trying to prevent the loss of life and not because we are trying to prevent injuries, as much as for the fact that these injuries involve public funds and the expenditure of public funds with respect to people who are injured. There is the cost factor with respect to hospital care, health, family welfare, police costs, and property damage, in which I and the other members and all the citizens and taxpayers of the province are involved whenever there is an accident.

Because of this tremendous cost which has been escalating by virtue of the fact that there have been so many accidents, we have a right as public officials to pass a law to say—this will be the 11th commandment—thou shalt not be able to get into a car and thou shalt not be able to drive without putting on your seatbelt and without wearing your seatbelt properly as it was meant to be worn.

I say that there is another salutary effect with respect to wearing a seatbelt, or using other safety devices in the car. That is, I find when I get into my car and I put on my seatbelt it makes me feel safety conscious, from the moment that I fasten that seatbelt around my girth. It brings to my attention that I just don't get into that car, put the thing into drive and—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Must be quite a job.

An hon. member: A long way round.

Mr. Givens: Yes, it is quite a job because they don't make these seatbelts as long as they used to, Mr. Speaker. But it makes a person think when he gets into that car, before he drives hell bent for leather down the road, that he has taken this precaution and it makes him think of the other fellow. It has a salutary effect. Even if for this reason alone, it would be worthwhile to make it mandatory to wear seatbelts, with failure punishable by a fine.

Not only that, but on finding that a driver hasn't worn his seatbelt, it should be considered an element of negligence or an element of contributory negligence in any civil case, where he should be punished, even if he is awarded damages, by loss of 10 or 15 per cent of the damages awarded to him.

Another thing: A lot of people feel inconvenienced when they get into their car and the buzzer sounds. Another thing manufacturers should be forced to do—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. On my list we have another speaker as well. Would the member please keep that in mind.

Mr. Givens: All right, I'll just wind up.

I would see to it that this buzzer, or a light, should go on outside the car to embarrass that particular driver who refuses to put on a seatbelt. The buzzer noise should be sounded from outside, or a light outside should indicate that he has refused to put the safety belt on.

I could talk on for another half hour, Mr. Speaker, but at your request I shall take my seat in order to enable another one of my colleagues to speak in favour of this bill that is before us.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand up and say a few words on this topic.

The question has been asked, why has this government been reluctant to bring in such legislation when it appears to have

such unanimous consent? It appears that it is the motherhood resolution.

But I think the facts are in and this government is very well capable of smelling out political strength, and I don't think that the general public as a whole has accepted the theory that seatbelts should be used. I think this has been what has hindered the government in introducing this legislation, because this government's idea of leadership is to find out which way the public is going and then run like hell and get in front of it and then say, "Follow me, this is the way we are going to go." That is the kind of leadership that we have been getting from this government.

I have some statistics here which will encourage the government and will tell them which way the population is going. They will encourage them to run out in front of the crowd and ask the crowd to follow them.

In a safety-belt survey conducted by the Nickel Belt Auto Club in Parry Sound, Nipissing, Timiskaming, Cochrane, Sudbury and Manitoulin Island, which is part of the area that I represent, by a club which has a membership of 40,000, 55 per cent of that organized automobile club membership was in favour of seatbelts. They said that drivers should be required by law to wear safety belts. Now that is the driver. In the survey 78 per cent of them indicated that passengers should also be required by law to wear safety belts.

I think the government has nothing to fear. There will not be any political backlash. They have the majority with them. So let's go ahead and have it done. Certainly we know that this private members' bill is not going to be enacted into legislation; it has to be done by a government official.

There is certain other support that I think I should bring to the attention of the ministry. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Automobile Association has representatives right across this land from the Alberta Motor Association, to associations in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, and so on. It represents a pretty wide body of public opinion in our country. This association did pass a couple of resolutions in 1972. This report is for the year ending June 30, 1973, so its recommendations are new. I will read policy 3.3 of the report;

> The Canadian Automobile Association endorses and encourages the use of safety belts and other restraining devices complying with established standards for both front-seat and back-seat passengers and calls for a continuous public education programme on their value.

So there is nothing to fear there; there is no political backlash there.

Mr. Speaker: Could the hon. member conclude his remarks, please.

Mr. Germa: I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: This concludes this order of business.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 16, 1973

20th anniversary of Metro Toronto's incorporation, statement by Mr. Davis 963

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Lewis 964

Ryerson financial problems, questions of Mr. McNie: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 966

Sales tax on energy, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 967

General welfare rates, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis 969

Municipal grants, questions of Mr. White: Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Cassidy 969

Mercury task force, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Reid 971

Students' travel expenses, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Bounsall 971

Gasoline tax rebate for farmers, question of Mr. White: Mr. Gaunt 971

Alleged actions of reeve of Kingston township, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Shulman 971

School budgets, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Singer, Mr. Deacon 972

Religious discrimination in education, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Foulds 973

Alberta natural gas, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Givens 973

Great Lakes flood damage, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Deans 973

Problem of farmers in Uxbridge area, question of Mr. White: Mr. Good 974

Activities of Holiday Magic Ltd., questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Stokes 974

Dial-a-bus system, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. B. Newman 974

Assistance for welfare action centre, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Martel 975

Use of market value assessments, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Good 975

French schooling in Elliot Lake, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Foulds 975

Report on the committee on the costs of education, Mr. Wells: Mr. B. Newman 976

Presenting report, Department of Public Works, Mr. Snow 977

Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, first reading 977

Security Transfer Tax Act, bill to repeal, Mr. White, first reading 977

Income Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 977

City of London Board of Education Act, bill respecting, Mr. Walker, first reading 977

Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Breithaupt 978

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to 988

Estimates, Provincial Secretariat for Justice, Mr. White, continued 988

Private members' hour 1000

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, on second reading, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Young, Mr. Eaton, Mr. Givens, Mr. Germa 1000

Recess, 6 o'clock 1010

No. 23



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 16, 1973

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1973

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, PROVINCIAL SECRETARIAT FOR JUSTICE
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): It looks as though we are going to have a little private time together. Mr. Chairman, could the Provincial Secretary for Justice give the House the benefit of the current thinking of the government on what it plans to do about the checkerboarding of lots, as a result of the answers to the various questions which were posed by the government under the Constitutional Questions Act to the court of appeal of Ontario?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Chairman, there was a number of hypothetical questions dealt with by the court of appeal regarding certain situations, which indicated that an intent to avoid the application of the Planning Act was not in itself wrong, that that in itself didn't invalidate the title. At the present time the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) and his senior counsel are studying the report and the decision of the court of appeal.

There is a possibility—and I'm saying only that there is a possibility—of some sort of legislation validating titles that as the result of checkerboarding are now in trouble, and conveyances and mortgages that were made under this scheme and are deficient in some way. That is one of the considerations. There is a concern by the secretariat and by the Attorney General when certain solicitors who act for people and who are aware of the legislation—for example, the Planning Act—who are aware of the objectives of the Ontario government, particularly from the point of view of land development and planning, intentionally try to circumvent existing legislation.

There are two situations, of course. There is one dealing with those cases and conveyances that took place prior to the 1971 amendment, and those subsequent to it. However, as I say, because of the difficulty and the hardships suffered by many people—particularly in one area east of Toronto—as a result of this checkerboarding, and the fact that mortgages have been judged invalid from the point of view of foreclosure proceedings, some type of provincial legislation will be necessary.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my colleague the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) raised with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Clement) a day or two ago—and then by redirection to the Attorney General—the question of Pellegrini Enterprises, of 3019A Dufferin St. in North York, and the lots being sold by that company in the township of Nottawasaga to unsuspecting buyers. There was a reply made at that time that, for practical purposes, there was no one in the government who had any jurisdiction to deal with the matter in such a way that would override the traditional view of caveat emptor.

Now if my understanding is correct—and it's difficult when one reads the decision of the court of appeal to believe that one has a fair grasp of exactly what they were trying to say—in substance what they are saying is that unless the legislative draftsmen in this assembly can match their wits with the conveyancers in downtown Toronto and elsewhere we are never going to be able successfully to implement the intention of the Legislature with respect to the policies set out in the Planning Act.

I think that's a fair interpretation because the court still seems to think that, when the overall planning of the government of Ontario is announced in the Legislature of the Province of Ontario through an Act of the Legislature, we are back in the feudal times when it's permissible for conveyancers, by the exercise of what is called ingenuity, to circumvent the policy of the Province of Ontario.

Frankly, I don't understand that. Is it a fact of life that the courts in the Province of Ontario are so far behind in their capacity

to decide what is the intention of this Legislature that they have got to resort to this language about "recognizing the legitimate ingenuity of conveyancers operating under 20th century conditions, as their ingenuity was recognized in much earlier periods before statutory reform began"?

Is that the game which we still must play in terms of statutory interpretation? I don't think that there was any question in the minds of the members of the Legislature when the statute was enacted as to what we were trying to do both in the 1960s and then, with the amendments which were forced upon us by this ingenuity, in the early part of the 1970s. We cannot, in this assembly, sit here, attempting to enact statutes of the Province of Ontario drafted on the advice of legislative counsel and then find the very disruptive and unsettling conditions which have resulted in the Province of Ontario, and continue to exist.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government is sadly in default if it allows these leisurely processes of the courts to perpetuate, as they have now done for about four years, the whole question of checkerboarding and whether people do or do not have valid title to their lands. The part of the decision of the court which bothers me immensely is not so much the specific and delightful answers to the particular questions which were posed to them. Anyone can play the little game and draw his little chart of Green acre, divide it up and make up his little chart and think what a fine, lovely, pleasant little game this is that the court and those select people who appear before it can become engaged in.

What does concern me is when the courts appear to be unable to answer question No. 9 which was put to them. The only answer which they give to question No. 9 is that that's the best they can do in the circumstances. Their answer simply is that the transaction would be voided if its validity was dependant upon alleged good faith and want of notice in a purchaser for value, for his knowing participation in such a scheme would destroy any defence based on those circumstances.

I don't think it requires any genius to work out that, if a person alleges he is a bona fide purchaser for value and he is not a bona fide purchaser for value, the scheme would be voided. I don't think that there is anything which requires the exercise of legal ingenuity to come to that conclusion. Again to say that a distortion of the facts with the object of deceiving the public administration would likewise avoid the transaction, doesn't seem to me to advance one iota the cause of clarity with respect to the ownership of land in the Province of Ontario.

There is the one matter, and the crucial matter, Mr. Chairman, which the court of appeal refused to answer. They didn't say they refused to answer it. They said in their own way: "As indicated at the outset in our answer to question No. 9, we are unable to answer this question in more specific terms." What they said was that they were not prepared to give even the benefit of the doubt to the Legislature as to what its intentions were. I am quite certain that anybody in this Legislature who was concerned about the problem had no doubt whatsoever what the intentions were.

We're not back now playing some latter day game of court supremacy over the Legislature of the Province of Ontario. If we have to go back to preambles in the recitals to all of the statutes in order to make our intentions clear, I think it is about time that we did that. Anybody who would read—anybody but a lawyer constrained within the framework of his own legal education and warped into the system—if he were to read this judgement affecting titles to the land in the Province of Ontario would say that they can't be talking about land in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Right on!

Mr. Renwick: I am suggesting to you, Mr. Chairman, and I am suggesting to the Provincial Secretary that there is something seriously wrong with the whole question of the way in which titles to land are registered in the Province of Ontario, and the way in which land is sold in the Province of Ontario, if we are going to live in a continuous state of unsettlement because of what took place in these developments in rural Ontario in direct contravention to what everybody in this assembly knew was the intention of the assembly.

I am saying to the minister, Mr. Chairman, what we have said before, that there are going to have to be prospectuses, if necessary, given to every single buyer of land; that if the prospectus does not clearly set out all of the terms and conditions and if it turns out to be false in any material respect or fails to contain the kind of information which is required, then the person can have a right of rescission and get out of the contract.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that in the case which was put before the House in the question of my colleague, the member for Yorkview, and we can do it again when we go downstairs into estimates in the Attorney General's branch—on the general policy question there is a serious default in the government, when we stand up session after session to ask about the title to land in the Province of Ontario and all the answer that the government can give is, "We are considering it."

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the lawyers who are advising the government and the lawyers who are members of the government are hypnotized by the mythology of a court which doesn't understand what the statutory intention of this Legislature is with respect to planning in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): How about the lawyers in private practice?

Mr. Renwick: I am saying, Mr. Chairman, let's go right back to the problems that this government is going to face. It's going to move into the area of controlled land use on a scale which has never yet been seen in the province. If the legislative intention of this assembly is to be hamstrung by interpretations of the court of appeal in the Province of Ontario, I am saying that you will never be able to implement an effective land-use plan in the Province of Ontario. Why, just think of the problems which will occur when you get around to zoning land for agricultural purposes, and you then have persons trying to circumvent that legislation. The value to persons circumventing that will mean that they will be able to pay the highest priced conveyancers in the Province of Ontario, who within the traditions of the legal system dealing with land in the Province of Ontario will deal with the problem as if we were in feudal times.

I wanted to make the point to the Provincial Secretary for Justice. Since the Minister for Consumer and Commercial Relations indicated that he can't do anything about the case that my colleague the member for Yorkview raised, and since the only reply that the Attorney General can give is that the matter is now being considered in the light of the decision of the court of appeal, I am saying—and I am going to say it for the last time, Mr. Chairman, and then I will sit down and wait for the secretary to respond—if we join in that game it will not be this Legislature that is enacting laws, it will be whether the skill and ingenuity of the legislative counsel sitting under the gallery and advising the government can be matched by the skill and ingenuity of the lawyers downtown.

I suggest to you that if we have reached that sorry pass in providing for the orderly and effective development of the land-use programmes of this province, there is something seriously wrong. We don't need to have a great deal of meticulous study now on the questions which were answered by the court of appeal. The answer is perfectly clear. The interpretation statute of this province with respect to how the courts will deal with the legislative intent of this assembly, and the ancient rules governing the decisions of the court about statutory interpretation, have got to be amended in such a way that the courts have the kind of leeway which will permit them, in the language of the courts, to give the assembly the benefit of the doubt and not to give the benefit of the doubt to the ingenuity of the conveyancer downtown.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that in the absence of adequate reform of the land law system of the Province of Ontario with respect to the registry offices and to land titles in the absence of some kind of prospectus requirements for the exploitation of rural lands for development purposes, in the absence of some clear redefinition of what the courts are required to do in interpreting the intention of this Legislature as enacted in statutes, this government is in serious trouble with respect to any effective land-use programme.

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member for Riverdale mind if the Chairman broke in for a minute to allow the introduction of some guests in the west gallery?

Mr. Renwick: Well, you stopped me in full flight, but that's okay.

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member for Peel South introduce our guests?

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Chairman, if I may, estimates come and go each year, but we have with us tonight three groups who will perhaps come just once. I would like to introduce to the hon. members the 214th Cub pack. They are from the riding of the member for York West (Mr. MacBeth); the 158th Boy Scout troop from the riding of the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman); and last, but not least, five scouts from the great riding of Peel

South, the 44th Mississauga Boy Scouts. We welcome them here tonight.

Mr. Chairman: We all appreciate very much the member for Riverdale allowing this interruption; he may now proceed.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say to my friends in the east gallery up here is, let them be careful before they buy land in the Province of Ontario under this government Planning Act.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): There is more wisdom up there than there is over there.

Mr. Turner: This is west, not east.

Mr. Renwick: West. I am sorry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. We interrupted the member for Riverdale and he was very gracious in conceding the time to introduce our guests. Please carry on.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, let me speak again to the Provincial Secretary on this point. It is very interesting that in England as long ago as 1926, after a considerable amount of study—although it only took them about 2½ years under the leadership of Lord Birkenhead to do it—they effected a complete renovation of the land-owning system in England. Now there are great differences, and I'm not suggesting that that system can be transplanted here, but I would guess that as long as any person has been sitting in this assembly we have been talking about reforming the land registration system, to clear it up, but I would guess that as long as any person has been sitting in this Assembly we have been talking about some of the ancient language, ancient concepts and ancient ideas which are still embodied in our land laws. I am suggesting that this is a top priority of this particular Provincial Secretary for Justice in the Province of Ontario.

He talked in his opening remarks about concepts and principles as being matters which were near and dear to his heart. Well, I am suggesting to him that he has got to break out of the legal trap that this mythology has put us in. I am not going to recite at length any of the provisions of the statute —perhaps we can deal with it in more detail before the Attorney General.

We are in serious trouble. There are not only the persons who do not know whether they have good titles to their land at the present time but persons who now don't even know whether, having bought the land, they will be in a position to build on it at any time. In addition to being in that unsettled condition, the province is talking about embarking on the land-use programme which will plan out the use of land in the Province of Ontario for a long period of time.

The lesson is perfectly clear from the court of appeal in the quaint legalese of that decision that the Interpretation Act of the province is going to have to be amended; and the other matters to which I have referred are going to have to be dealt with.

I have taken up some time in the House on this particular question simply because I wanted to emphasize to the Provincial Secretary for Justice that this is a matter which can no longer be allowed simply to go on in limbo the way it has for so many years; and that the ministry is obligated to stand up in the House and say we are going to correct any defective titles by legislation if that is necessary — because, mark my words, the point has arrived where legislation is necessary.

The court of appeal has said in substance that if it is a fraudulent device for the purpose of riding through the statute, they will knock it down, but they have left it open to indicate that if a lawful scheme is worked out that will avoid the intention of the Legislature, that it will be upheld. We can't afford the luxury of having the intention of the assembly thwarted by the ancient mythology of the court.

There are probably other members that want to comment about that; but I feel very strongly about it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Very well said.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I do not want to comment on that, but I give full marks in veracity to my colleague.

There are three matters; I will try to be brief. I don't think we want to unduly prolong these particular estimates this year, but rather get on with the Attorney General's estimates downstairs on perhaps a more nitty-gritty basis, as far as I am concerned; although Lord knows this has been little philosophically done.

There are three areas; one of them is looking at your department. And let me reiterate a bit what I said on Friday. Com-

ing into the minister's portfolio, if I were in his role, I would look at it as an enormous challenge with almost unending possibilites, a number of which—and only a very few, a handful—have been pointed out to the minister in his job. I don't know why the minister, sitting in this particular designation and post, doesn't give various types of papers—call them Green papers if you will—on any number of subjects. You don't have to take governmental stands and you don't have to commit your government to any particular position. They can be matters, which simply under the burden and duress of this House, we are not up to date on. Again, I could mention just one area—criminology. Why couldn't you give a purple paper on criminology telling us what the newest—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Purple?

Mr. Lawlor: You have got the whole university community and your ministry contributes vast sums to the Centre of Criminology. What utilization do you make of it? What benefit or what feed-in to this particular body derives from that particular source? You could give a black and blue paper, if you will, upon the policy of policing; the philosophy of the police that we have previously mentioned in these remarks.

Mr. Stokes: How about red, blue and white?

Mr. Lawlor: There are a number of things you could do through your office if you would seize the gauntlet, if you would make it meaningful and not let the thing fall into desuetude, as the man who formerly occupied this post permitted it to do through sheer lack of imagination and through not being forthright enough about his office.

The second area I want to just mention briefly has to do with that kind of publication, that kind of desideratum over a wide number of topics having to do with the law, not just necessarily confined to Ontario, but having rapport and immediate impact to the Province of Ontario.

The Attorney General of this Province, for instance, publishes nothing, he gives us nothing, he brings forward no desiderata. But on occasion the poor, impoverished devils from the Civil Liberties Association—such a publication as this — the Canadian Civil Liberties Education Trust, who have no money, who latch on to people like me to contribute five bucks a year to maintain and keep them, do try to make an interrogation of the courts, do try to provide statistics and data upon which to give some insight as to which way the courts are going, how the judges are handling bail, what is the incidence of committals with respect to preliminary inquiries, with respect to any aspect of the system, and its inherent inequities.

But this Attorney General last year in the House pooh-poohed and denigrated this particular document. He said, "Oh, the range of sampling is so small as to hardly give any semblance. You can't rely upon a document like that, full of loopholes. Well, maybe you can't, and I shut up. But it's over a year and it has obviously ground in my groin and I am back here to say tonight that if their document is not adequate then let somebody else do it. Let you who have the wherewithal dedicate a few dollars to studies, objective studies, that are available to all sides of this House as to how too closely safeguards are safeguarded within the criminal justice system of the Province of Ontario. We have nothing like that.

As I say, these people put themselves out to try to do some kind of a haphazard job with the funds available and then they are placed in the pillory. If this is the best we can do and this is the best we get, then I will rely upon it, and let this ministry and let all the ministries over there accost it in detail, point by point, and bring it under disregard. But they simply shrug their shoulders and say that, "It is of little worth as far as I'm concerned," on their side of the fence.

There is another matter that I wanted to mention and I just wonder if you would take it under consideration. Our judiciary really are held under wraps. Oh, you get the odd maverick like Edson Haines or somebody like that speaking up before groups or even from the bench on occasion, about various defects and loopholes in our law. While Lang up in Ottawa takes issue with people of that kind, I don't; quite on the contrary, we need more. But they do exercise a certain circumspect skill in this regard; they are very delicate about it and reserved, as they well should be, as members of the judiciary.

The people who are not reserved, and the people who ought to be called to account to some great extent, are the chiefs of police of the Province of Ontario. By which divine right, by what inherent gesture are they able to speak out on every occasion and sundry, condemning the Legislature, condemning the law, saying that they find this unworkable, that they won't co-operate, that they won't do this and that they don't like that?

These people are public servants as much as the rest of us—far more, really, than the autonomous judiciary. They are paid civil servants, and they have the effrontery and gall on many occasions to spit in the face of those who employ them.

I don't think they should be kept under wraps; at the same time, I don't think they should be given the area of free-wheeling freebootery in terms of language that they presently use. I say to the Provincial Secretary of Justice that we have never moved in on that area. Nobody ever says anything; we all grin and bear it. Invariably, the most vocal of them are also the most atrocious, the ones who wish to impose the full vigours of the law, in all its plenitude and majesty, upon the head of some poor devil of a citizen. They want hanging—they're all for it. There's the odd chief of police across the country who may have a more enlightened opinion, but by and large—I suppose it is a constitutional hazard and an occupational disease—they have to defend their own particular forces. They take what they regard as the vein of the matter instead of giving leadership in this particular regard.

I just want to bring to your attention under this head an article in the Globe and Mail which talked about a chief of police and the role of the police in Calgary, Alberta. There the man, being a new chief of police out there, said it was far more to their task that they were more beholden to the public in the direction of giving leadership and of giving some direction to the kindly things, and to be suave in the community, than to be forever lambasting the citizenry as being somehow predilected to the criminal, under suspicion somehow that we might commit an offence the hour after next, which is the basic way in which the jaundiced vision of most chiefs of police look upon each one of us, poor devils, as we try to exist in the community. This is a very widespread phenomenon, and I think you should exercise, now that you have the leisure—and you certainly have the effrontery—to watch the situation carefully and give some direction.

It is your responsibility, Mr. Solicitor General, far more than that of this minister, to give this some thought at least. I don't think you're likely to seize the bull by the horns. Some of those chiefs of police are pretty tough hombres. I wouldn't want to meet them at sundown on the main street—and I'm sure that you wouldn't either. As a matter of fact, I don't have to and you do.

I suspect that at high noon on some Thursday you might have to do the duties of your office and place them under some form of discipline with respect to the criticism meted out, not only to your ministry, but to the highly opiniated versions of the Criminal Code and, to a degree, subversions of the Bail Act. There's nothing wrong with the Bail Act, it's been said over and over again; it's the way in which it has been administered. The administration of the Act doesn't seem to be that far out. If you don't like it, it's a new thing, it weighs heavily upon you, you find this business of weak-kneed, bleeding-hearted legislators giving in to every form of human complacency and guile.

Well, you could take the beggars down to the police station and lock them up for the night. Nothing would be a better cure. They won't be back in the entanglements of the law for a good long time. This business of spoonfeeding and giving milk to the public, letting them go home and giving them a summons, we find that terribly unpalatable. How will you ever get an ordered society and disciplined citizenry treating people with that particular form of kindliness? No sir.

I never heard any member of this House speak out in this particular direction in this wise, and I wonder if it isn't the truth of the matter neverthless, and just what you think as to what suzerainty should be enjoyed by these particular men inside the demesne of Ontario.

Finally, I have been asked by the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) to ask a very specific question to which we insist on knowing the answer: To what degree have you made official use of Ontario airplanes? The air force over here has put a blanch in the cheek of Cambodia. We want to know a few details. What use have you made of government aircraft in the last year? Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for St. George.

Mr. Lawlor: Can't I get a few answers?

Mr. Chairman: It'll come, it'll come. Just wait.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Do you want to answer now, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I know that both the hon. member for Riverdale and the hon. member for Lakeshore don't expect all of their queries to be answered—

Mr. Renwick: We do.

Mr. Cassidy: They do, and quite rightly.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: However, dealing with the problems with the Planning Act, and the conveyancing under the Planning Act, and the court of appeal's decisions in respect to questions put to it by the Attorney General—as the members know, the court of appeal indicated, basically, that if there isn't a fraudulent device used in a conveyance and the conveyancer has successfully avoided the application of the particular legislation, this could be considered a valid title.

I think the member for Riverdale questions the court of appeal for applying this rather narrow interpretation of the legislation, particularly when the intent of the Legislature, in fact, is known. The only thing I would say about that is that there is no doubt about the question that legislation must express, in the law, what it means; for that, of course, is what the person who is involved in the interpretation of that legislation must be able to rely on.

I realize that in the whole area of land law and conveyancing the public is involved; the government is involved, probably in these areas more so than, for example, the area of income tax. It has been a fact since we had the first application of income tax that it was quite proper for the citizen and for his counsel or for his tax expert to save what he could from the payment of taxes as long as he obeyed the law. In other words, if he found loopholes, if he was able successfully to avoid the application of the Income Tax Act, this was all quite all right. This was expected and this is why we have legislation; this is why we have lawyers.

Now, whether or not in the area of land law and in conveyancing it is incumbent upon the courts, in some way, to try to analyse and interpret the intention of the Legislature, of course, is something that is debatable. It can be discussed among lawyers. My only reply to that, Mr. Chairman, would be that I think it is incumbent upon us to have the best possible draftsmen to draft our legislation so that there aren't the loopholes we find now existing in some of our legislation dealing with conveyancing. When someone is successful in developing some type of scheme or is able to avoid the application of legislation, it is incumbent upon us, of course, to amend that legislation immediately.

In dealing with the remarks of the—

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, before the minister goes on, isn't there some sense of obligation on the government to validate the titles of persons who are now placed in the position where they don't know whether they have a good title or do not have a good title to land? Surely there must be something incumbent on the government to deal with that specific problem.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, when you have a situation as flagrant as exists at the present time in this whole area of checkerboarding, where there was no real legislation dealing with land separations at the municipal level and where it was incumbent upon the province to legislate in a very broad way, when many of the conveyances took place prior to that legislation and some after, and when there still were loopholes and ways to circumvent that legislation, in view of the hardships that exist as a result of that, certainly the government has to consider some type of validation legislation.

Mr. Renwick: May I just again comment to the minister? There is in the Interpretation Act of the Province of Ontario a section relating to the interpretation of the statutes of this province which is binding on the courts and which the courts didn't refer to at all in their decision. The Interpretation Act provides very clearly in section 10 that:

> Every Act shall be deemed to be remedial, whether its immediate purport is to direct the doing of anything that the Legislature deems to be for the public good or to prevent or punish the doing of anything that it deems to be contrary to the public good; and shall accordingly receive such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as will best ensure the attainment of the object of the Act, according to its true intent, meaning and spirit.

In the face of language such as that, it seems to me that it is incumbent upon the court to give the benefit of the doubt to the intention of the Legislature when it is dealing in matters of the public good relating to the planning of land use.

In strict legal terms this is the point I am making, that that provision of the Interpretation Act is totally ignored when the court is dealing in this ancient game of the conveyancers' art. I think that that section clearly distinguishes the taxing statutes, where I think we all agree on the strict interpretation of the statute when it is extracting money from the citizen. That isn't what the Planning Act was doing.

The Planning Act was dealing with the public good in an area where it was necessary

to override the private rights of property. What the courts have done, as they always do, is to fail to understand that the Legislature of this province is quite capable of passing a statute which will override the private rights of landowners in the conveyance of their property. That is what section 10 of the Interpretation Act means. Perhaps next time there is a reference to the courts, you could ask the courts to give their judicial interpretation of whether or not section 10 wasn't sufficient to form a basis upon which they could have answered question 9 clearly and affirmatively, and simply said to the Legislature and to the people of the Province of Ontario, "If you don't like what they did, kick them out at the next time around in the election, but when they have enacted statutes give them the benefit of the doubt and don't give the rights of private property paramount rights over the express intention of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario about matters affecting the public weal."

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The only thing I would like to add to that, Mr. Chairman, is, for example, when there are cases before the Supreme Court of Canada in respect to the constitution, particularly vis-à-vis federal or provincial rights or vires, the interpretation of the statute, an old statute like that, is a very basic question and a very real consideration.

In this situation, as the hon. member well knows, we have the Attorney General asking a number of hypothetical questions to the court of appeal. We have no real adversary system, no real submissions or debate and no real hearing in the normal sense. I am wondering if they really went into the interpretation or the intent of the Legislature as much as they normally would.

Mr. Renwick: They spent a good deal of the judgement dealing with the intention of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the points raised by the hon. member for Lakeshore, we are moving toward the objectives that he suggested as far as using more coloured papers, for example; there are what you might want to call many exotic areas of research that we intend to move into in the next few months.

The hon. member mentioned the civil liberties group as one voice, and of course he mentioned the chiefs of police could be considered another voice. But I think we have to hear from all of them, whether we agree with their stances or not. Certainly the chiefs of police in this province feel, because they are very close to the scene, that they have a legitimate opinion. I think it is incumbent upon us to view all opinions and, in light of those opinions and our research and consideration, to make the right decisions.

I don't think any one group has all the good ideas or that any one group can be considered wrong or archaic in its thinking. Certainly we are using the device of green papers and different coloured papers to gather opinion without definitely committing the government and, at the same time, to get the benefit of various opinions on some very important questions.

The hon. member asked a specific question—

Mr. Lawlor: Before you come to that, may I simply say that if a junior member even of high estate in your ministry went about making public statements, you would certainly see that he was answerable to you.

The Civil Liberties Association is an autonomous, completely divorced group of citizens who have come together on their own and voluntarily; as far as I know they receive no benefits from your department or ony other source. They have tried to do some kind of research work in this general area—surely their position is different from that of the chiefs of police. I don't think you have really given them very much consideration over the years as to precisely what they want. I don't wish to place a blanket around them; at the same time, I think that they have enormous responsibility in this regard as subordinate officers to the Ministry of the Solicitor General, and I just wonder if that has ever been recognized.

If an officer of a police force wanted to take exception to what the chief had to say at a Kiwanis dinner the previous night, he would very soon find himself in hot water; the chief of police vis-à-vis you is in the same position. Do you find that altogether palatable? Do you particularly welcome it when all the arguments weigh in a particular direction, a direction in which legislation hasn't proceeded for 25 years?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell).

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ontario.

Mr. Dymond: I have listened to this with some interest but as a layman I must admit

this is certainly beyond the comprehension of a simple country doctor. I would suggest to the Provincial Secretary for Justice that we might leave the exotic quite alone for a little while. There are some very homely, common everyday problems that need to be dealt with vigorously and effectively, as quickly as possible—problems of which he is not totally ignorant.

I have in my riding a group of people about whom I have spoken on many occasions to different ministries, and on whose behalf I have spoken; and while I haven't been as noisy as my good friend from Waterloo has been on their behalf, I have other methods of dealing with my constituency problems, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): So far your efforts haven't been very effective in helping the victims of Century City.

Mr. Dymond: They're equally effective. It isn't always the big wind or the earthquake or the fire that achieves things.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): You might have the ear of the civil service.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): It is high time we had a government debate on Century City.

Mr. Dymond: I do want to say to you, however, that if we leave out the green and blue and the black and blue paper so beautifully and aptly discussed by my colleague from Lakeshore, we don't need to use that. We can use the common ordinary white paper we use every day or, even without paper, we can deal with some of these problems.

Mr. Lawlor: I always fear the white paper.

Mr. Dymond: These people sold their land to a developer and it looked like a good deal. This happened a long time ago, in 1968, in fact, to begin with. It looked like a good deal, and it was a good deal as far as they were concerned until this government, in its wisdom, said that this project could not be allowed.

An unfortunate thing happened, however. Many of my people were left with mortgages which they found were, to all intents and purposes, worthless as far as they were concerned. For some 2½ or three years the purchaser—the developer—has not only been in default of the principle but has been in default of the interest and, indeed, also in default of the taxes, paying only enough to keep the property off the market for tax sales.

The developers, through their legal experts, tell me that it is because of an amendment which we passed to the Planning Act—an amendment, Mr. Chairman, I would draw to your attention, which was passed after these farmers sold their lands and now they can't foreclose their mortgages. They can't reclaim their lands and they're completely frustrated in all of their efforts. I urge the government, Mr. Chairman, through the Provincial Secretary for Justice—and that's a good word, justice—

Mr. Good: There has been none up to now.

Mr. Dymond: —it's a word that's very meaningful in this matter. I urge him to exercise his full sense of justice and find some way, quickly and definitely, of making it possible for these people either to be paid for the land or to reclaim it in the ordinary course as the average citizen has a right to do.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Had to speak out on that, when your usual back door method didn't work.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1101?

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly glad we've been able to bring the whole problem of Century City out into public debate in this Legislature. It's something that should have been done two years ago and I welcome the remarks of the member for Ontario. I hope that, on his behalf, the government will move now that the thing has been brought out into the open because the people in Century City are fed up right up to here!

They don't know where to turn. They've spoken to everyone in cabinet, their own members, the member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) and, finally, I got involved in it. This is the first time, to my knowledge, there's been any public debate in this Legislature about this shameful thing which has existed for over two years. I commend the member for Ontario for bringing it out again.

Mr. Chairman: We have an amendment before us by Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, just before you get to the amendment—

Mr. Good: Let's get a response from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, all I can

say is that as far as this whole business of checkerboarding and the circumventing of the Planning Act is concerned, this is something that is under discussion in our policy field and I'm sure that the Attorney General will tell you during his estimates that we have every intention of doing something about it. There is no sense in prolonging it. The problem won't go away. The situation, as the hon. members for Ontario and Waterloo North mentioned, will not improve until we move. We have to move and there has to be legislation here.

To the member for Lakeshore, just one trip and that's only since September.

Mr. Chairman: The member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I'm just a new girl here so perhaps I'm not quite acquainted with all of the matters pertaining to this ministry, as my friends and colleagues are.

I have noted recommendation 8(1) in the third COGP report and it said: "Policy ministers without operating responsibility should be appointed to devote full-time attention to (1) setting priorities . . ."

Mr. Speaker, with my simple mind, I would like to understand what the priorities are which have in fact been set by the secretary. I would like to understand what the priorities are with reference to organized crime in this province, because it was my impression that this government was brought, kicking and screaming, to the position of setting up a royal commission to investigate one aspect, basically, of this whole field.

Perhaps the secretary could answer that question—could tell us whether he approves of the type of investigation which has been going on in the sister province of Quebec, or just how he feels this matter should be handled, if in fact it is one of his priorities.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Aren't you lucky, Bob?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You're right.

Mrs. Campbell: After receiving the information as to what the priorities are, I would like to understand what leadership has been given in policy development by this secretary. Again, Mr. Chairman, I have not seen evidence of it, but of course, as I say, I haven't been here all that long.

Thirdly, I should like to have spelled out for me just what co-ordinating has gone on among the respective policy fields in this galaxy. On top of that I would like to know how many tours this secretary has taken—the road-shows which I understand one of the secretaries has undertaken.

It is a part of the whole philosophy of this third report—and I think I'd better quote so I shan't be accused of misquoting. The report lists "the major aspects of a policy minister's role," and I'm quoting from page 16 of the interim report No. 3, dated Dec. 19, 1971: "The second major aspect of a policy minister's role affects his relationship with the general public."

It is intended, according to my reading of this report, that the secretary, having been relieved of administrative responsibilities, will be consulting with the public to advise the public of the policies of this superministry and perhaps of other aspects of the galaxy.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I find that all of these questions relate very clearly and definitely to the matter of the estimates which I'm being asked to review. If I might have answers to those questions, Mr. Chairman, then I might be better able to come to the conclusion that, in fact, this is a functioning portion of this government which ought to be supported fully, or that it is not and that I should not then be supporting it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like the answers.

Mr. W. Newman: What's the question?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It's unfortunate that the hon. member for St. George wasn't here on Friday morning.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that when the minister discussed organized crime which was the member's question?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, but we did discuss priorities. We did discuss some of the activities of the policy secretary field. I attempted to explain at that time just what we were doing from the point of view of a collective discussion of those areas that we feel are priority areas. At that time, as I mentioned, we were involved in such areas as uniform store hours, Sunday observance, the Competition Act and bail reform. We also even touched on juvenile courts, training schools, and aftercare.

All I can say is that, in a situation where we have a particular policy matter, that may be brought to our attention in various ways. We'll use an example of a delegation making a submission to us, a group of people saying that we should move in this particular area. We, as a secretariat, listen to those people.

We may listen to delegations from the other side of the question. It may be as a result of research requested or commissioned by us; we may have a report. In any event, our secretariat then sits down and discusses this. It is then that we decide that the certain appropriate minister within the policy field should draft legislation which we consider, or it could be a green paper, as the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations is doing with respect to credit reporting. Then when that is again discussed by us, and further honed by us, it goes to the policy and priorities board, which is chaired by the Premier (Mr. Davis) and of which the three policy secretaries are members, as well as the Treasurer (Mr. White) and the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. Winkler). Then if it is approved by policies and priorities or amendments are made at that stage, it goes on to cabinet, caucus and legislation.

Mr. Cassidy: You guys are so enamoured with this process of yours, and so far it isn't yielding anything.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Oh, dry up!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That's the procedure.

Mr. Cassidy: It's an enormous dilation of activity by the ministry with no concrete results.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I told the members about some of the priorities, as I have mentioned. There are bills that have been introduced during this current session—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister talks about the ministry and it isn't working.

Mr. Havrot: Oh, shut up!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and there will be more bills during this session which are the result of those policies.

Mr. Cassidy: There hasn't been one this session yet.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There have been 28 bills this session and 20 from the Justice policy field.

Mr. Cassidy: All of them insignificant.

Mr. Renwick: Not of any significance! The minister knows that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There are some. The meaty ones are still to come, I admit.

Mr. Cassidy: That's what I said, you haven't brought in one yet.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Havrot: Oh, shut up!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There's a couple of them there.

Mr. Cassidy: Where has the minister been for the last eight months?

Mr. Foulds: They were housekeeping bills. The member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) seconded them.

Mr. Cassidy: He had eight months to produce these bills. Where was he?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, can you button his lip before I go over and do it?

Mr. Foulds: The minister is being provocative.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the question of organized crime, we have our inquiry. We don't like inquiries; we don't think that is the way to deal with organized crime. We would like to see evidence, charges laid and convictions. But when there isn't sufficient evidence, this is a second-best approach to ferreting out the criminal element and getting to some sort of solution to the problem as exists at the present time in the construction industry.

I don't particularly like what is going on in Quebec. I think the terms of reference of that inquiry are much too broad; too many people are being slandered, there's too much of a witch-hunt going on, and there is too much guilt by association. So, in my opinion, that type of inquiry should be avoided.

I can say to the hon. member for St. George that I haven't taken any tours, but I have as much as possible—by tours I think she means mainly of the select committee—

Mrs. Campbell: No!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Oh, I thought you were being facetious. I'm sorry.

If you mean have I visited various institutions in the province, I've been to various correctional institutions in the province, for example. I've met with people who are connected with this secretariat in an indirect way in the whole field of justice, for example.

Yes, I have met with people in different parts of the province. I am sure that I have met people who would ordinarily go to another ministry. When we meet those people the results of those meetings are then taken to our weekly policy committee meeting.

Mr. Cassidy: This is so banal it defies belief. It really is.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I asked the question—not because I hadn't read what was said here on Friday—it was because, Mr. Chairman, I really couldn't believe what I had read. Do I take it then that the Provincial Secretary of Justice forms his priorities on the basis of deputations which come with some form of complaint? Is there no one in the ministry who might in these terms think for themselves, and look at the types of legislation we have, and bring forward something to give some more human type of concept to our legislation and our legislative processes?

Must it always wait for somebody in the community to put the matter forward? And if it does, does it really honestly require this kind of money to sit down and assess the relative merits of deputations bearing briefs? And if it does, why can't it be done through a regular department rather than at this kind of an additional cost to the taxpayer?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, when I talked about deputations and submissions, I was really just trying to give one example. The way policy is formed by government is the result of a lot of input; it's input from experience, it's public opinion.

Mr. Cassidy: What arduous tasks you have.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We amend existing legislation to meet whatever the current needs are. We have talked about that tonight, for example, in respect to the Planning Act.

In commissioning research, for example from the Centre of Criminology, we feel a little ahead of public opinion in many respects. And there again, we can enact legislation or formulate policy. It is not all as a result of deputations, but all I am saying is that there is some need to co-ordinate the activities of three or four ministries within a secretariat, and this is the main purpose of the policy secretary.

If there are areas where, for example, they feel more policing or more law enforcement is needed, what effect does this have on our courts? What general effect does this have on the administration of justice, what effect does it have on our institutions as far the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps) is concerned?

Mr. Cassidy: You sound so embarrassed when you say all these things.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Those are all areas that are similar, that are part of the secretariat, and where a certain amount of leadership is necessary.

Mrs. Campbell: I wonder if I could question the minister further, Mr. Chairman? Do I take it, then, that the secretary is telling us that the thrust of recommendation 8(1) has been changed in practice; that co-ordinating related programmes of government is the top job of the secretary, rather than setting priorities and providing leadership in policy development? Is that what the secretary has just told us?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member for St. George is not trying to place priorities in the phrases within that particular paragraph. They are all equal.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, let me understand what the secretary said. I don't know much about the operation of the law, but I get the distinct impression that the secretary said you pursue the law in conjunction with the ability of the courts to handle it and the penitentiary system to hold the criminals.

That is what it sounded like to me—that you set your priorities based on whether the courts are capable of handling the additional workload and whether the correctional institutional system is sufficiently advanced to handle the additional prisoners.

Mr. Martel: Well, they've still got some vacancies.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Is that real? Is that what you meant to say, because I listened to you very carefully?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You are putting too literal an interpretation on what I said:

Mr. Cassidy: You are being very literal tonight.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I use another example. That maybe was not a good enough example, but you are grabbing at something rather than what I am attempting to analyse and attempting to answer in the hon. members' questions. You are putting, as I say, too literal an interpretation on it.

To use another example: If we feel that the rate of recidivism is too high—

Mr. Foulds: Rate of what?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Recidivism. If it is too high, then there must be something the matter with the system.

Mr. Cassidy: What are you doing about it, then?

Mr. Renwick: You haven't got the information to make that decision.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We do have that information. This is the type of information we are after all the time. Why is it too high? Is it the courts, is it the method of law enforcement, or is it the manner in which we are operating our institutions?

Mr. Cassidy: After a year, do you have some answers?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Those things all have to be considered.

If in spite of harsher sentences, for example, people are staying longer in institutions, and yet the crime rate goes up, we should find out why. These are the areas where we should have some research; areas where all the ministries within the policy section have some interest and where we have to show some leadership and come up with some solutions.

Mr. Deans: Just for clarification, because it is interesting to me, is the crime rate going up, and have you decided whether or not it is because of longer sentences? Is it, in fact, resulting in a policy which will change the structure of the judicial system?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No.

Mr. Deans: Have you looked at the very things you have raised—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Deans: —and have you come to any conclusions? I suppose that is what we are trying to find out—whether, in the course of the time you have been in the job, you have come to any conclusions in regard to:

(a) the sentencing, and whether or not it is appropriate;

(b) the institutions, and whether they are able to do their job and whether they are doing it; and

(c) whether or not we are turning out people at the other end who have, in fact, had an opportunity to be rehabilitated and have taken advantage of the opportunity.

Have you done that kind of a study? It seems rather elementary.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is elementary. We haven't done a formal study, as outlined by the hon. member. As I say, again you are being too literal. You are taking an example and asking for information of the example.

Mr. Deans: That's what I am saying. These are examples you gave.

Mr. Cassidy: It was an example the minister gave, and we haven't found out after two days.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: All right.

Now this is again all part of the whole area. We have information. We have information on sentencing in Ontario. We have information on the rate of recidivism. We have the whole area of rehabilitation under study.

Now in some areas, for example, street crimes where victims are involved and the rate is going up, we are concerned that sentencing hasn't been consistent. There is too much difference in the sentencing for the same crime in certain parts of the province.

We are concerned about the whole area of parole and bail, and we think this is necessarily directly related with the crime rate.

On the question of juvenile crime, we are wondering if, for example, our aftercare is sufficient; whether or not the type of parole and care that young people have after they leave one of our trade schools, for example, is sufficient or should we move more and more into group homes and this type of thing.

Mr. Cassidy: Well what do you think?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: These are things we are considering. And we are considering these in light of statistics and research information that we commission outside, and information we can gather ourselves in the secretariat.

Mrs. Campbell: Could I ask a question following that?

Mr. Chairman: On this point? All right!

Mrs. Campbell: Is the secretary beginning now to deal in a qualitative analysis of justice rather than the quantitative, merchandising type of justice analysis that has gone on in this government?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would say yes.

Mrs. Campbell: Good!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, I have to associate myself with a few of the remarks

the member for Riverdale made with regard to checkerboarding and land division and the Planning Act. But I also want to emphasize that I was not happy with the decision that was made by the courts on the stated 10 questions, because quite frankly I was very much disturbed when I saw the court interpretation in relation to this Legislature's intent. It seems to me that what was set up here was a very rare situation for a British parliamentary system, and much more to the intent and method of a congressional system in the republican form of government. When one saw the court interpretation, it was somewhat different than what the Legislature had in intent on any basic law.

It seemed to me that this was quite a difference and one that our cabinet should have immediately done certain things about. We have only a few members in this House who are affected to any great extent by this checkerboarding. There are a few minor cases involving a few members, but there are three or four here who are very basically involved with several hundred titles.

It seems to me also that this whole matter and the discussion that has been taken place with the policy secretary is one that should have been dealt with by the ministry responsible for the Planning Act. And further, much as I agree with the member for St. George in this regard, much of the discussion here tonight should have been undertaken under the estimates of the various ministries rather than with this minister, because really it hasn't been policy, it has been matters of money and estimates. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There is one thing I think that I do have a responsibility to bring to the attention of the Justice secretary, and it's as a result of a dialogue I got into with the judiciary in Thunder Bay, as well as many people who are in the legal field in Thunder Bay. There has been considerable dialogue here, and in this Legislature, about the abolition of grand juries across the province. As a matter of fact I think one of the grand juries sitting around Metropolitan Toronto has asked that they be legislated out of business.

The legal fraternity in Thunder Bay feel very strongly that the grand jury system should be continued. They give two reasons for it, and they have asked me to quote from remarks that were made by Justice Holland, who was appointed just a short time ago.

In addressing the grand jury and calling the roll, he went back into the historical background for setting up grand juries. He went back even before the Norman conquest. He drew their attention to the fact that he was bringing Queen's justice to the area, and he told them that no one should be put through a trial unless there is some case against them. He said it was their job to decide whether or not there is sufficient evidence to warrant a person going on trial.

The legal people in northwestern Ontario feel very strongly that there is a need for the continuation of that kind of scrutiny.

In addition to that, he said that a most important function of the grand jury is the inspection of public institutions. The people in northwestern Ontario feel very strongly that you need a body that will go around and inspect these institutions, whether they be the jails or whether they be institutions where people are held for rehabilitation purposes. He felt, and the judiciary and the legal fraternity of northwestern Ontario, felt, that this was something that was worthwhile continuing.

He says:

> I have the power to deal with any man in that jail, and if there is something wrong, let me know. This is a most important duty.

Mr. Justice Holland told jurors to question inmates of the jails in the absence of officials in case they might be afraid to answer honestly while being supervised.

He went on to say:

> You must also inspect the building, the facilities and food—look for fire escapes, for example—and report to me. Grand jurors will be provided with lists of all the public institutions in the Thunder Bay district and the last date on which they were examined.

The judge advised them particularly to inspect homes for the aged.

Mr. Justice Holland expressed his regret in hearing talk about doing away with the grand jury, and he said it would be a sad thing as they can do a lot of good, especially in regard to public institutions.

So on their behalf, and on behalf of all citizens in northwestern Ontario, I would like to ask the minister for the Justice policy field to assure the people that, at least in northwestern Ontario, the grand jury system will continue; and hopefully those to whom they are reporting will be much more responsive to the recommendation they are making for improvement in the judiciary system and the

rehabilitation system in that part of the province.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I might just very briefly say that the public review committee, which will replace the grand jury, will in fact inspect all public buildings in the same way as the grand jury has been doing. The main reason that McRuer recommended this change be made was that the grand jury really had a dual function. As well as inspecting buildings and commenting on those, it also reviewed bills of indictment. This will not be taken on by the public review commission; this will be done by way of preliminary hearing, or there may be an amendment to the Code to, in some way, fill this vacuum.

Mr. Stokes: Pardon me, just for clarification on the function of reviewing bills of indictment: How do you propose specifically to fill the role that was formerly—or is presently—being filled by the grand jury? Have you consulted with the legal fraternity in all areas of the province to see what is their opinion? They are closer to it than any of us, much closer even than you people are sitting down here.

The legal fraternity up there felt that it fills a very badly needed role and does it quite adequately. I wonder why you would seek to change something which in their opinion works so very well. Just because McRuer suggests it, it doesn't necessarily mean that it is valid for all parts of the province.

They felt very strongly about it when I spoke to them and they said I had the authority to speak for all the legal people in northwestern Ontario. That was their feeling and they felt very strongly about it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: All I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that I think in time the fraternity in Thunder Bay will accept a new change.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre. Is your question on the grand jury?

Mr. Cassidy: No, it isn't.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville has something on the same question.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): I wanted to ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, what disposition is made of the recommendations of the grand jury?

I am specifically referring to my own local area where the grand jury has been meeting, and has submitted reports one year ago, in January of this year and again in April of this year, recommending or suggesting that facilities were not adequate as far as the administration of justice was concerned in the community; that there was need for a floor to be added to the present county courthouse; and likewise that the amount of funds or the moneys paid to jurors was absolutely not in keeping with the cost of living today.

I brought to the attention of the Attorney General the case of a fellow who had been on welfare, got off welfare and worked as a barkeep in a hotel. Because he was called to grand jury he was only paid $10 a day—he lost $19 a day—and on $10 a day he could not get by at all. All you were really doing was forcing him back on welfare by not providing him with sufficient funds to be able to get by. The $10 a day certainly was completely out of tune with the times.

It was absolutely inadequate. In a case such as I mentioned—of the fellow by the name of Bob Bailey, in which it was a real hardship to the individual—there should be some accommodation made or some discretion given to the court in the city to compensate the individual so that you would keep him off welfare.

I am particularly interested in your reply to what is going to happen to the county courthouse. Are you going to provide additional facilities by adding another floor?

You are the policy minister so I would assume that any decision would eventually have to be made by you rather than by the Attorney General. Does the Attorney General mean that he will be making the decision rather than the policy minister as to the need for facilities? Is that what he is telling me by nodding?

I will ask the policy minister at this time concerning the two issues that I raised—the need for additional facilities and the pay to jurors.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As the Attorney General's nod indicated, this really is something that will be decided within his particular budget provisions.

Mr. Lawlor: That is one of the reasons you are going to abolish them, though; They are a thorn in your side.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is true that grand juries year after year bring down reports indicating that the facilities are archaic and they need to be replaced. If we tried to comply with every request of every grand jury, we would outspend even the Minister of Health (Mr.

Potter), I am sure. As you know, it was just a few years ago that the province took over these facilities and the administration of justice in that area, and all of a sudden we had to replace a number of old courthouses.

All I can say is that it must be done within whatever budgetary restrictions we might have. I think it is fair to say that when we do have reports from grand juries we do what we can to at least renovate and make sure the building is safe, that it can be used and that there are proper facilities for jurors and witnesses and the personnel involved in conducting hearings, as well as sheriff's staff and other personnel.

As far as jurors' fees are concerned, I am sure the Attorney General will agree with me that they need revamping. The fees are too low, and I give him credit, he has recommended an increase in fees, and I anticipate that there will be an increase in jurors' fees.

I would just like to make this one comment though, there is a certain social responsibility for all of us, even those of us with exemptions, to make some sacrifice in respect of the administration of justice. I don't think it should be as great as it is now as far as jurors' fees are concerned, but there is this obligation on people to serve on juries and help facilitate court hearings and the administration of justice. Having said that, I hope that there will be an increase in jurors' fees.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I do accept the fact that there is a responsibility on the citizen, but when the citizen is being deprived of an opportunity of a livelihood and is being forced on welfare, and when he does have difficulty with the welfare system, then what are you doing to him? You are really penalizing him. I think you have got to fairly well judge each case on its merits.

Mr. Minister, you did mention that the recommendations of the grand jury always depend on the financial resources of the department or the government. That is true. But when you listen to a recommendation such as this, concerning the provincial jail—to improve the recreational facilities, that is exercise, and hardtop the recreation area; the existing area is probably sand—there isn't much in the way of funds required to come along and implement such a recommendation. Another is, if it is not possible to leave the individual's cell doors open during the day, more seating facilities should be made available in the cell block. These don't involve a lot of money, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, those are fitting questions to be asked of the minister responsible.

Mr. B. Newman: So I ask the minister in all sincerity to look at the recommendations of the grand jury very seriously and implement at least those that are not involving large expenditures of funds, and implement them as soon as you possibly can.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Those are more fitting to be under the estimates of the Minister of Correctional Services than they are to this minister.

Mr. B. Newman: All right, I will ask exactly the same thing under Correctional Services. I wanted to conclude with the minister here and tell him to—

Mr. Chairman: You have my permission.

Mr. B. Newman: —to at least take into consideration the recommendations that I put forth in this House.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the minister, if you will, in broad questions of social philosophy about social justice, in which I hope he would feel engaged as the policy minister, the Provincial Secretary for Justice. Before I go into that I would just like to say a word.

I wasn't fortunate enough to be in the House here on Friday, but I did read the debate and thought that after some of the comments there the minister might have tried to show a better face to the House tonight and during the course of these estimates. But in fact, as he was seeking to justify what he did to the members on this side of the Legislature and to the hon. member for St. George, he writhed and entangled himself in his own machinery, with policy committees and delegations and this sort of thing. You can see the diagram of it all happening with nothing coming out, and that really worries me.

I thought that the minister might have taken some guidance from what the House was saying to him on Friday and might have been able to tell us. But in fact, any time he came close to brushing with specifics and he was asked about specifics from this side of the House he said, "Oh no, that is just an

example." And he has not yet, Mr. Chairman, introduced a specific policy recommendation or a specific kind of study which will guide the ministry or the various ministries in this policy field arising out of the activities of his super ministry.

If he wants guidance on how to spend $350,000 well, in fact, a single $7,000 or $8,000 employee in one or two of the departments of government spends, or is responsible for spending, that much money in a year—and we don't need a $40,000 minister. So I came in fairly charitably disposed, but I'm not so sure right now.

I rather tend to think that the leader of my party (Mr. Lewis) is perfectly right; that $1, if the minister was really prepared to work for that, would be about what his product in the job has been worth. Perhaps he will take this debate to heart and, since the Premier hasn't yet shown any disposition to get rid of the policy secretariat, begin to show us some value for the money that we are spending.

Mr. Foulds: The minister has lost heart since he was demoted from the Ministry of the Environment.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member does know that the motion was made to vote 1101?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I realize that.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment was made to vote 1101.

Mr. Cassidy: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Chairman: Not in the statutory amount.

Mr. Cassidy: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment was made to vote 1101, not to the statutory amount of the minister's salary.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh! In other words he would be paid to administer $1 worth of expenditure, rather than $358,000?

Mr. Chairman: No. I just wanted to make sure the member understood that the amendment that was made was for the $343,000, not the $15,000.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, I did read the debate carefully. I'm sorry that we didn't include a reduction in the minister's salary, but I suppose that's a tribute to the work that he has done in previous ministries in the past. It is the sort of charitable kind of favour one shows to a long-standing employee of whom one hopes better in the future on the basis of the record in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister about the question of landlord and tenant law and landlord and tenant law reform. It's a field which unfortunately he did not mention on Friday in outlining some of the areas in which he was engaged in and thinking about as policy minister.

I'm directing these questions to him because they are a matter of social justice, or social philosophy, and because of the inadequate replies of other ministers of the government in the past. In other words, I'm going as near to the top as seems appropriate.

I'd like to ask him, in fact, whether he has given any consideration to the imbalance of rights or of power which currently exist in this province between tenants on the one hand and landlords on the other.

Mr. Chairman, the minister said that he listens to deputations. I don't know if the thought ever crossed his mind, but he might have wondered at some point why he doesn't see deputations of tenants. There is a good reason for that. And that is that the powerlessness of tenants in urban areas of Ontario today has put them in a position where most tenants are deathly afraid of getting together and organizing to a point where they bring a deputation to your superministry, or to some other ministry in the Justice field; because the moment they show that kind of activity they are liable to be victimized, evicted or otherwise mistreated by their landlords. And they have literally no right of redress under Ontario law.

In fact, the only tenants who are organized are tenants in Ontario Housing Corp. housing; and they do enjoy a certain security of tenure and some protection from this Legislature in their discussions with the OHC.

It's now about 3½ years, Mr. Chairman, since the Landlord and Tenant Act amendment which came into force in 1970 passed through this Legislature; and the minister is probably aware just how ineffective those Landlord and Tenant Act amendments have been.

In Ottawa, as in other parts of the province, the tribunals which were to be set up under that Act in order to mediate disputes between landlord and tenants have proven to be totally ineffective. They've proven to be ineffective because they didn't have any teeth.

In Ottawa the tribunal functioned for a

few months. It heard a few cases; it worried about its liability in case of suits and that kind of thing. It ultimately heard no more than about three or four cases. In those cases the landlords generally refused to appear. I think its track record was one, and one only, case successfully resolved.

The members of the landlord and tenant tribunal resigned in disgust because of their ineffectiveness—the fact they felt they could do no good. All that has arisen from the Act in the Ottawa area has been as follows: There is now one employee who was responsible for giving information to landlords—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member now is talking about an operating ministry—

Mr. Cassidy: Pardon?

Mr. Chairman: You are now talking about an operating ministry. His responsibility—

Mr. Cassidy: No, I'm not, Mr. Chairman. I'm talking about the results of the social philosophy of this government.

Mr. Chairman: But you had been talking about the operation and administration of a particular Act.

Mr. Cassidy: No, this is not even operated under provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but you had been talking—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): It is pretty obvious to us.

Mr. Cassidy: This is a provincial Act, which is the responsibility of the policy minister and his field ministers.

Mr. Chairman: It isn't his responsibility. He is responsible for policy, not for the actual operation or administration of the Act—

Mr. Cassidy: I'm suggesting that the policy of the minister has proved ineffective and—

Mr. Chairman: —that is the responsibility of the Attorney General and much more fittingly should be discussed under his estimates.

Mr. Cassidy: All right, I'll talk in a more general vein, Mr. Chairman. As I suggested, the tribunals have failed. I'm sure the minister is aware of that; I don't need to go into it any more. I'll mention briefly another aspect: The courts, in administering the Act, have proved themselves biased against tenants. The problems landlords had in getting recourse to the Act have generally been resolved. The problems the tenants have had have not been resolved.

In another area in which the minister has general policy responsibility there has been no action and no changes; that is, the attitude of the police toward disputes involving landlords and tenants. The police have taken the view that these are civil matters and they have permitted evictions to take place. They have not interfered with what amounts to assaults by landlords under the Act. They have washed their hands and told tenants to seek civil recourse at a time when brute force was being used upon them through evictions on to the street, with the consequent disruptive effects on them and their families. The police have simply not interfered, and there has been no policy direction from the minister.

Mr. Foulds: It's all the fault of the member for Timiskaming, who isn't here.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, in the field of labour legislation, which is not under this ministry, there has been an effort to try to regulate the power and responsibilities of the two parties involved, labour and management. In industries which are organized there is a certain balance—the right to strike and the right to lock out; the right of workers to organize and certain rights which are left with management, known as management rights. In the area of unorganized labour, Mr. Chairman, the government has stepped in to ensure certain minimal rights to workers —hours of work, minimum wage, paid holidays and that kind of thing. In other words, there's been an attempt, however faulty, to bring in economic justice for people in the work place.

What I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, is whether the minister is prepared to ensure social and economic justice for tenants in their dwelling place or whether the Ontario government intends to simply leave the current laissez-faire, free-market situation as it's called, which is having intolerable effects on tenants in Ottawa, Toronto and any other major urban place here in the Province of Ontario.

The government approach up until now has been that landlords and tenant should simply reason together. It is an approach which is becoming increasingly out of step with the approach being taken to landlord-tenant problems in other jurisdictions—Nova Scotia, Quebec, Manitoba, Massachusetts, New York and, in fact, the entire United States under the American President's doctrines, as well as European countries.

Ontario is out of step, and the result is that tenants don't have any rights. I'm asking whether the superminister would consider giving tenants some essential rights to correct the imbalance of power that they suffer from right now—their inability to fight against evictions, arbitrary rent increases, refusals to repair, illegal entry, changing of locks, inadequate heat, refusal to obey municipal by-laws on the part of landlords.

I'm asking whether the minister will redress the imbalance of power so that tenants can approach landlords as equals and not in the unequal position that they are in right now. I don't even want to give examples. I've given examples in Throne Speeches debates and in other places, and many other members on this side of the House have given example after example after example of the kinds of problems that tenants suffer.

But I'm asking whether the government can climb off the heartless kind of policy which it has right now, which is that half of the population of the province are homeowners and therefore their interests should be protected; and the other half of the province are tenants and all we will do is civilize our relationship, which is basically that of the jungle, by ensuring that when they are evicted it will be at the end of a lease or with one month's notice.

I would like to ask the minister specifically what changes he has been studying in the landlord-tenant area. I'd like to know specifically whether he will consider granting a security of tenure for tenants, in order to give them the kind of equality of rights in approaching their landlord that they do not now enjoy; whether he will consider permitting evictions only by order either of the courts or of a landlord-tenant tribunal which I would hope he would set up; and whether he will consider that evictions should be allowed only for certain specific reasons such as abuse of the property, over-crowding, non-payment of rent, uses which are immoral, or possibly a requirement by the landlord to occupy the premises either for himself or for very near relatives.

These are not radical ideas imported from Europe or some place like that, Mr. Chairman. In fact, these have been the principles which have governed landlord-tenant legislation in the Province of Quebec for the last 20-odd years under governments just as conservative as the one we have opposite.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister can answer those questions and maybe one or two that follow.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Go ahead.

Mr. Cassidy: No, I'd like to see some response from the secretary.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Put them all on.

Mr. Chairman: If the minister does not want to give the answers now, the member should go ahead and ask any other questions. He'll sum them all up at the end.

Mr. Cassidy: No. My questions are all to do with landlord-and-tenant laws. If I have any subsequent questions they would be dealing with another subject.

Mr. Chairman: Have you got some other questions?

Mr. Deans: That's not the way the estimates are normally conducted. A member asks a question and he gets an answer.

Mr. Chairman: The minister has the right—

Mr. Deans: No.

Mr. Chairman: The minister has the right to decide whether he wants to answer or he doesn't want to. And he doesn't want to; he wants to hear all the questions.

Mr. Deans: The general custom in the Legislature in dealing with the estimates is that members have engaged in a question-and-answer period in which they asked a question and the minister answered, and they were not obligated to put all their questions at one time.

Mr. Lawlor: Have you done the estimates before, Bill?

Mr. Deans: This is the way—

Mr. Chairman: Neither is the minister obligated to answer any question.

Mr. Foulds: He hasn't for two days, why should he start now?

Mr. Deans: In fact, I think you are wrong. In the estimates the minister is, in fact, obligated to answer questions.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Mr. Deans: The purpose of the estimates is so that the minister can be questioned about the expenditures. It is his obligation to answer the questions as they are asked, or to prove to us that he doesn't know the answer, which may well be the case.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): You know that's not true.

Mr. Deans: That has been the custom over the last five years.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, in order to save time and silly childish bickering—

Mr. Deans: Answer the questions, then.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —I'll deal with the points raised by the last speaker. As the hon. member knows, there were substantial amendments and changes in the landlord-and-tenant legislation in the Act of 1968. This was as a result of recommendations from the Law Reform Commission. That Act pretty well, in our opinion at that time, was in fact a bill of rights for tenants. Since that time there have been at least two amendments that I am aware of, indicating that the Act is continuously being reviewed and continously being updated.

Mr. Lawlor: It is detrimental to the tenant.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I felt, and I think this House felt, that the Act in 1968, certainly when it was brought in, was fair.

Mr. Lawlor: It was an excellent Act.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There was an equal balance between the landlord and the tenant. It was felt this would be conducive to some type of harmony in the whole area of leased premises.

I think the hon. member made a good point when he indicated that these tribunals or advisory bureaus that were set up, I believe at the municipal level, haven't been all that successful. I will admit that I think in some ways there has been some misconception of the role of the advisory bureau. There has been the conception that it is in fact some sort of a tribunal which has the powers to make decisions, vis-à-vis a landlord and a tenant. In fact, it is what it says it is —an advisory bureau. It isn't in a position to override the contractual relations between a landlord and tenant and it just attempts to—

Mr. Cassidy: And therefore it can't get them out?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That's right. It tries to iron out the differences of opinion which have developed between a landlord and tenant.

As you know, over time a certain amount of bitterness will develop. If a landlord feels that a tenant is destructive—that is, his children in some way are destructive—if he is annoying other tenants in the building; if there are complaints; if there is an attitude that he will reluctantly pay his rent on the first day of the month when it is due and there is a pattern of late payment, you can see a certain feeling developing between the landlord and tenant. This takes place. It's hard to legislate human relations that develop in situations like that.

I think, for example, of one of the remedies that we talked about in 1968 which, possibly, should have been brought into effect or, at least, had more thought given to it. That is the idea of a uniform type of lease instead of having leases which are drawn up pretty well on an individual basis, in which terms will differ from community to community depending on the type of premises or whoever the landlord may be, and in which the small print is too small. That is where the balance is in favour of the landlord.

It takes a Philadelphia lawyer really to understand all the terms of a lease and certainly the conditions and regulations which are set out in these small stationery store forms.

Mr. Foulds: How about a Burlington lawyer?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: These are areas which I think we should continue to move into. It worries me when the hon. member makes the broad blanket statement that courts are biased against tenants. I don't think you can make that statement.

Mr. Deans: People are afraid to go to court.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There may be a problem with a certain judge or a certain court in Ottawa which may not be a problem in Toronto or Hamilton or Windsor.

Mr. Cassidy: It is a consistent pattern—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think the courts are attempting to interpret a contractual relation between a landlord and tenant, at the same time trying to apply the facts that exist in respect of the terms of that contract.

I am concerned about the fact that people overhold and don't realize it. They have a lease, it expires; the landlord sometimes knows that and likes the situation better when he has a monthly tenant instead of somebody who has a particular contract, knowing that it may be easier to get rid of that tenant by way of 30-day notice.

These things concern me. I think there is a certain obligation on the tenant to know his rights. At the same time, I think there is some onus on the landlord to say, "Now our contractual relationship has been terminated we should enter into another one." The question of whether or not there should be automatic renewal depends a great deal, I think, on the relationship or the history of that tenant.

As I say, if he is somebody who has been a problem in the building, as far as other tenants are concerned—he hasn't necessarily been in breach of some provision of the lease —but if he has been a continuous problem in the building, therefore affecting the other units in the building which may be vacant because of the situation; he may be a tenant who has, as I say, no respect for the property of others, there should be some right left with the landlord to make a decision on whether or not he wants to renew that lease.

Now it may be that this is the type of thing that should be considered by a tribunal —where there should be one, as the hon. member indicated, as in the field of labour. You know, this still is a question of a private relationship; we're still dealing with private property.

If the landlord in this province is encumbered and inhibited by all kinds of government regulations—over and above our basic concept of what should be the landlord and tenant relation—you just won't get landlords and you won't get the type of accommodation that is required so urgently in this province.

Mr. Deans: Speak to your friend, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman).

Mr. Cassidy: The minister says we are still dealing with private property, and I think he reflects the problems that the government suffers from, which is that it just doesn't move in the same kind of circles that members from this side move in, who have day-to-day contact with tenants and with the kind of problems that they have.

You are dealing with people's lives, Mr. Minister, and not just private property. If you are concerned about leaving the contractional relationship between equal partners, that is between commercial landlords and commercial tenants, or industrial landlords and industrial tenants in the free-market system, so be it. Both parties on that side have got legal advice; they have relatively equal strength, equal talents and equal profit interests. But in the case of private tenants—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: The anti-labour rump again!

Mr. Cassidy: It really is. The rump, Mr. Chairman, keeps on protesting because they too feel that private property is more important than people's lives. The minister says, for example, that the advisory tribunals, or advisory committees, were needed in order to intervene in a case where the tenant was being a bit late with the rent—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Stokes: The Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow) shouldn't be speaking at all; he is not in his seat. You can only speak from your own seat.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: —when the tenant was paying the rent quite on time or the landlord wasn't—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: —and that somehow sweet light and reason would prevail through this being taken before the landlord and tenant advisory tribunal.

Mr. Chairman, what happened just this month in my riding, when a tenant sought some action from a landlord and complained to a government body is that that tenant got evicted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister talks with some sympathy.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You need a court order to get evicted.

Mr. Cassidy: What? No.

An hon. member: Sure you do!

Mr. Cassidy: You do not have to get a court order to get evicted; and I think it's a shocking fact that the minister did not know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes you do.

Mr. Cassidy: If the tenant resists, you need a court order to evict. However the eviction notice can be given and the tenant must be out at the end of the month.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: An eviction notice given by whom?

Mr. Cassidy: By the landlord. All it needs is 30 days' notice.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That's a normal expiration of a lease.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. Okay. Many people in this province—if the minister wasn't aware of it—still live on monthly tenancy. The court order is required, Mr. Chairman, in order to enforce an eviction; the tenant however has virtually no redress or recourse against the court hearing in order to prove that he should not be evicted, because there were no grounds in the Act.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Oh, baloney!

Mr. Cassidy: The only grounds in the Act are where a tenant has raised this particular complaint to a governmental authority where there had been a landlord and tenant dispute, and I know of no cases—unless the minister could bring out some examples—where that has been successful and where the tenant in future had quiet enjoyment of the property.

In the case which I have before me, the family in Ottawa, I think they probably have a case which a fair court might grant to them; it might refuse the eviction order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: But the courts aren't fair—is that what you are saying?

Mr. Cassidy: Not in our experience in my riding, Mr. Chairman. The courts are not fair. However, that tenant faces the risk, if he loses, of getting evicted on to the street the next day by the courts. He doesn't know what is going to happen. In the meantime, his own personal life is disrupted. All the landlord faces is the risk of losing one or two months' rent. And if he has several properties, then it's not really a harm to him.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the minister that he is quite right in saying that when a tenant is disruptive in the building and is causing disorder, or isn't paying his rent, or in other ways is not living up to his obligations, then the landlord should have the right to be quit of that tenant; I thoroughly agree with the minister. But I ask him, in view of that rather sensitive statement of his, why is it that he is not willing to protect the 90, 95 or 98 per cent of tenants who, in fact, live up to those obligations? Why does he leave the doors wide open to landlords to evict or otherwise victimize their tenants in order to protect that right that he feels a landlord should have to evict in cases where tenants are being disruptive or are being seriously behind in their rent or whatever the particular thing happens to be? Landlords do throw people out, as the member for Lakeshore has commented, and it happens with 30 days' notice. Well, what good is that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Cassidy: Call the new leader of the rump to order will you, Mr. Chairman?

I would like to point out, too, to the minister that another power that landlords have which can have an equally disruptive effect on tenants is the power to arbitrarily raise rents to a level which a tenant cannot afford. I have had a number of instances of rent increases of $30 and $40 in my riding in recent months. The other day I had one of a 50 per cent increase, from $230 a month to $350 a month for an ordinary three-bedroom house occupied by a university teacher and a young son.

Mr. Lawlor: They might have charged more!

Mr. Cassidy: That is right, why not more?

Mr. Chairman, that rent increase has the effect of an eviction. It is an economic means of forcing a tenant out; and it is used again and again and again. It is used for speculative purposes and it is thoroughly unjustifiable, as far as the view of this party is concerned.

As far as we are concerned, it is part of the tenant's rights. A tenant should have the right of redress, the right to go and appeal what he considers to be an unjustifiable increase in rent. While he should negotiate it with the landlord, he should be able to take it to a landlord and tenant tribunal. That in no way interferes with the landlord's right, as the minister mentioned, to get rid of somebody who it can be demonstrated is hurting the property or who is not keeping up with the rent payments or who is using the place for immoral purposes or putting 22 people in a house meant for five.

Mr. Lawlor: He should be made to show cause.

Mr. Cassidy: That is right. He should be made to show cause, just as he should be made to show cause for any arbitrary kind of increase in rent.

I would just like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by talking about the concept of tenants getting together. When workers get together to form a union, there is a certain protection in the law which protects them against being fired for being engaged in union activity.

That doesn't exist in the case of tenants. In this age of large corporate landlords, developers, and people like that, you have developers or landlords who deal with hundreds and even thousands of tenants and are dealing with tenants as individuals.

The minister is sufficiently familiar with labour legislation to know that it doesn't work there, and I am sure he can draw the parallel, nor does it work in the case of landlord-tenant relations. It is obvious that tenants are weak and landlords are strong so long as tenants have to deal with the landlord as individuals. So long as they face a lease expiring at the end of the week or the end of the year they cannot risk being seen to be in a leadership position, organizing a tenants' union and seeking to have bargaining with the landlord.

We happen to feel that one of the alternatives open to tenants should be the power to get together to form a workable tenants' association, an association to be able to talk with landlords where there are common grievances, whether it is about common areas badly maintained or a laundry room out of kilter, the heat out of whack, or to talk about rent. If tenants wish, they should be able to bargain collectively with their landlords. In many cases, it won't come to that, Mr. Chairman. However, that range of options ought to be open.

The kind of power relationships that exist between landlords and tenants have to be equalized for that to occur. In order for that to occur, that means that the tenants must be protected against arbitrary rent increases that can't be justified on the basis of cost. It means the tenants must have the kind of security that the minister and I apparently both agree about, that is, a security which can be broken only by showing cause, by court order or tribunal order. The cause would be such things as refusal to pay rent or immoral activities or destruction of the property. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, maybe the minister and I are more on a common wavelength than I thought on entering this debate but I may have talked myself into that position and I would appreciate his reply.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, on the same point very briefly indeed; you are aware that British Columbia, of recent date, in order to give security of tenure, has made it obligatory that for 12-month periods at a time, written into leases, are no rent increases but all other grounds subsist for getting rid of an obnoxious tenant. The device of increasing the rent exorbitantly to drive a tenant out is not allowed in that particular jurisdiction. It's been true for the whole time in Quebec. In terms of straight equity, in terms of the policy of the ministry I would ask you to give some consideration to that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the last point of course, if people enter into a lease—

Mr. Lawlor: Well, a lease, yes, there would be exceptions.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —you have a security of tenure.

Mr. Deans: There are escalator clauses in the leases which the tenant really doesn't have access to.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I mentioned that the terms of a lease should be fairly clear. Certainly, some of the small print is not clear particularly where it is under the heading of rules and regulations. It's a little too balanced in favour of the landlord. I agree with that.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, they don't give leases any more. Once a lease has expired, they go to a monthly tenancy.

Mr. Deans: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Of course, this is a problem when you have a housing shortage. When you have a shortage of available units that people can afford, the landlord feels he can carry on without a lease.

Mr. Cassidy: We have had that for seven years.

Mr. Lawlor: The most defenceless ought not to bear the brunt.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: At the same time there is a certain advantage to the landlord as well as the tenant to have a lease. Don't forget you have a situation in some areas, particularly where the rent is fairly high, or—I was going to say, furnished, but really in an unfurnished situation—I can imagine all kinds of situations in which an honest, sincere landlord can be—

Mr. Chairman: Could we have some order in the House, to let the minister speak and be heard, please.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —put to some monetary loss and a great deal of inconvenience. If you have people staying in a place who, as I say, are not good tenants or are in arrears of their rents—sometimes they can work it so that they can be as much as three months in

arrears before they can be evicted. This can happen.

Mr. Lawlor: That's pretty hard to do now with your laws.

Mr. Cassidy: It takes 15 days.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, I think if the tenant is that type of person and is willing to scheme to that extent, it can still be done. I'm sure it is still being done.

Mr. Lawlor: Naive landlord.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: At the same time, the whole problem here is to maintain a reasonable balance between the landlord and tenant and try to make sure that the rights of each are clear and reasonable and just.

I think there should be more leases. I think that the leases should be more and more uniform so that the tenant, particularly the one who probably doesn't pay enough attention to the lease, can know what his rights are and what his obligations are under a lease. We have done away with certain things such as security deposits and things like that. I think that was a big step and one that many landlords, of course, objected to, because people could move out without notice, and leave a great deal of damage and there was no recourse.

In this whole area it is important that there be reasonable balance. As I said earlier, we have a relatively new Act with new amendments and I am sure we will be continuously amending that bill to update it; if there are injustices I think they can be corrected.

Now the landlord and tenant advisory bureau is set up mainly to assist tenants. Possibly there should be a little more power than its strictly advisory role. But at the same time, I can't help feeling that a person who rents property, who was able to get a lease, who knows his rights and is prepared to live in that particular dwelling as if it was his own, shouldn't have any trouble with a reasonable honest landlord.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, Mr. Minister!

Mr. Lawlor: I detect a certain naivety there!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville. Would the member for Windsor-Walkerville like to speak in this debate?

Oh okay; the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I just want to talk for a moment about the whole area of a standardized lease form, because it has bothered me for the last six or seven years that in the Province of Ontario there are so many of these stationery store leases around. Most of them contain something called an escalator clause, and this clause permits the landlord to raise rents during the term of the lease in the event of things such as an increase in fuel costs, an increase in taxes or an increase in general maintenance costs of the building.

Now this simply affords many landlords the opportunity, of which they take full advantage, to raise the rent between the starting and termination date of the lease. I have felt for a long time that the Province of Ontario should have something called a standard form of lease; and that standard form of lease should set out the various clauses which are acceptable within this province. And nothing else should be accepted; that should be the standard form for this province, for all rental properties. Then no matter in which building a person lives or to which landlord he may be in servitude, he knows exactly what he has signed and what kind of leeway he has.

An hon. member: Servitude?

Mr. Lawlor: It comes to resemble that!

Mr. Deans: I think the minister fails to recognize some rather basic points about the relationship between the landlord and the tenant.

When the tenant goes down to the washing area to wash his or her clothes and finds that the machines aren't working, there is nothing he can do. He may call the landlord. The landlord will say: "Don't worry, we're going to get it fixed." And you know in that old term, "in the fullness of time," it's repaired.

Or when the tenant goes down and can't get into the parking lot because it hasn't been cleared of snow and he complains to the caretaker. The caretaker says: "Don't worry we're going to get it done." And gradually, the spring comes, the snow disappears. There is no way that tenant can get at that landlord to have the work done.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): It is an exaggeration.

Mr. Deans: It's an exaggeration? You obviously live some place where there are very few apartments.

Mr. Lawlor: He lives where there is no snow.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Or when a tenant finds that the regulation with regard to heat is not being lived up to, and he can prove that he is only getting 66 deg. He still has to take some legal action in order to get the landlord to comply with the law. Now you can imagine—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: You're wrong again, you're always wrong. It's amazing you ever got here. How can someone who's so stupid be in the Legislature?

Isn't it interesting to note—

Mr. Taylor: Who are you addressing?

Mr. Cassidy: All of you.

Mr. Deans: Would you talk to your friends and ask them to go out for a while?

It seems to me the government fails to understand the problem the majority of people have in the province. The majority of people don't like to go to court. And even if they were to go to court with these rather minor breaches of the contract, they would find, in essence, that the court would take so long to deal with them that by the time they got around to it the problem would have either resolved itself or have been resolved.

Mr. Lawlor: It would cost more money than it was worth.

Mr. Deans: And the landlord knows full well that this individual isn't going to take a day off work at the possible loss of $35, more or less, in order to go into court to have him fix a washing machine, or to have him scrape the parking lot, or to have him fix the heat so that he can get enough heat. And this is what's basically wrong with the whole situation.

This tenant should be able to call the advisory bureau, and that advisory bureau should have on its staff people of sufficient knowledge to be able to go to the building, assess whether or not the complaint is legitimate and order that the work be done. The tenant should have the right, on a pro-rated basis, to deduct for every day that whatever it is is not provided, an appropriate amount of rental; so that the landlord knows that if he doesn't provide the things that are set out either in the lease or by understanding of the tenant at the time that he entered into the lease, that he is going to lose not only the rental from that tenant, or the portion of the rental from that tenant, but he is going to lose the portion of the rental from every other tenant in the building who also doesn't have the appropriate amenities provided for him.

This is what you have got to do in the whole area of landlord-tenant relations. You have got to ensure that the landlord in fact does provide the smaller things. It is not a matter of whether the tenant is being evicted. The eviction is obvious and can be dealt with, and the member for Ottawa Centre set it out very nicely. But the problem, frankly, is in providing the comforts that are set out in the lease, or the understanding of lease. It is the providing of the necessities. It is making sure that the littler things that are most difficult to force on the landlord are in fact provided without the tenant having to go through all the process of the law.

I think this is really what we are saying here—that if you had a standard lease first of all, and if you did have an advisory bureau that had the capacity to make investigations and order that certain matters within the lease be complied with, then I don't think we would be faced with nearly as many difficulties.

If you carry it one step further and ensure in the standard lease that there is no provision for increases of rental during the period of the lease; and if you carry it even one step further and guarantee that in a period when the minister himself has stated there is a housing shortage, and when the minister himself has stated landlords are in fact taking advantage of the imbalance in the available number of accommodations over and against the numbers of people who are looking for accommodation, and you institute in the Province of Ontario on a trial basis, in some municipality, some form of rental control, so that in fact any landlord who wants to raise his rent has to prove that the amount of the increase is justified—this is the key to all landlord-tenant relations.

There isn't a tenant anywhere who isn't prepared to pay, or at least to try to pay, an increase in rent if the landlord can justify the increase. If the landlord says, "Look, my taxes have gone up by X numbers of dollars per unit and there it is; my heating costs have gone up by X number of dollars per year and there it is—"

Mr. Renwick: Or, "I've been taxed on energy."

Mr. Deans: Or, "I've been taxed on energy," as my colleague from Riverdale says.

Hopefully, of course, the government will see the error of that and will correct it before this legislation is completed.

Mr. Renwick: They'll be withdrawing that.

Mr. Deans: But if the tenant had the right to question the landlord as to the validity of the increase involved, then I feel that you would find fewer complaints in the area of the landlord and tenant over the matter of rent. I do feel that the tenant doesn't have access to the kind of information that he has to have in order to make a proper judgement.

There is no question when the landlord says, "I am raising your rent $20, because we all know that taxes went up in the municipality last year, and we all know that fuel costs went up, and we all know that hydro costs went up, and we all know that general maintenance went up and therefore $20 is fair," that it is extremely difficult for any tenant, given that he doesn't have access to the books of the landlord, to make a judgement.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Oh, get off it.

Mr. Deans: And what we have happening in the Province of Ontario—I hear the voices from the wilderness—

Mr. Cassidy: The Neanderthals are out again.

Mr. Deans: Well, let me just digress for a moment. I think it would be in the best interests of the government backbenchers to have the cabinet ministers explain to them that the longer they yatter in the background, the longer I am going to talk.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Yes, we know that.

Mr. Deans: That's a simple fact of the way this place operates. The longer you yipper and yapper around in the back, the longer I am going to talk to you about it.

Mr. Taylor: You never say anything worthwhile.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The rump is up tonight.

Mr. Deans: Rumps usually are noisy.

Mr. Taylor: You won't roast this rump.

Mr. Deans: That may be true, but then again there's not much meat on it—most of it's fat. I think what we are really saying is that, in terms of rental increases, since the tenant doesn't have access to the information that is available or should be available, it is impossible for him to make the kind of judgement. The minister can make this as a part of the whole bureau structure that was set up in 1968 or 1969. I'm not sure whether I am still a member or not, because there hasn't been a meeting for so long, but I was a member of the Hamilton landlord-tenant advisory bureau and I can tell you frankly that a more useless organization has rarely ever existed.

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): With you on it I am not surprised.

Mr. Deans: It is interesting to note that in spite of my best efforts, which are obvious to everyone in the House, I have been unable to move that landlord-tenant advisory bureau to do anything other than give simple advice, and generally the advice is, "You'd better see a lawyer because you are going to require one."

I think that this is really what the problem has been. I think you could quickly change the advisory bureau and give it a little more muscle, give it the power to investigate, to order certain functions to be performed. You could make it necessary within the terms of the lease to justify—either at the end of every lease or at the re-signing of every lease—in a statistical way the increases that are being demanded. You could set up a standard lease form that everyone would know is available and is used throughout the Province of Ontario.

You could take a look at rent control in a specific area—for example the area of Ottawa, which came to the private bills committee back in 1968 or 1969 and asked for permission to set up a rental control agency in order that it could deal with unscrupulous landlords in that municipality—and they are not alone. There have been others—and that was denied by this government. It was denied by this government in spite of the fact that the local municipality felt in its wisdom that it was necessary. It was denied by the government, and don't for one minute think that that committee wasn't directed by this government.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right—by the member for Carleton East (Mr. Lawrence).

Mr. Deans: You may sit there, Mr. Minister, and try to convince me otherwise, but I sat on that committee at the time and I can well remember the debate. When a munici-

pality comes and asks for that kind of legislation because there is not an adequate supply of housing, and because the people in the municipality, by their own admission, were being mistreated and taken advantage of by unscrupulous landlords, and the municipal officials felt that it was necessary for them to have this kind of power in order to come to grips with it on a short-term basis, and this government refused to grant that power—and in addition to that, refused to build the necessary numbers of units to relieve the housing shortage—then there is something drastically wrong with the thinking of this government in relation to the power of the landlord and his right to make money over and against the requirements and needs of the average citizen in this province to have decent accommodation.

Now don't forget that when we are talking about landlords in many municipalities we are not talking about some Canadian who is sitting in Canada and doing his bit for the country. We are talking, in many instances, about German money being brought into this country and used for development and speculative purposes. And this, in fact, means that you are working hand in hand to ensure that Canadians who are working every day, earning pitiful wages, are having to pay exorbitant rents, much of which is being taken out of the country to a foreign power. That is one of the basic problems in this province that hasn't been dealt with.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the Minister of Justice doing about it?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Just one brief question, if I could, of the minister, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I understand you told my colleague from Lakeshore that you took one brief trip in December in a government plane. Would you mind telling us where you went?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I believe it was Thunder Bay. I'm not sure, but I believe it was Thunder Bay.

Mr. Shulman: Was that on government business?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: I have an amendment proposed by Mr. Lewis. Sorry—the hon. member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon).

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This reminds me of last weekend. It's nothing but enthusiastic support. You are not really winding up the debate on the amendment that's before us, Mr. Chairman, but since you are starting to fool around with your gavel I thought perhaps I had better say something before the amendment was put.

Mr. Chairman: You want this on the record, do you?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's very appropriate under these circumstances that the amendment is before the House to reduce the expenditure for this particular policy ministry to $1, because there is every indication from the discussion here this evening and also on Friday that we could very well do without the expenditure under this minister's direction, and the government and the province would not suffer.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that a very wide range of debate has been permitted by yourself and your colleagues who have been occupying the chair this evening on almost any subject that might possibly be even remotely associated with Justice policy. As a matter of fact, I thought that perhaps we would be discussing farm prices, because if there is any injustice in the province, it has to do with farmers. We haven't got around to that yet; perhaps we should.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is evident that the concept of this particular superministry—so called—has been a failure. I think it has been a serious mistake on the part of the Premier to downgrade this particular minister as well, who had served so well in other capacities, by putting him into what has amounted to almost a senate appointment, where he has little or nothing to do but sit among his ministers and probably talk about what is in the daily papers and how exciting the question period is these days.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there are matters of grave and growing concern, such as the government policy with regard to the control of organized crime, which was put to the minister tonight. His answer amounted to nothing, as far as I was concerned. Surely this is the time when he should be prepared, if he can't give a ringing statement to the House—pounding the desk as he used to in the days when he was controlling pollution—that at least, if he couldn't do that, he could give us a very well documented point-by-point dissertation on what this government, led by himself in the policy

field, is doing to control the menace of organized crime in this province.

All he did was indicate that he and his ministers were looking for charges and convictions and that they were not interested in a public examination of what the problem is. In that way, he criticized what is being done in the Province of Quebec. I would hope, frankly, that this ministry has somebody sitting in on those hearings for every moment of them, because the information that is revealed there seems to have a considerable impact in the affairs of this province as well.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is growing toward adjournment, but we for our party will certainly support the amendment that is before you, sir, that will reduce the expenditure for this particular ministry to $1. We even think that would be wasted.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: There are two or three other matters which I would like to have the opportunity of raising with the Provincial Secretary for Justice. If it is in order, I would ask that perhaps the House leader would move the committee rise and report.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I suggest we carry on for another half hour, so we can deal with those points.

Mr. Renwick: No.

Mr. Cassidy: No.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Members are eating into other ministries. Time is wasting.

Mr. Stokes: It is our time.

Mr. Deans: We consider the minister's job more important than he does.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Members opposite wasted about half an hour of it in irrelevancies.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs leave to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would like to say the House will continue with the discussion in supply tomorrow.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): What about the budget?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am sorry. We will continue after we have the speaker for the NDP in reply to the budget. There will probably be the same procedure on Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 16, 1973

Estimates, Provincial Secretariat for Justice, Mr. Kerr, continued 1015

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1042

No. 24



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have visitors with us this afternoon: in the west gallery, students from the Waterdown High School in Waterdown. This evening in the west gallery we will have further groups of Boy Scouts from St. Clement's in Toronto, the Toronto Boy Scouts Troop No. 188, and the Scarborough Student Council members.

We also have some special guests in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon. They are six exchange students from India and one from Mexico, who are sponsored by the Rotary Clubs of Lindsay and of Fenelon Falls. We welcome these gentlemen with us this afternoon.

ESTIMATES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I have here a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By his own hand, W. R. Macdonald, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1974, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, April 17, 1973.

WCB OFFICIAL

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. On Friday the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) said—and I am using the Hansard not yet printed:

> Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 3 the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, who unfortunately is not in his seat this morning, in reply to the Speech from the Throne made several remarks about Mr. A. G. MacDonald, executive manager of Workmen's Compensation Board. The tone and context of the remarks have left the impression in Hansard that Mr. MacDonald accepted a bribe.

Mr. Singer: How does Hansard express a tone?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: As the House knows, Mr. Speaker, such action on Mr. MacDonald's part would constitute grounds for a criminal prosecution. The hon. member said and I quote: "He has a $75,000 yacht, he has two lovely homes, he winters in Switzerland, yet he is the man who, on a $30,000 salary, engineered the Fidinam deal."

Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the House that Mr. MacDonald does not own a boat, he has one home, and he has never been to Switzerland or Europe for that matter.

An hon. member: Wrong again!

Mr. Yakabuski: Par for the course with Eddie.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. MacDonald has been with the Workmen's Compensation Board since 1946, and in those 27 years he has been steadily promoted to his present position as executive manager, which is the equivalent of a deputy minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the member coming to his point of privilege?

Mr. Sargent: This is part of the point. Hang on to your seat. It goes on:

> I very greatly regret that the hon. member should make such an attack on Mr. MacDonald, and I feel that the member's actions were cruel and cowardly. The member is well aware that Mr. MacDonald cannot rebut the member's remarks either in the House or in a court of law. I do not expect the member to apologize to the House, neither do I presume that he would have the courage of his convictions to repeat his remarks outside the House.

Mr. Speaker, in the issue of the Compensator, a publication of the Workmen's Compensation Board, of June 11, 1971, on page 7, after a very lengthy, glowing report of the great

qualities of Mr. MacDonald, it goes on to say:

> The gardens of his Willowdale home find themselves a trifle neglected during the warmer months, for on every available weekend Alan MacDonald heads for Lake Simcoe's Cook Bay and the fully equipped, six-berth, Alcan 370 house cruiser, which is based at Keswick. Its twin OMC 155 engines will propel it at 30 miles per hour.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will you get to your point of privilege?

Mr. Sargent: I am getting to the point.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He is saying the minister is wrong.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He is saying the minister is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Sargent: The article says:

> Its twin OMC 155 engines will propel it at 30 miles per hour, space permitting. Last year MacDonald brought his craft through the Trent canal system's 41 locks to Toronto in one weekend. He claims the 300-mile odyssey wore out two crews.

Going back further into the article, it says:

> MacDonald's role is that of a company executive—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): They don't like the truth over there, eh?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I can see nowhere where the member's privileges in this House have been abused. There is no point of privilege at this point in time.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well, what is your point of privilege?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have high regard for the minister personally, but when he accuses me of being cowardly and cruel, I think that is a point where he might apologize. In fact, I point out that he is completely wrong in what he said. If the minister doesn't regard that as a yacht, the people of Ontario do.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That has nothing to do with the member's point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: I think he should apologize for what he has said so far.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is no point of personal privilege that has been abused.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to speak to a point of order, surely, sir, it is your responsibility, when an exchange of this nature takes place in the House, to see that the facts as they are on the record are put forward from any source.

The hon. member, my colleague, has made certain charges which were replied to by the Minister of Labour, under whose responsibility the gentleman under discussion works. He made certain charges against my colleague which were very far-reaching indeed. As a matter of fact, you could call them insulting, but the hon. member, my colleague, is simply calling to your attention, sir, the fact that what he said was at least in large measure completely factual.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. minister.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should like to point out that the explanation given by the hon. member opposite mentions a boat in 1971. We are now in 1973.

Mr. Sargent: That is when the Fidinam deal was made.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has he got a new boat?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No. It is not so much the fact of the boat but the inference that one senior employee at the Workmen's Compensation Board would have done things which are not proper or which would show some misconduct. That is what I didn't like. I can tell the members in this House that I have been tough, I have been hard on the board.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Not tough enough.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I feel it is my responsibility to support people who have served this province for 27 years.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is becoming a debate.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: On what?

Mr. Sargent: I would ask the Chair to let me have two more lines to prove what I am saying here today.

Mr. Speaker: You have shown no point of personal privilege which has been curtailed or abused in any respect.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Before you make your ruling, if I may, we have before us the situation where a minister of the Crown calls a member of this Legislature cowardly as a result of three accusations. You now have the member, in response to that, reading from a periodical published by the board, saying that two years ago the man had a yacht. The response to that by the minister is that he doesn't have a yacht now. Does that justify the allegation of cowardliness?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have heard many charges thrown back and forth across this House, none of which can be substantiated and many of which should not have been said.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Sit down.

Mr. Sargent: Just try and make me sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Many of the things should not be said which are said in this House, in my opinion.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister is a fair man, will he apologize for saying "cowardly," because I don't think I am really.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Oh, yes the member is. Say it outside.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say the member was cowardly. I said his remarks were cruel and cowardly.

Mr. Sargent: Even though the minister was wrong!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Now, I would like to point out that in his statement he also said—

Mr. Sargent: The minister knows he is wrong!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: In his statement the member said that he had a yacht of $75,000, two lovely homes, and he wintered in Switzerland—yet he is the man who, on a $30,000 salary, engineered the Fidinam deal.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, he has proved the minister wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister want me to develop these points? Does he want me to prove it to him?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is getting into a debate, and the Speaker cannot rule on the accuracy of these remarks.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That was probably the first legitimate point of privilege.

TASK FORCE HYDRO

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, the first two reports of Task Force Hydro have been released. The first dealt with Hydro in Ontario, "A Future Role and Place". The second was "An Approach to Organization".

Today I would like to present to the House the third report, dealing with "Nuclear Power in Ontario". This report was prepared by a five-man team of consultants in collaboration with a broad cross-section of Hydro executives and the Advisory Committee on Energy.

My purpose in presenting the report is to inform all the members of this House of the results of their study.

This report reviews and evaluates Ontario Hydro's decision in the late 1950s to proceed with the Canadian heavy water series of reactors known as CANDU.

What action will be taken by the government will be determined only after careful consideration has been made of the recommendations, and I can assure the hon. members that they will be given our immediate attention.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development:

Has he cleared up the confusion that was evident in his statement in the House on

April 10 pertaining to the availability of troops to assist in sandbagging certain areas of the Great Lakes where the danger from flooding has been bad and may get worse? Is he aware that, according to statements made recently, the troops are definitely available on the call of this ministry and that it would not be totally at the cost of the ministry, according to the information that is now publicly available?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any confusion except in the minds of some of the media, particularly in the Windsor area. As recently as last night, I have had discussions with the hon. Jack Davis; and certainly he is not confused. The troops have been available from the very beginning—no one has ever quarrelled with the fact that they were available—and they include engineers, of course, ordinary members of the services.

However, from the very beginning it's been quite clear that the formula available to the Province of Ontario was one that placed virtually the total burden of cost on this province on the basis of factors and formulae, which I've made available to anyone who'd like to see copies. In addition, the question of cost was one which neither the federal government nor our own people had the experience or the knowledge to equate. In other words, it was totally open-ended and could run into millions for services that we couldn't assess.

I may say that it had been hoped that the federal government, at today's cabinet meeting, would come forward with a more useful, more reasonable proposal. If not, I understand they're meeting on Thursday, and again we may hope for some proposals. But the question is not one of availability; the question is one of a total blank cheque as to the costs to this province for calling in the troops themselves.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister not agree that his comments were misleading when he said the total costs of the use of the troops would have to be carried by the province, when it is generally understood that only special costs would be the responsibility of the provincial Treasury —that is, the cost of the sandbags, the cost of transporting the troops involved—and that the salaries and the other costs associated with the troops would, as usual, be carried by the government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: That is simply not so, Mr. Speaker. If the Leader of the Opposition would look at the schedule—and I can get a copy for him—as a matter of interpretation, we come under what can be seen as the second column, and in that case, the province would pay everything, 100 per cent. It is debatable whether we might or might not come under column 1; in that case there would be only minor disbursements picked up by the federal government, with us paying the cost of rations, food, laundry, wear and tear,, transportation, salaries, out-of-pocket expenses, and housing. I may say, Mr. Speaker, one of the most intriguing things is that there is a 10 per cent gratuity which we pay on top of all those expenses.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Incredible!

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): By the opposition's wonderful federal friends! Don't apologize for them.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: So that there will be no more confusion about this—there is no confusion in the mind of the hon. Jack Davis —I hope, as I mentioned earlier, that either today or on Thursday, we will be presented with some formula that is rational and acceptable to us.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the minister prepared, if the menace of the high waters on the Great Lakes system and elsewhere continues and grows, to get the assistance of these men on the scene without worrying about the cost of laundry and gratuities? Would the minister not agree that it is time it is worked out, whoever is to blame, so that we can get the services of these people, as we obviously need them?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, of course, if the question of danger to life and limb were to arise, it would be the immediate responsibility of me and this government to call in the troops. As members know, the troops in London are only a few hours or an hour away and the troops in Petawawa, I am told, can be at the scene in under 24 hours. Absolutely, if there is danger to life and limb, they will be called upon without regard to cost.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that the borough of Etobicoke is supplying sandbags

and, to some great extent, crews to put them in place, on its own initiative and apparently without any assistance from the minister?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, that in dozens or scores of places along the shores of the Great Lakes, municipalities, groups, individuals, and volunteer parties are doing exactly what the member has described.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, is the minister's position in regard to this matter not similar to that of a mayor of a town saying, when the fire department was at a fire, "We can't allow you to go ahead and put out the fire until we know how much water you are going to use"?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: No. I think that's a ridiculous comparison, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the minister if it is not true that the federal government is the one that is holding up the proposal of the province at this time, and that's why we don't have the troops?

Mr. Roy: What does it have to do with that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We will remember the member's place in history.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The minister keeps on making excuses rather than getting some work done.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, may I say that in my dealings over the last number of hours, days and weeks with the hon. Jack Davis, he has been nothing other than open, straightforward, supportive and understanding of our problem.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: More than the minister remembers it.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: He is the person who has to carry this particular problem insofar as the federal government is concerned. He is the person who has developed what is in my opinion—and I am sure will be in the opinion of this House—a workable, sensible formula for the use of the troops. He is the person who assures me that this week, that proposal will be available to the Ontario government. Therefore, I don't want to jeopardize, in any way, the straightforward and working relationship—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Stop right there.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: —between the people of this province who, as taxpayers, will benefit from the proposed scheme, and the federal government.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): That wasn't the right question.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary. The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Should it be clarified to the satisfaction of the minister and of the cabinet that all normal costs of the Canadian Armed Forces will be borne by the federal government, will the minister in his wisdom request these troops to come in and co-ordinate a proper approach to sandbagging and other remedial works in these low-lying areas in the province, such as the township of Malden and the Lake St. Clair area?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): The federal government has been sandbagging us for years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I can't speak at this moment on behalf of all my colleagues in the government, but depending on how you interpret the word "normal," my answer would be yes. If all normal costs, in our opinion—if the overhead, rations, food, and all this kind of thing—were things that were to be borne by the federal government, I am sure we would have called them in weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the hon. Minister of Revenue: Before he spends any money from the additional $100 million that is in the estimates for his department this year and which is designed for the purchase of land in the North Pickering project, will he recommend to his colleagues in cabinet that a full public hearing be held as to the usefulness of the decision made by the government to begin the expropriation and pur-

chase of land in that particular area and for that particular purpose?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, Ontario Housing Corp. is merely being used as the vehicle for the handling of the transactions in a technical, legal sense. I would refer the hon. Leader of the Opposition to my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), who at this moment is in charge of the arrangements for the North Pickering project.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Would the minister explain why it is in his jurisdiction that we are going to be asked to debate this matter of an additional $100 million when we get to it in the estimates debate? What does he intend to do—transfer the responsibility for that debate to his colleague as well?

Mr. Roy: Pass the buck.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did point out to the hon. member that there were technical reasons for doing this. It was a vehicle which was felt by all concerned to be the most expeditious one to handle this matter.

The hon. member is concerned about the ability to debate the matter because it will come up in my estimates. I can assure the hon. member that arrangements can be made, and I am sure the Premier (Mr. Davis) will agree with me, so that it is made possible for the members of the House to debate it, either in my estimates with my colleague present or in some other form.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to transfer the question, particularly in view of the fact that we have already had a resolution passed by the House permitting the appropriate minister, whoever it is, to go ahead and spend the money even before the debate comes forward. I would like to transfer the question and ask the hon. Minister of Industry and Tourism if it is his intention to have a full public hearing as to the usefulness of the North Pickering project before he gets his hands into that $100 million and starts buying the property in that area, where the prices have already been so seriously inflated by the way the matter has been handled up until this time.

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, at this very time we are in negotiations with the federal government relating to the hearings which it is intending to hold, even further to the one it had last spring. We are discussing it from the terms of reference that the federal government is placing before this government and we have come to no decision, because there has been no agreement on exactly what it will produce in the final analysis.

I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we are not in a position to say at this time as to whether we will conduct a full public hearing on the situation or not, but we will inform the House as soon as we have entered into, or not entered into, an agreement with the federal government relating to the hearing it is going to hold.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Is it not true that the hearing the hon. minister is talking about has to do with the Pickering airport, which in many respects is an entirely different subject and where there certainly should be a full public hearing before too many dollars are spent, federal or provincial? Would not the minister at the same time agree that the same reasons that seem to be compelling the government of Canada to have a public hearing into this matter should apply with at least as much force to this minister's policy to proceed with North Pickering community?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, it has been the federal government's request of us that we should also conduct the hearing on the North Pickering community in conjunction with its hearing on the airport, and we have made no decision. At this time we have actually said we will not hold a public hearing, but we are reviewing the situation.

I also inform the House that as far as the spending of money for acquiring of land in the project has already commenced, as of last week we acquired—

Mr. Sargent: The government still doesn't know where it is going.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: That might be very true, but the member would lead the way, I suppose, if we were to call on him?

Sir, we have acquired 407 properties and we have expended a total of about $37½ million at this time in acquiring lands in North Pickering.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre, a supplementary.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, is the minister proposing to hold up expropriation until after his decision is made with regard to these hearings?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, we have not decided on exactly whether we will advance along the line of expropriation. When we do, it will be noted in the journal.

Mr. Deacon: He is not answering the question, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the minister if he has decided to hold up expropriation until the government has made a decision with regard to holding the hearings?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, at this point I would say that the two subjects are not related. We will make a decision on one not connected with the other.

Mr. Cassidy What does the minister mean, they don't relate to that?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Of course they are related.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West on a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: I take it from the minister's reply that he is prepared to spend on behalf of the government all the money that has been appropriated for this purpose, independent of the federal government's decision on the airport, whether or not a public hearing is held in advance, and even though it violates all of the precepts of the Toronto-centred region plan as they were set down?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I think I've clearly indicated to this House on more than one occasion that the government has indicated clearly that the relationship of North Pickering to the airport is not there; that if the federal government should decide not to advance its project of development of an airport, we are not in the position—nor do we wish to indicate at this time that we are going to be—to terminate North Pickering community. Further to that, we do not accept the remarks by the leader of the NDP that it is not in keeping with the Toronto-centred region plan.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not aware that when the Toronto-centred region plan was introduced it envisaged a community of between 20,000 and 50,000 people in the Cedarwood area, which the government has now inflated to a quarter of a million on perhaps the unjust premise of an airport being built? How can the minister spend over $100 million of public funds with that kind of misconception from the beginning?

An hon. member: The member should get his facts straight before he asks questions.

Mr. MacDonald: Look who's talking.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the question as asked by the leader of the NDP is repetitious, because I have answered the same question to him in previous statements in this House—that the North Pickering community is the amalgamation of two communities that were in the Toronto-centred region plan.

If one goes back and reviews the Toronto-centred region plan he will find that the population of the two communities that are joining had roughly about 300,000 people. In the North Pickering community we are estimating the population in the future will reach about 200,000. We believe it is in keeping with the Toronto-centred region plan and we are advancing the project.

Mr. Renwick: Come on, don't misread that report.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East with the last supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister is aware of what the purpose of a hearing is? Is he not precluding anything that might go in a hearing if he is going ahead to expropriate in the first place? Why is he having a hearing?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: No, I think the member is wrong, because I have not indicated that we are having a hearing. I have indicated exactly the opposite.

Mr. Roy: He is contemplating one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He might.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? The leader of the New Democratic Party?

SALES TAX ON ENERGY

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Would he not agree when one puts a tax on the energy resources of the province, that energy, like bread or milk, is a commodity that has regressive incidence characteristics? In other words, a price increase on energy affects the little guy on an income scale almost as much as the higher-income earner because they likely consume comparable amounts of energy.

Would he not agree, therefore, that it is regressive?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Man cannot live by bread alone.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, although it is not directly in my field, I think that we can go back to the philosophy of the White select committee on taxation. The fundamental touchstone of that philosophy was that the regressivity of a sales tax or an energy tax can be overcome by the application of a tax credit system.

Mr. Cassidy: Not for 50 cents a week it can't.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I believe that the Treasurer's (Mr. White) budget is consistent with the fundamental philosophy of that particular committee.

Mr. Cassidy: For 50 cents a week? That's nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, in view of the Treasurer's remarks about lowering the thermostat and putting on sweaters and things of that kind, would the minister agree that price increases are an inequitable means of bringing about energy conservation? He certainly agrees with that?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: If they were isolated and done on their own I would have to agree.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Then he would also agree that all I have put to him is a direct quote from a speech by the parliamentary assistant (Mr. McKeough) to the Premier in March of this year, whose words are clearly in conflict with the decision made by the provincial Treasurer—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Lewis: —and how is it that none of these energy views was resolved in cabinet before the provincial Treasurer brought down his sales tax increase on energy?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The cabinet didn't get consulted on that.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I can't comment on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has further questions?

GAS RATE HEARINGS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a further question of this minister. Is the minister's department intending to make an intervention before the Ontario Energy Board related to the rate application hearings for Consumers' Gas?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: The matter of an intervention before that board would not be strictly within my jurisdiction.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): What does the minister do over there?

Mr. Cassidy: What does he do except fly to Cuba?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I expect that that should be best posed to the Attorney General.

Mr. Lewis: I will be glad to redirect that, Mr. Speaker, if I could, to the Attorney General. Is it the intention of the government of the Province of Ontario to intervene before the Ontario Energy Board on the rate base application for Consumers' Gas?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): The matter is being studied now. I would anticipate that an early statement would be made. I expect the government will have counsel, but the statement will be officially made.

Mr. Lewis: Would not the minister think it incongruous that the people of Ontario have to pay $28 a year more per family for energy; that then there'll be a two-price system in Alberta; and that now Consumers' Gas wants to raise its rates? Does he not think the government might take the consumers' interest to heart at some point in time?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Very much so, but this matter is going to be dealt with before the board.

Mr. Lewis: But the minister is not willing to give a guarantee of intervention?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That matter is being studied carefully at the moment. When the whole matter is resolved, as to the intervention and so on, a statement will be made.

EFFECT OF ENERGY TAX ON EDUCATIONAL COSTS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education, which many of my colleagues have wished to ask, and I'd like to open it up. Has the minister calculated into the overall educational costs the increase that will fall on school boards, given the seven per cent energy tax?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is no, it was not calculated into the original determinations of the ceilings. At this point in time, I don't know what it will actually amount to.

Mr. Reid: Tell them all to bring sweaters to school.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have asked for the figure and it will be available tomorrow, I'm told.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: Does the minister realize that the imposition of this tax will cost the Metro school board alone $750,000?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I don't realize that, Mr. Speaker, because I haven't got the figures. maybe the hon. member has been able to figure this out, but I haven't had the figures presented to me.

Mr. Dukszta: I have a supplementary. Will the minister ensure that this additional cost to the school boards will not mean further cutbacks of essential services?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as I've said here many times, cutbacks are really not being imposed in educational services. I will certainly study the impact of the seven per cent tax on school board budgets.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside, a supplementary?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Mr. Dukszta: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject. In view of the fact that the minister is supposed to have made a decision by last Friday whether or not to allow the school boards to phase in the cuts until June, 1974, has he made a decision on this? The school boards have requested the minister to allow them to phase in the cuts until June, 1974, and he was supposed to give an answer to that last Friday. Would he be able to tell the House whether he has given the answer or whether he is prepared to give an answer to that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't replied to the Metropolitan Toronto Board of Education in answer to their letter and the delegation that met me. I expect to answer them tomorrow or first thing Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. In view of the fact that this seven per cent energy tax—I'm waiting until the minister is listening.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): The member might wait a long time there. He'd better ask it.

Mr. Burr: In view of the fact the seven per cent energy tax will cost the Windsor school board approximately $50,000 a year, which is the equivalent of five $10,000-a-year teachers and this will be the same result all over the province, would the minister consider asking the Treasurer to exempt school boards from the energy tax to avoid having to pass the money out with one hand and take it back with another?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I asked for a study to be made of the actual impact of this tax on the school boards. These figures will be available tomorrow. When I've got the figures, if I think it is appropriate and necessary, I will certainly make representations to my friend—

Mr. Reid: Does the minister mean he has no idea?

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries?

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and see if there need to be some special considerations for school boards. But let's wait until we get the figures and the facts. We're not going to operate—

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, which I had not intended to ask but I'm provoked to: Does the minister not think that it's a pretty typical example of Tory planning that having given ceilings across the province, he imposes a seven per cent energy tax which will affect the expenditures of all school boards everywhere, and he doesn't calculate the impact in advance? Doesn't the minister think that's nonsensical? And the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) with his ceilings—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Roy: What kind of planning is that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: No, I have one new question which I want to ask. Can the Minister of Government Services tell me, now that the estimates are out, how much money he's put aside for purchase of lands on the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, the money for the purchase of lands on the Niagara Escarpment will not be within my estimates.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question then of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Can he tell me what moneys have been put aside in his estimates for the purchase of lands on the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, there is no specific setting aside of funds for lands on the Niagara Escarpment.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): There had better not be.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development what amounts of money have been put aside for the purchase of the Niagara Escarpment by any of his ministers in this field?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I think, Mr. Speaker, that moneys specifically allocated to the Niagara Escarpment will be found in the Treasurer's estimates.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary question.

Mr. Lewis: Well, what is that amount?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Does the minister mean that he received the report on the Niagara Escarpment and he doesn't know how much money we're spending?

Mr. Cassidy: He doesn't have very much of anything.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Chairman of the Management Board, which makes the economic decisions, how much money we have set aside for the acquisition of land on the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll say this, Mr. Speaker, it will be known in a very short time when the money is allocated—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Grey-Bruce have a supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: If the minister can answer, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. Sargent: I asked the minister a month ago when that commission was going to be named for the Niagara Escarpment. Does anybody know what's going on about that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, we all know and it's a matter of government policy. When we're ready to bring it to the House, then the answer will be given.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary then: Is the minister going to give representation to the Bruce connection on that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll certainly be very closely in touch with those people; yes.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for York West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Scarborough West. I don't have—

Mr. Speaker: I meant Scarborough West, I'm sorry.

The Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question from the previous day.

POLLUTION PROBLEM AT CANADIAN GYPSUM

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, a supplementary question was asked me about the Canadian Gypsum Co. by the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) as to whether I was aware of complaints of emissions of odours from the Oak St. plant.

On checking, I find that we have had no complaints about odour emissions, but we have had some complaints about noise having to do with some of the new equipment that has been put in to deal with some of the pollution problem. And again speculating, it could well be because some of the equipment was put into operation only about 10 days ago, and there may have been a short break-

down or something or other there. But, if the hon. member can give me details, I will pursue it further.

Mr. Speaker: We also have an answer from the Minister of Community and Social Services.

USE OF INDIAN PROGRAMME FUNDS FOR WOUNDED KNEE EXPEDITION

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question with reference to whether any assistance had been given to a trip to Wounded Knee.

I am informed that in March, 1973, the director and three field workers of a youth project decided to travel to Pine Ridge, SD, as observers at a cost of approximately $500. The personnel mentioned did not proceed to Wounded Knee, but remained at Pine Ridge for two days, then returned to Canada.

The Indian organization which originally hired these staff members for another purpose has recently issued a formal statement that permission was not given to the four youth workers to travel to South Dakota and has, in fact, refused to accept the cost of the trip. The four individuals had been requested to reimburse the Indian organization for that amount. I also understand that the contract for the staff members has since been terminated.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

URANIUM RESOURCES

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

In view of the fact that nuclear energy is going to be one of the few areas that Ontario has any jurisdiction over as far as future energy needs go, and in view of the No. 3.7 recommendation in report No. 3 on nuclear power in Ontario, has the government or the minister's policy field carried forward any negotiations with the uranium producers in the Province of Ontario as to guaranteeing sources of uranium for nuclear reactors? Secondly, does the Province of Ontario intend to become a stockholder or owner to guarantee these resources?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there have been no negotiations involving the government. All I can say is that from the policy field's point of view it has been before us a number of times; the whole issue of uranium—its availability and, as important, the jurisdiction over uranium as between the federal government and ourselves.

I would not be surprised but that today it may well be a matter of discussion between the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) and his opposite number in Ottawa, who at the moment, with the other ministers from across Canada, are involved in an effort to develop a mineral policy for Canada.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): We own our own resources. What do we want to go to Ottawa for?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: But I can't respond to the question as to whether or not any thoughts have been given to either negotiations. Certainly no discussion has occurred in the policy field with regard to such a specific thing as purchase of stocks, shares or the assets.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary: Would the minister not agree that because of the strategic nature of this particular resource, it's absolutely essential that we arrive at a policy immediately before we lose this particular resource that we have to depend on?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of a supplementary, could the minister advise this House when the government will be appointing a portfolio of energy resources so that we could direct our questions to the parliamentary assistant to the Premier, rather than hearing him involved in public debate outside the House?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, as I suggested a couple of weeks ago, the particular report which relates to the means by which energy will be handled from a governmental point of view in this province has been made by the parliamentary assistant to the Premier. My own guess is that in a matter of days or weeks the government will be bringing forward that report; it's not far off in being presented.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—actually it pertains to the question—would you take under advisement the possibility of having the parliamentary assistants being given the right to answer questions in the House? This would allow the parliamentary assistant for energy to take part in the question period, which would obviously

be desirable, and it would also affect certain other parliamentary assistants.

Mr. Lewis: Careful. Careful.

Mr. Speaker: I think that's a matter that should be resolved fairly soon.

Mr. Lewis: That will be all right for the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough), but what about the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith)?

Mr. Reid: Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would ask if you think it is right and proper that the parliamentary assistant can report to the press and answer questions of the media in the Province of Ontario where we cannot elicit that information in the Legislature itself?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I think any hon. member is free to answer any question outside the House he sees fit to answer. To answer the previous question, though, it's in our rules and order that any minister—

Mr. Deacon: But my friend is talking about policy, government policy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, can any hon. member answer—

Mr. Speaker: No, no. I didn't. That's what I said earlier. Any minister may refer a question, as our orders say, to a member of a board or commission.

Mr. Sargent: Especially if he doesn't know.

Mr. Speaker: But it hasn't been resolved yet that a question may be directed to a parliamentary assistant. I think that should be taken under advisement right away.

Did the member for Ottawa East have a supplementary?

Mr. Roy: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary. The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Did the Provincial Secretary protest to the Premier of the province when he took energy away and put it under the member for Chatham-Kent?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Does he not agree that it fits in his policy field? Has energy become too important for him?

Mr. Sargent: Good point. Good point!

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

AIR POLLUTION AT HAPPY VALLEY

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Is it the department's intention, once the families in Happy Valley have been relocated, to remove the monitor situated in Happy Valley, as was reported in the press last week?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I really can't answer that question. I would think that we would continue to have it there, because of the prevailing wind. It is one of the ways we monitor the stack at Falconbridge.

I wonder if the member can tell me who had reported that we were proposing to do this?

Mr. Martel: Is the minister not aware that one of his staff indicated to the Sudbury Star last Thursday, as reported in the press, that the monitor would be removed once the citizens were relocated?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would doubt that, Mr. Speaker, but I will check into it and let the member know. As I say, it is in the location in which it will monitor the stack through the prevailing wind; or at least, it is in an area in which we get the wind direction quite constantly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Laughren: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! A supplementary on this one?

Mr. Laughren: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Mr. Laughren: Is there any truth to the rumour that the new Northern Ontario Place is going to be established in Happy Valley?

Mr. Speaker: I don't see that that's a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am certainly sorry I missed that. I wonder if the member could repeat it.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, I'll gladly repeat it. I wonder if the—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: The minister asked that the question be repeated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry?

Mr. Laughren: The minister asked that the question be repeated.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't really recognize it as a proper supplementary.

Mr. Laughren: Oh, it certainly was, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It's fundamental to the fallout in the Sudbury basin.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

SALES TAX ON ENERGY

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whom to ask this of, but the chairman of the board of management, or something, might know. Is that his job?

An hon. member: Management Board.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Across Ontario, when people go to pay their hydro bills, the Hydro doesn't know how to handle it because, if they pay their bills on May 1, they are paying for past power.

Mr. Speaker: Have you a question?

Mr. Sargent: What is the government going to do about it? How is it going to straighten out Hydro across Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think if the member watches what happens, he'll learn how we're going to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment! A supplementary.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has the first supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I would ask him to repeat his answer. I didn't hear it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Will the Chairman of the Management Board give us that again?

Mr. Sargent: Will the minister repeat his answer?

Mr. Speaker: The answer was not heard.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, what was your comment?

Mr. Speaker: I believe the member did not hear your answer.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about millions of dollars in overpayment across Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: What is the government going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As the budget matters are implemented, they will be referred to the House.

Mr. Sargent: On May 1 we have to decide.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: What the minister needs is a shot of hydro.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Have no fear—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Waterloo North has a supplementary.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The question is this —will people be paying the seven per cent tax on bills which are issued on the day this comes into effect—

An hon. member: July 1.

Mr. Good: —on July 1—therefore they would have to pay on energy used before July 1—or will the tax be calculated on energy used after July 1?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am sure that this, too, will become apparent when the legislation is introduced in the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister certainly doesn't know, that is apparent.

Mr. Sargent: He doesn't know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please! The member for Cochrane South.

CONDITION OF TIMMINS HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. Has the minister had an opportunity to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. I cannot hear the question. The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): We didn't hear any answer.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't they all resign?

Mr. Ferrier: Has the minister had an opportunity to study the numerous briefs and representations made to him about the replacement of the Timmins High School? Is he in a position to reconsider his decision to go ahead with renovations to that high school?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have considered the representations made by the various people of Timmins, and I must say to my friend that my original answer to them still stands. I feel that the only thing that we can approve at this time is renovation of that school.

Mr. Roy: They should all run for re-election.

Mr. Sargent: The member is making them look foolish.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Given the fact that additions have been made to that school in 1958, 1962, 1967 and 1968, there is much of that school which certainly is not in the category of a school that should be replaced.

Mr. Ferrier: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister does not think that he will spend as much or perhaps more money on a renovation process than he would if a new school were built? As a second supplementary, will the minister himself go and see the school to see how inadequate it is and how inadequate a renovation programme will be to upgrade it, if he wants to?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, there are many schools across Ontario that people would like to replace. There just isn't enough money to do all the replacing.

Mr. Roy: We'd like to replace the minister.

Mr. Ruston: We will.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have indicated to many of these schools that they will have to get by with renovations. I don't believe the renovations will cost more than an actual replacement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would like my hon. friends to tell me how he could justify to the ratepaying public of Timmins replacing facilities that have only been built in the 1960s. You can't replace them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Welland South was on his feet.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, a supplementary. This will be the last supplementary then. The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Haggerty: I have a question directed to the Provincial Secretary for National Development.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are hearing a supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: I have a supplementary of the Minister of Education: In view of his comments about the cost of new construction, would he be prepared to bend the regulations in order to permit the renovation of Lisgar Collegiate, a historic high school in Ottawa, which is now coming before his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That certainly isn't a supplementary question to the Timmins one.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

IJC MEETING ON LAKE LEVELS

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question directed to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development about the proposed International Joint Commission meeting to be held in Toronto on May 3 to hear the proposals on reducing the lake levels on Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. Will representations be made from the legislative assembly here, by members from here, or will the staff from his ministry be present?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I expect, Mr. Speaker, that will depend on the judgement of the International Joint Commission and Mr. Robichaud. I know that when they were meeting here last month they invited me to attend and have staff present. If the member is requesting me to pass along such a request to Mr. Robichaud, I would be glad to do it.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: I think that in the past it has been the practice of the International Joint Commission to send out notices to those parties that are concerned. I am thinking, in particular of those from the ridings that front the lakefronts.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

AUTO PACT SAFEGUARDS

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Clement), Mr. Speaker. Since the vast majority of Canadian auto parts production and auto assembly occurs in Ontario, what representation is the minister making to the federal government to ensure that the safeguards in the auto pact not only are not removed but are, in fact, strengthened, so that the dollar value of production in Ontario, or in Canada, equals the dollar value of the sales?

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): Wrong minister.

Mr. Bounsall: Could I redirect that to the Minister of Industry and Tourism.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, a week ago Monday, as I reported to this House last Tuesday, we had an opportunity as the ministers of industry for the 10 provinces of Canada, of discussing some of the policies and some of the problems that the federal government is encountering in trade negotiations, and the auto pact agreement was one. May I say to this House that we have been in touch with the people in Ottawa of recent hours to see exactly what was included in the negotiations that Mr. Gillespie, the minister for the federal government, conducted with Washington a month ago.

I am waiting to have a further report because I was not aware of the fact that there had been any representation by the federal government to the US government in Washington. I do assure this House that I have made it very clear to Mr. Gillespie that this government wants to be involved in the negotiations relating to the auto pact agreement with the American government. I can only say to members of this House that I have been assured by Mr. Gillespie that we will have an opportunity for an input. As to how effective that input will be, we will have to wait and see.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

EFFECT OF ENERGY TAX ON HOSPITAL COSTS

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Presuming that the budget was a statement of total government fiscal policy representing the attitude of all ministries and secretariats, could he advise whether hospitals are exempt from the imposition of the seven per cent tax on energy use? If they are not, could he tell me what calculations his ministry has made or OHIP has made as to the cost to local boards or OHIP in connection with the imposition of that tax on hospitals?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question. I can only say that we have already started to assess the problem to see what it does mean to hospitals.

Mr. Reid: Did they not tell the minister?

Mr. Lewis: Amazing! Both Health and Education.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, am I correct in understanding that the response from the minister and his colleague the Minister of Education, is that no calculation heretofore or before the budget was made in connection with the imposition of that tax on educational institutions and hospital facilities?

Mr. Paterson: And other government institutions.

Mr. Roy: What was the purpose of the minister's policy meeting?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I just have an answer, yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As I told the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, we are at the present time reviewing this to see what effect it has on the hospitals.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of one final supplementary, am I correct in assuming that no calculations were made by OHIP or the Ministry of Health as to the effect of that tax on hospitals in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: I think that is enough. The member for Port Arthur.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Let me have an answer.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister wish to answer?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of making a review of the institutions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: I take it then—it follows logically—that neither the Minister of Health nor the Minister of Education knew of the major tax changes in the budget? It was the Treasurer's budget.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

CONSTITUTION OF TRADE MISSIONS

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism, Mr. Speaker: Why is it that in the latest, undated, press release that crossed my desk from his ministry about the Italian and German targets for an Ontario trade mission, in the list of mission members there is no representation from two of the most discriminated against segments of our society, i.e., northern Ontario and women?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I have not got the list of all the trade missions that have left this province in the last three or four months, but I do assure the members of this House that when we select members for trade missions, either for trade or for tourism, we select people from across the Province of Ontario. Northwestern and northeastern Ontario have been represented in many of our trade and tourism missions, and if the member wishes to make a specific reference to it I will be glad to review the files and see exactly where the individuals come from.

An hon. member: What about women?

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, the minister didn't answer the second part of my question.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a quick answer to the second part of the question?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I will also take that under review.

Mr. Speaker: All right. The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order or point of privilege—

Mr. Reid: The member should make up his mind.

Mr. Carruthers: I would like to refer to an article appearing in the Toronto Star today, reporting the speech by the hon. member for Kitchener, who states that chairmen of select committees get $1,000 extra, plus $60 a day. As chairman of a select committee I am not aware that we receive $1,000 additional.

Mr. Lewis: He will ask for it now.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Paterson moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, a brief explanation: This bill exempts, with due caution, fire department vehicles, police vehicles and ambulances from having to observe speed limits, stop at red signal lights and observe the no parking, standing, or stopping restrictions that exist in the present Act.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, may I rise on the request of my constituents to deliver personally to the Minister of Education the 1,700-name petition expressing the concern of my con-

stituents about the effects on Parkdale Collegiate of the cutting of education grants.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but for future guidance, it should have been done under petitions.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government.

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, in responding to this budget, I want to begin with a few words about the provincial Treasurer (Mr. White); and I feel almost as though I'm punching a pillow, because he isn't here.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): The member has been punching pillows for years.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): He'll be here; he'll be here!

Mr. MacDonald: However, I suspect he will read it in the record.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): He'll be here; perhaps we can save it.

Mr. MacDonald: The provincial Treasurer thinks of himself as being something of a swinging guy. Now I'd be the last to deny there's some validity in this contention; in fact, I don't think I ever smoked him out so readily in my experience.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Here he is.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I'm very glad to have him.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Start over again now.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Well!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): We thought the Treasurer was in hiding.

Mr. MacDonald: Because he is something of a swinging guy, one is almost a little critical of him because that characteristic sets him apart from this cabinet in rather a pleasant way. When Bob Macaulay resigned from the government back in 1964, he was quoted as saying he couldn't stand the stuffed shirts in the government any longer. Well, the last thing one could accuse the provincial Treasurer of being is a stuffed shirt.

But by way of an appropriate comment, I'd like to borrow from a former colleague of mine, Walter Pitman, from his article that was carried in the Toronto Star last June 23. It reads as follows:

> Every good hockey team has one—the big, tough, thick-skulled hard-checking, stick-swinging defenceman whose job it is to soften up the opposition and assure that his team doesn't get pushed around. He is essential, the John Ferguson type; the guy who will spend a lot of time in the penalty box, but will protect his less aggressive team mates and will slow down the competition.
>
> Governments appear to need this kind of policeman too. The Ontario Tories have a lot of Lady Byng winners—Fern Guindon, Gordon Carton, James Auld—but the emerging tough is John White. Political etiquette frowns on physical violence, so the brickbats must be verbal. It takes a fast tongue, a raucous voice, a ready wit and a bright intellect to engage in the kind of confrontation which takes on the entire opposition and attempts to offset their criticism.

Hon. Mr. Welch: A fair assessment!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it's a fairly apt comment. Since his days in the back benches the provincial Treasurer has always regarded himself as a self-appointed hatchetman for the government, and often he barged in with an impulsiveness that on occasion would have tempted one to believe that a more apt hockey analogy would be that of Eddie Shack. However, that would be unfair. That would be unfair, because Eddie Shack's contribution was invariably sheer brawn and little brains.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He scored some goals.

Mr. MacDonald: And the provincial Treasurer's contribution is—

An hon. member: Sheer brains!

Mr. MacDonald: —a tantalizing mixture of brawn and brains. I, for one, would never deny that he has an intellectual capacity that no other, bar none—this is a provocative statement—of his colleagues could match.

In fact, to the cabinet posts that he has acquired down through the last two or three

years, he has brought not only that provocative capacity to throw in such comments as, "If you could only read," or, "If you would only listen," but he also brings erudition.

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I regretted that, but my friend must admit that the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) is unusually provocative.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, well, I would have to agree with that.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): No more than the Treasurer.

Mr. MacDonald: But the point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, is that he also brings erudition. Some time in the years past he was reading Bartlett's book of quotations, and he came across that quotation from Samuel Johnson, which he has paraphrased ad nauseam, even on the TV panel that I shared with him last Thursday night after the budget. It's something to the effect that I can't give you comprehension, but I'll give you an explanation; or I'll give you the facts—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Understanding!

Mr. MacDonald: Or he can't give you understanding. As I say, he paraphrases it. He garbles it to his own purposes each time—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member means he doesn't get it right.

Mr. MacDonald: But he's bringing some degree of erudition. But sometimes—and this is the point I want to get to—the brain and the impulsiveness, this sheer imagination run riot, exceeds good common sense and careful assessment of the full consequences of his action. That was never more graphically illustrated than in the provincial Treasurer's first budget.

In fact, we have already had it documented; two of his colleagues, while he was out this afternoon, embarrassingly had to admit that they didn't know about the consequences of the tax increase, for example, on the full range of education and health institutions across this province. They are scrambling to figure out what it's all about; what the impact is going to be.

In this budget the provincial Treasurer's personal propensity for romanticism has reached new heights.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Lovable heights.

Mr. MacDonald: There will be no sales tax, says he, on pets or flowers, those lovable growing creatures; but he doesn't hesitate to slap a regressive tax on those other lovable creatures, the people of the Province of Ontario.

It is surely the epitome of Tory romanticism that pedigreed pets should be exempted from taxes which are applied to the poor people of Ontario. But while the provincial Treasurer's romanticism is mildly tolerable, his capacity for false image-making is really distorting the situation beyond tolerable limits.

For example, he speaks for a government which has preached, ad nauseam, fiscal restraint. That's the image. What's the reality? Well, Mr. Speaker, last year Ontario's gross revenues were $5,766,000,000. Next year's forecast is that they are going to be $6,867,000,000, an increase of over 19 per cent.

Now there's fiscal restraint! The Treasurer preaches it but he never practises it and that's been characteristic of the budget—his own and his predecessors'—down through the years.

Another example: He says he is going to be frugal this year, that he is going to cut $100 million to $200 million from our public debt. If we examine the budgetary figures, we find that last year the net public debt was $2,778,000,000 or $343 per capita; and this coming year the public debt is going to be, not less, but $2,991,000,000 or $371 per capita.

What, in effect, the provincial Treasurer has done is to point to the fact that there is going to be no increase to the public debt by external borrowing, in bonds and treasury bills, ignoring the fact that there is going to be internal borrowing to the extent of a cool $950 million, just short of $1 billion, from the Canada Pension Plan, from the teachers' superannuation fund, from the municipal employees' retirement fund and so on. We have the image of a provincial Treasurer who is going to be cutting the public debt, when in fact he is borrowing internally—that word he tends to hide, internally—he is borrowing close to $1 billion.

In short, Mr. Speaker, don't take the budget at face value. It requires a bit of analysis. And that's precisely what I would like to do this afternoon. I'd like to get down to some of that analysis without any further ado.

In the public mind, Mr. Speaker, the outstanding feature of the budget was the 40 per cent boost in sales from five to seven per

cent and the imposition of a new seven per cent tax on energy. The government argues that these new taxes were necessary to increase grants to the municipalities and reduce property taxes; to enrich the tax credits and thereby relieve the burden on the lower-income groups.

Now, commendable as these objectives may be, the point I want to make and to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, is that new taxes were not necessary to achieve these budget objectives. During the next 12 months the provincial Treasurer is going to collect anywhere from about $364 million to over $500 million more revenue than he is now forecasting.

Once again this provincial Treasurer, as all his predecessors have done, has misrepresented the financial position to the people of the Province of Ontario.

The Liberal critic referred to this yesterday—it has been referred to down through the years. Quite frankly I think it's time this aspect of budgeting should be grappled with in a really serious manner. Therefore, we have attempted to do a careful analysis of it. I have here, for example, in tables which unfortunately are too large to be manageable and to put on to the record Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the budget for the last 10 years in the Province of Ontario. The fascinating thing about them is that there is an almost monotonous consistency about those budgets. It can be summed up by a few things that could be put in a tabular form.

For example, on retail sales tax, in nine of the last 10 years the government underestimated what it was going to get and its average error was 5.3 per cent. On gasoline tax, in eight of the 10 years they underestimated and their average error was 5.2 per cent. On corporation tax, in nine of the 10 years they underestimated the amount and average error was 11.5 per cent. On succession duties, in nine of the 10 years they underestimated the amount and the average was 7.4 per cent. On motor vehicle tax, they underestimated in eight of the 10 years and the average was 6.4 per cent. On the LCBO they can't even figure out, on the basis of all our experience, how much we are going to drink in this province—maybe there are some reasons for that. In 10 of the 10 years they underestimated and the average was 4.3 per cent.

On income tax—this was the one that came closest in terms of a balance—in six of the 10 years there were underestimates, in four there were overestimates, and the average error was 5.3 per cent.

Interestingly enough, when one goes back to the mines profit tax, which was for only the first four years of the 10, they underestimated in three of those four years and the margin of their error was 24.1 per cent. Even these Tories couldn't believe how little money they were going to get from this source.

Well, there's the record for the last 10 years—and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is 5.3 per cent on the average across the board.

Okay, let's take a look at last year, because I want to draw some conclusions from this and I don't want you to think I am being unfair in drawing these conclusions. The underestimation of taxation for the past year, according to the budget which the provincial Treasurer has now presented to us, was enormous. It was even worse than before.

In the 1972 budget, the Treasurer predicted tax revenues of $3,116,000,000. As it turned out, he raised $3,400,000,000 or 9.1 per cent more than he expected. That was taxation revenue. This is the largest-ever miscalculation of tax revenue. The yield on the retail sales tax was underestimated by 4.4 per cent. The personal income tax by 3.8 per cent. The motor vehicle tax by 20 per cent. The land transfer tax by 27 per cent. The estate tax by 31 per cent. The corporation tax by a whopping 48.6 per cent.

The more sophisticated this government becomes in its budget planning, the bigger the errors it makes. The average in terms of net revenues—and I am going to put it on net revenues so that it is comparable with the net revenue figures over the last 10 years that I have already cited—is that in the past year the Province of Ontario underestimated its net revenue by 7.8 per cent across the board.

Okay; what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? Let's translate that into dollars. We have a budget this year of $6,867,000,000. If we take the average for the last 10 years of an underestimate of 5.3 per cent, it means that next year the Treasurer can be almost dead certain—as certain as he can of anything in this world—that he is going to have at least $364 million more hidden revenue in his budget, and he knows it is there. It is a calculated misrepresentation. On the other hand if we take the seven—

Hon. Mr. White: I would make a point that it is not. It is the very best forecast we can make.

Mr. MacDonald: Just let me get to it. I am not going to get sidetracked by that for a moment.

If we take last year's error, which is 7.8 per cent, and if it were repeated this year and applied to that budget of $6,867,000,000, it would mean that by the end of next year he is going to have $535 million more revenue than he predicted. One can safely conclude, Mr. Speaker, that the greater revenue than is revealed in this budget, which the government will have to work with during the course of the year, will be somewhere between the figure of $364 million and $535 million.

In short, the Treasurer didn't need to put these new taxes on at all, from which he is going to raise a net levy of $333 million. The provincial Treasurer argues, as he attempted to do a moment ago by an interjection, that these are the best possible estimates. They are as good as Ottawa's said he.

Hon. Mr. White: Better!

Mr. MacDonald: They may be but it doesn't make it excusable, Mr. Speaker. Let me be fair, until now all governments have engaged in this game when budget-making—of under-estimating their revenues so that they have a cushion for supplementary expenditures during the course of the year; or so that they will have a better budgetary picture at the end of the year and they can present themselves as being great managers of the economy and the finances of the province.

There are some serious consequences flowing from this, Mr. Speaker, and I think they are too serious to tolerate playing games in this fashion in the future. It is bad enough to deceive the public with a calculated misrepresentation of the actual financial situation in the province and to use that as an excuse to fill a gap in revenues which won't exist. It is a mythical gap. That is bad enough; but the government in so doing is undermining its position, its own credibility, vis-à-vis the federal government.

The general complaint of Ontario with regard to Ottawa has been that Ottawa hasn't been doing enough to stimulate the economy. This Treasurer and his predecessor, Charles McNaughton, and his predecessor, the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) have been arguing consistently with the federal government that they have left too much of the slack to be picked up by the Province of Ontario; that Ontario had to engage too much in deficit; that there has been a fiscal mismatch; that instead of having the appropriate kind of economic thrust from Ottawa, Ontario has had to come in with the appropriate kind of thrust.

To a considerable degree I would agree with the minister. I think Ottawa is vulnerable on this point and therefore I would agree with the general proposition for which this minister and certainly his predecessors were pleading—that is, the establishment of a joint economic council through which the federal and the provincial governments would harmonize their fiscal policies. In fact, if that be the objective that the government was really interested in, I wonder why the provincial Treasurer has done what he has just now done.

For example, I have here quotes of his, given to that meeting of the ministers of finance on Jan. 18 and 19. Let me quote from page 22 of the official reproduction of his remarks; he is speaking to the federal finance minister.

> The time has come for a bold fiscal initiative to stimulate the economy, to rectify the financial imbalance undermining our federal system. The major cut in federal income tax that I advocate is the key for meeting these multiple objectives.

A little bit earlier, on page 10 in the same document, he is quoted as saying—I hope the provincial Treasurer is listening; the words are coming back to haunt him:

> It is our opinion at this time that tax increases by the provinces and the municipalities would both depress the economy and contribute to the resurgence of inflationary pressures.

The author is the Treasurer—not somebody else, the Treasurer.

So what he's doing is destroying his own credibility vis-à-vis the federal government. Admittedly, the federal government wasn't as bold as the provincial Treasurer wanted. It wasn't as bold as I would have wanted. I would agree with the provincial Treasurer that Ottawa's budget wasn't as expansionary as, in my view and perhaps in his view, the circumstances demanded. Admittedly, the federal government cut income tax only five per cent, rather than nine per cent, and didn't give as fair a share of the revenues to the provinces. We have a bad situation; certainly a situation that isn't as good as it might be. But is that justification, Mr. Speaker, for the province making a bad situation worse?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): White the knife, he'll be known as.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that justification for deliberately accentuating the fiscal mismatch?

Hon. Mr. White: On the contrary, we are running a larger cash deficit this year, as to the proportion of our revenues, than the federal government is.

Mr. MacDonald: Just let me get to that in a minute. The Treasurer is on the ball, but he is just about 30 seconds ahead. He anticipated me, and perhaps offence is the best form of defence. He is up to his old game. But he has destroyed his own credibility vis-à-vis the federal government.

What the Treasurer is now doing is saying to them: "You haven't had enough dynamic, expansionary thrust in your budget." And what does he do? He comes along and bolsters that inadequate expansionary thrust.

The fact of the matter is that, after pleading for that bold fiscal initiative, his government has brought in a contradictory budget. The Treasurer has a mythical $402 million deficit, but I've already pointed out in a pretty solidly documented fashion that he has hidden revenues that range anywhere from $364 million to some $530 million. So, by the end of the year, his deficit will be minuscule. It will be a balanced budget. He may even have a surplus; unless, of course, he gets engaged in massive supplementary expenditures which, I suppose, is also part of the game he may be intending to play. But he is not going to give that necessary thrust. He is making a mockery of the first objective of his own budget.

Has the provincial Treasurer forgotten what the first objective of his own budget was? I quote: "To ensure that the economy continues to move towards full employment."

The provincial Treasurer confirmed that any unemployment figure in excess of three per cent is unacceptable to this government. He reported that our unemployment had been 4.2 per cent in February. It was down to 4.1 per cent in April. Then he revealed that the average for the year is likely to be 4.4 per cent. Therefore, he was conceding that the averages in the later months of this year are going to crawl back up close to five per cent so that one can get that 4.4 per cent average.

Neither the Liberal government in Ottawa nor the Tory government here is doing enough to meet the job situation. The Treasurer has come in with a contractionary budget to make a bad situation worse, and each government is spending its time—this is the tragedy of it—blaming the other.

Mr. Speaker, I want to proceed from that to an analysis of the more regressive taxes that the government has brought in, to take a look at them in more detail. Mr. Speaker, in mediaeval France—I'm sure as a scholar of mediaeval days the minister will recall this.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He is certainly mediaeval.

An hon. member: He's a Tory.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, he is primeval.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: The government of those days imposed a tax on salt, which was deemed in those days to be a big necessity for the well-being of the nation and its people. Down through the centuries the salt tax has always been cited as a classic in regressive taxes.

In 1964, it is interesting to recall, the Conservative government of Duff Roblin in Manitoba put a tax on heating fuel. So great was the public outcry and so certain did even the government become persuaded that they'd made a mistake, that a year later they repealed it. Now the provincial Treasurer apparently either didn't know about the Manitoba experience or he chose to ignore it.

Hon. Mr. White: What did they do about the tax on electricity?

Mr. MacDonald: Ontario's energy tax bids fair to becoming the salt tax of our history.

Hon. Mr. White: What's Mr. Schreyer done about the tax on cooking energy, heating energy, manufacturing energy? What's he done about lighting energy?

Mr. MacDonald: You know, I'm not so interested in isolated bits and pieces that the provincial Treasurer wants to pick out from what Mr. Schreyer does.

Hon. Mr. White: What is Premier Barrett doing?

Mr. MacDonald: What I am interested in is that Premier Schreyer brought in a budget that was so good that when the final vote came, both the Liberals and the Tories voted for it.

Hon. Mr. White: And the member knows why!

Mr. MacDonald: The minister's colleagues voted for the budget.

Hon. Mr. White: The member knows why—because they've got $42 million of our dough.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the minister trying to do? Pull the rug out from under his Manitoba Tory colleagues?

Hon. Mr. White: What is Premier Barrett going to do about his five per cent on heating, cooking?

Mr. Lewis: That's a social credit tax; don't be preposterous.

Hon. Mr. White: What's Premier Barrett going to do about that?

Mr. MacDonald: You know, there is little wonder that that long-time Tory, Fred Gardiner, expressed shock at the energy tax, and that he added, in reference to his political buddies up at Queen's Park, and I quote:

> They'd better start thinking what they're doing. They've no appreciation of what brought Ontario to the position it occupies as the number one residential, commercial and industrial province of Canada. Somebody seems to have gone off the beam.

Hon. Mr. White: It's 1973!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Now that we've virtually exhausted our low-cost hydro power sources in the Province of Ontario, yearly boosts in power costs are bad enough. The higher costs of thermal and nuclear power may be inescapable. Cheap power, once the major advantage upon which this province's development has taken place, is fast disappearing.

But this government now steps in to make a bad situation worse. It's going to compound the higher power costs by taxing them. After all the lament that we have heard from the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the member for Chatham-Kent and others since Alberta announced its increase in the wellhead price of gas, it is little wonder that Premier Lougheed—another Tory; how delightful it is to watch this go on in these days—rose in the Alberta Legislature the day after the Ontario budget to point out how Ontario had destroyed its own credibility.

Seldom, if ever, has a government undermined its own position in such a sweeping fashion as this government has done by boosting the sales tax from five to seven per cent; and extending it at the same time to include energy used for heating, cooking and lighting purposes—a vital need in our northern clime.

First, it has destroyed its own bargaining position in challenging Alberta's new pricing policies for energy. Second, after being so critical of Ottawa's inadequate fiscal policies, it has now duplicated those inadequacies and thereby worsened a fiscal mismatch in federal-provincial policies; assuring us that the high levels of unemployment won't be corrected and making a mockery of Ontario's plea for the past two years for a joint economic council to harmonize the fiscal policies of the federal and the 10 provincial governments.

And thirdly, it has made an even greater mockery of its own much-trumpeted efforts of tax reform. All along the line it is building new inequities in our tax structure, while at the same time posing as a champion of tax reform.

If the government were determined to raise more new revenues, instead of relying on the $350 million to $500 million which are hidden in its deliberately underestimated revenue forecast, then it had two major choices; the income tax or the sales tax.

To no one's surprise it refused to raise anything more from its friends in the corporate sector, or very little more; and it has gone through elaborate rationalizations as to why it shouldn't touch the more progressive personal income tax at this time.

The provincial Treasurer argues, for example, that structural changes in the income tax base are resulting in greater federal revenues, under the guise of tax reform, and that the provinces are being cut out of their fair share of these added revenues.

Furthermore, he argues that the indexing for inflation—that's another delicious overtone among the Tories at this point—that the indexing for inflation which the federal government has now adopted, will further cut down the province's share. Ironically, the idea was stolen—

Hon. Mr. White: That will be of short life.

Mr. MacDonald: The idea was stolen from Stanfield's tax proposals, so the provincial Tories are now being victimized by the tax reform of their federal counterparts.

Now it's possible to agree, Mr. Speaker, as I do, that the province is not getting a fair share of the income tax from the federal government, but to use all of these arguments as an excuse, either temporary or long-term, for forsaking the progressive income tax

field and resorting to the highly regressive sales tax field is an exercise in illogic and political obfuscation.

Hon. Mr. White: I heard on CFRB the member wants to put the income taxes up.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. White: I heard Jack Dennett say the member for York South wanted to increase the personal income tax.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Better that than sales tax!

Mr. MacDonald: If that is what Jack Dennett said at least it wasn't a gross violation of what I had in my release; some of the other CFRB broadcasts were a garbled account and went across the whole country as a complete misrepresentation.

The shattering thing for me was that they attributed to me what I had correctly speculated were the Treasurer's thought processes. And that was a little appalling when I saw it come back.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is adding insult to injury.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: The member wants higher personal income tax like Mr. Schreyer.

Mr. MacDonald: If the Treasurer just waits until I am finished I will show him where he should raise his revenue.

This is what this government is doing today, as I say—being illogical and engaging in political obfuscation.

In his recent Economic Council of Canada study—

Hon. Mr. White: Forty-two and a half per cent.

Mr. MacDonald: —entitled "The Pattern of Taxation in Canada", Allan F. Maslove said this: "The provincial general sales taxes, the second largest revenue source, are regressive over the entire income span".

Moreover, the provincial Treasurer has now compounded the regressivity of the sales tax by imposing it on individuals, on the people, while exempting the corporate sector from much of the burden. This government's approach is shot through with so many inequities that it is almost impossible to seek them all out for a proper listing.

For example, gas distribution companies already charge residential consumers more than twice the rate which they charge industry, and the gap is widening. According to the last annual report of the Consumers' Gas Co., average industrial charges had dropped from 63 to 61 cents per thousand cubic feet, while average residential charges went up from $1.26 to $1.27. I repeat, the gap is widening. And now the government steps in and imposes a seven per cent tax on the residential consumer, while imposing no charge on the manufacturer for energy used in production.

Thus they are encouraging industry to use up, even faster, this fuel which may be exhausted by the end of the century, while they are imposing a tax on the already overcharged residential consumer.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: Listen, Dad—

Mr. MacDonald: The Treasurer should listen himself and he may get some good out of this this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. White: The member wouldn't be talking out of both sides of his mouth, would he?

Mr. MacDonald: They are imposing a tax on the already overcharged residential consumer, allegedly as an incentive to conserve energy. You know, while the Frost Building blazes in lights every evening, I have been interested in watching it, the provincial Treasurer assures us that the lights are turned off in his office.

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order!

Mr. MacDonald: And yet he calls upon homeowners to turn down the thermostat to 69 deg. and have the family put on an extra sweater.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Stokes: And carry candles around.

Hon. Mr. White: I didn't say that at all.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Order!

Hon. Mr. White: I didn't say any such thing. I said that I had noticed in my own home, because of the emphasis on the shortage of energy, that we had—

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): The Treasurer's wife was talking about him!

Hon. Mr. White: —subconsciously turned our heating down from 72 to 69 and we are wearing a little more clothing.

Mr. Stokes: And subconsciously put on a sweater.

Hon. Mr. White: I did not suggest that everybody had to follow our custom.

Mr. Cassidy: He sure did.

Hon. Mr. White: No, I did not.

Mr. MacDonald: It's rather interesting. What day is it today?

Mr. Breithaupt: Tuesday.

Mr. MacDonald: Today is Tuesday and the budget came down last Thursday and for five days now it has been emblazoned all across the Province of Ontario that the provincial Treasurer said, "Turn down your thermostat and put on a sweater!" Now five days later, he's finally got up to deny it.

Boy, he is a fast one on the trigger. He is really fast on the trigger. This budget has got him down and I don't blame him for being down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: I am sure there is a tape, so I think I can prove I didn't say it.

Mr. MacDonald: But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make with the provincial Treasurer is that he is pursuing the mice and ignoring the elephants in the world of energy conservation. He's becoming a threat to the lifestyle of the people of Ontario. Not only the bedrooms but every room of the house is going to be threatened by his invasion of privacy.

"Turn down the thermostat, put on a sweater", Big Brother demands; 1984 is here ahead of time!

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): And let the advertising lights blaze more brightly.

Mr. Stokes: George Orwell.

Mr. MacDonald: The people of Ontario might be willing to hearken to the provincial Treasurer's plea for energy conservation if he were consistent, but I remind members that his taxation policies are now going to bolster existing pricing policies which the government has done nothing about in the fuel board of the Province of Ontario.

The Attorney General (Mr. Bales) gave us some gobbledygook earlier about what the government may be going to do this time in the hearing. Those pricing policies encourage the corporate sector to use up this energy as fast as possible while he pleads with the little homeowner to cut it down.

Let me get back to the inequities with which the whole government's position is shot through. Manufacturing is exempt from the new energy tax for production but farmers, who are also engaged in production—

Mr. Paterson: Epecially greenhouse operators.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. Greenhouse operators especially have to pay it.

Hon. Mr. White: Their production is exempt.

Mr. MacDonald: They have to pay it.

Hon. Mr. White: Their production is exempt.

Mr. MacDonald: With one hand the provincial Treasurer grants a greater equity to farmers on their property taxes, and with the other hand he takes it away with his energy tax. But perhaps—

Hon. Mr. White: Their production is exempt.

Mr. Cassidy: They didn't find that out until the backbenchers on the Tory side began to push.

Hon. Mr. White: Take a look at page 10 of my statement.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps the most blatant inequity—the Treasurer is getting too exercised. Even as a young man, his heart is going to suffer from this.

Perhaps the most blatant inequity of all, even though it be short-term, is that when he boosted the sales tax, he made it applicable on May 1 rather than immediately. Thus everybody who has the money can go out before May 1 and stock up on liquor and cars and television sets, you name it, thereby escaping the tax. Those in the lower income groups who don't have the money will have to pay the higher tax when they have saved up enough to acquire some urgent family need later in the year. All this, we note, is coming from the man who poses today as the champion of tax equity.

There is a footnote to my comments on this tax equity. I think, without breaking the sequence of it, I'd like to put on the record the observations of another man which were referred to by my leader this afternoon when he quoted from a speech of the member for Chatham-Kent in Strathroy—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Sarnia!

Mr. Lewis: March 12.

Mr. MacDonald: Strathroy, on March 12.

Mr. Bullbrook: That close!

Mr. MacDonald: He never strays far from home these days. I quote:

> Energy, like bread or milk or property taxes, is a commodity tax that has regressive incidence in its characteristics. In other words, a price increase on energy affects the little guy on the income scale almost as much as, and proportionately more than, the higher income earner. They likely consume comparable amounts of energy.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: He said, "For that reason—"

Mr. Stokes: Good old Darcy!

Mr. MacDonald: This is the member for Chatham-Kent speaking.

Mr. Stokes: Good old Darcy.

Mr. MacDonald: He is the energy adviser, if he only had somebody to listen to him in the Treasury.

Hon. Mr. White: That's why we have retail sales tax credits.

Mr. MacDonald: He said, "For that reason—"

Hon. Mr. White: That's why we have retail sales tax credits.

Mr. MacDonald: He said, "For that reason—"

What did the Treasurer say?

Mr. Lewis: He said, "That's why we have retail sales tax credits."

Mr. MacDonald: We'll get to that in a moment.

Hon. Mr. White: And that credit—

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer is worse than a windmill!

Mr. MacDonald: We'll get to that in a moment.

Mr. Lewis: He is a Don Quixote over there!

Mr. MacDonald: The member for Chatham-Kent said, "For that reason, price increases are an inequitable means for bringing about energy conservation." There can't be tax equity but here is what he is doing, defying the advice of the newly appointed energy adviser.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He'll be sorry; he'll get it!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: He forces his private obsession on the people of Ontario. He has this thing about energy taxes; it's a personal fixation of his.

Hon. Mr. White: No, I have fixations but that isn't one of them.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it is. I know about the others. They are not worth raising publicly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: They're dogs and flowers.

An hon. member: We can't tax those.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, so far I have been attempting to take a critical overview of the budget. I'd like now to challenge the provincial Treasurer on his own ground and on his own terms, because in his heart of hearts—I can hear the wheels turning over there—he's been saying that all of this is invalid, for his reasons. I am convinced that on his own ground his case is just as vulnerable as it is in the overview.

Being a one-time university lecturer, the provincial Treasurer has presented his budget in terms of an academic model which he believes to be impregnable in its logic. Academics always think their models are impregnable.

Like many academic models, it strays pretty far from reality, particularly because it is based on two premises, both of which are false. The first premise is that Ontario taxes are the lowest, or among the lowest, in Canada and certainly the most progressive. He implied this in his budget. On the TV panel which I shared with him on budget night over at CFTO, he not only implied it, he asserted it with all that super-confidence which characterizes the hon. gentleman. But despite his super-confidence, he is dead wrong.

In December, 1972, Alan M. Maslove completed the study I referred to earlier, the one for the Economic Council of Canada on "The Pattern of Taxation in Canada". Let me give a few of his documented conclusions.

Generally speaking, Maslove concluded that the Canadian tax system is extremely regressive at the lower income levels, and that there

is a lack of progressivity over the remaining income levels. Now that should surprise no one. After all, it just confirms what the Carter study federally and the Smith study provincially have already documented for us.

Hon. Mr. White: That's why we are sifting these tax costs upwards.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sifting?

Mr. MacDonald: We'll get to that in a moment. Despite the fact that Ontario has the highest income levels, Maslove then documented the regressive nature of our tax system and concluded:

> With either income concept, the most regressive incidence pattern over the lower income levels is in Ontario. [He is talking about the whole of Canada.] In addition, over most of the income scale, taxation in Ontario is slightly more regressive (less progressive) than the national average except at the very highest level, where the Ontario pattern is more progressive.

Here's our new champion of the working people, the poor. Can I read that for the Treasurer again?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, please do.

Mr. MacDonald: Right! He says the very highest level is where the Ontario pattern is more progressive: everywhere else it is the most regressive.

Hon. Mr. White: How does he define the very highest?

Mr. MacDonald: Read the book—here.

Hon. Mr. White: How does he define it, over $1,000 or what?

Mr. MacDonald: Take this over to the provincial Treasurer and let him read it while he's listening.

Mr. Lewis: Can he read?

Mr. Cassidy: Can he understand?

Mr. Stokes: Are there any pictures in it for him?

Mr. MacDonald: On March 22, 1973, less than a month ago, the Economic Council of Canada released figures on the average effective tax rate per family unit. Ontario has the highest effective tax rate over the full income base and the second highest on the so-called broad income base. In short, the most recent figures available indicate that Ontario is one of the most heavily taxed provinces in Canada.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): But not the mining industry. They got $16 million. We don't tax them.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me proceed.

A study undertaken by the Canadian Tax Foundation compared tax rates in major provincial cities. It found that at the $5,000 income level, Toronto families paid 34.1 per cent of their income in provincial, municipal and federal taxes, the highest across the country. At the $10,400 income level, Toronto families had dropped into second place, paying 35.7 per cent of their income in taxes, compared with 36.4 per cent in Montreal.

Mr. Martel: That's a progressive step.

Mr. MacDonald: Significantly, Mr. Speaker, at the income level of $52,000—that's getting pretty rarified, although I know you're in it too—Toronto families had dropped to fourth place, paying 49.5 per cent, lower than Regina, Winnipeg and Montreal.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martel: What else is new?

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Backscratchers!

Mr. MacDonald: Now the provincial Treasurer has a new pose; he's posing as the new champion of the poor. I don't think the poor are going to be fooled by any of this, but the danger is that the provincial Treasurer is going to fool himself.

The public image that he is presenting of Ontarians being the mostly lightly taxed in Canada is, to put it bluntly, false—and blatantly so. No man of integrity can continue to publicly argue such a case; and since the provincial Treasurer is a man of integrity, in spite of all his other faults, I trust that we have heard the last of that propaganda argument.

Let me proceed to the second premise upon which the provincial Treasurer's model is built. The Toronto Star's editorial calculations yesterday contained a serious error in mistaking the property tax reduction with the property tax credit, but they were right on when they contended that the provincial Treasurer is attempting a sleight-of-hand trick on the people of Ontario; it's something that might be funny on the stage with a magician but isn't very funny when it's in a provincial budget.

Hon. Mr. White: They just left out a few factors.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not defending the mistaken calculations in it, but their conclusion about the sleight of hand was dead on. In fact, they borrowed a phrase that I was intending to use in the budget debate and I rather objected to it being stolen and used in that fashion ahead of me.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sleight of hand?

Mr. MacDonald: Sleight of hand, yes.

Put in the simplest terms, the provincial Treasurer argues—and here we are getting right onto his ground Mr. Speaker, right onto his ground—that the increase in sales taxes, including energy, will all be returned to the people in tax credits or larger grants to the municipalities to relieve the property tax, and that the net result will be no tax increase at all. Now there is a magician; no tax increase at all. In short, he is raising money here and he is paying it out there and the net result is that there is no higher tax in the overall.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, it is a neat trick, but it ain't true! In the first place, surely it is preposterous that any government should become involved in raising taxes by one of the most regressive levies at the provincial level, namely the sales tax—

Hon. Mr. White: Oh come now. It is not as regressive as the personal income tax.

Mr. MacDonald: —in order to relieve the burden of the most regressive tax at the local level, namely the property tax.

Hon. Mr. White: Come on, come on!

Mr. MacDonald: That is a bizarre procedure. Only a romanticist of the provincial Treasurer's exceptional capacities could become involved in that kind of an exercise and have the face to try to kid the public that it was a good thing.

However, let's look at it another way. On a full year the sales tax will return $340 million and the energy tax $100 million for a total of $440 million picked from the pockets of the people of Ontario—a modern salt tax. The tax credits, by the provincial Treasurer's own admission, will amount to $90 million a year on the sales tax, including energy, plus an extra $20 million on pensioners' rebates beyond the $20 million which they had been paying out in the $50 and $100 grants.

Hon. Mr. White: Plus $440 million for the municipalities.

Mr. MacDonald: That makes a total new payout, following this hike in sales tax, of $110 million—$90 million for the rebate on energy and sales tax, and $20 million new on the pensioners' rebates.

Hon. Mr. White: Plus $440 million for the municipalities.

Mr. MacDonald: But that is not the end—you know, he is uncanny—that is not the end of the government's generosity, the Treasurer contends. I read his mind so well that I can tell him what is in his budget before he has given it, quite frankly. That is the funny part of it.

In addition, the municipalities will receive, says the provincial Treasurer, $180 million more in grants through the property tax stabilization plan, which will cut local taxes by six mills in the south and 12 mills in the north. Look at the sceptical look on the face of the cabinet minister behind the Treasurer. He knows darned well that up in Moonbeam the taxes aren't going to come down 12 mills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are going to have to pay a lot more for their fuel. They need a lot of fuel in Moonbeam.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there are a few points here on which I might be inclined to quibble: $40 million of this $180 million are higher school grants which, may I remind you, were recommended by the Smith committee seven years ago and have been talked about ad nauseam ever since. Whether or not it is a fair proposition even, for this provincial Treasurer to include them as something of a rebate after a new sales tax put on this year is a little questionable.

But let's not quibble. Let's be generous with the provincial Treasurer. Let's accept his figures just as he presents them. The new revenue from the sales tax, including energy, will be $440 million in a full year. The payout in tax credits will be $110 million, plus another $180 million in larger municipal grants for a total payout of $290 million.

Hon. Mr. White: In brand new grants.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. The difference is $150 million more than the taxes he is going to collect. Yet the provincial Treasurer would have us believe that he is just taking the money in with one hand and paying it out with the other hand and the net result is that there is no tax increase across the Province of Ontario.

The scoundrel! He is trying to mislead us. When he is finished with the payout—

Hon. Mr. White: The member just dropped $260 million.

Mr. MacDonald: I haven't left out any $260 million!

And when he's finished with the payout—

Hon. Mr. White: Yes he has!

Mr. MacDonald: He's still going to have an extra $150 million in his greedy paw. That's the point.

Mr. Lewis: That's right. Right!

Mr. Cassidy: Right!

Mr. Lewis: And is it greedy!

Mr. MacDonald: However, let's deal with the issue once again on his terms.

The provincial Treasurer has an ace in the hole—and I want to be fair, I want to bring all his arguments into the picture.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): He's playing it pretty close to the vest!

Mr. MacDonald: The provincial Treasurer has an ace in the hole, so to speak. This payout, he says, will go mostly to the lower-income groups, thereby correcting the inequity in our tax structure, which he acknowledges. Well let's probe a bit into the detail.

Consider, first, this $180 million which is going to the municipalities to bring about a tax cut of six mills in the south and 12 mills in the north; for an average family saving, he says, of $25 in the south and $50 in the north. To begin with, the provincial Treasurer can't give us any assurance these cuts would take place across the board; and I'll bet him a double shot of his favourite Harvey's Shooting Sherry that it's not going to happen.

Hon. Mr. White: That's a bet.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, that's a bet. It'll be the cheapest bet I've ever had with the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. White: Let Hansard record that wager.

Mr. MacDonald: Furthermore, even if it did happen, what assurance is there that the average taxpayer is going to get the benefit of it?

Has the provincial Treasurer, for example, forgotten that over 43 per cent of municipal assessment in Ontario is commercial and industrial? In short, nearly half of his higher municipal grants will never get back to the people. Some of them will get back to small businessmen, who are deserving, but most of this 43 per cent will go back to business, fattening the corporate coffers still more.

Mr. Cassidy: Shame!

Mr. MacDonald: And what assurance can the provincial Treasurer give us that it's going to be passed on to the consumer? None of course; not a bit!

If the taxpayer is a homeowner, sure, he'll get it directly.

But according to the Dennis report on housing, one third of the people over $8,000 income, and one half of the people under $8,000 income, are tenants; not homeowners, tenants! What guarantee can the provincial Treasurer give us that, in the present housing scarcity, landlords will pass this saving in property taxes on to their tenants?

Mr. Martel: He's not here.

Mr. MacDonald: He's rather silent. He has nothing to say.

What mechanism has the provincial Treasurer set up to assure us that these savings will be passed back by the landlord to the tenant? None of course!

Here's an opportunity—I offer this suggestion to the provincial Treasurer, gratuitously—here's an opportunity for the government to move in and establish a rent review board. It could see that it happens.

Mr. Cassidy: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: But even the poor, struggling homeowner! He's assured of getting his municipal tax cut, or the sales tax rebate; it will come once a year, as a windfall, at tax-paying time; while, regularly, throughout the rest of the year, it will deprive his family of essential extra dollars for basic needs.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a windfall in April or May does little to compensate for hunger in January.

Mr. Cassidy: Hear, hear!

Mr. Laughren: Or cold!

Mr. MacDonald: Or is that a point which can't register with the provincial Treasurer, whose sentimentality shapes our tax structure in terms of exemptions for pedigreed dogs and pets while slapping taxes on low-income families and their children?

And I make a final point in this connection: The provincial Treasurer produced a table. Most members haven't seen it, except

insofar as it was reproduced, one portion of it, in the Globe and Mail. So members may have that.

Interestingly enough this table, which purports to indicate the savings for families in the $5,000, $10,000 and $15,000 income bracket because of the rebates and the municipal grant payouts, wasn't included in the budget or in the budget papers. But the provincial Treasurer distributed it to the media during the press conference that was held prior to the delivery of the budget here in the Legislature.

Well you know, my research colleagues have examined this table in light of Statistics Canada publications—again I'd be glad to lend this to the provincial Treasurer so that he can get in touch with modern reality—

Hon. Mr. White: I think the member invented that quote. I don't see anything here about regressivity.

Mr. Martel: Come on!

Mr. Cassidy: The Globe and Mail found it when they reported on it.

Hon. Mr. White: Has the member enriched the chap's comments slightly?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: "Family Expenditure in Canada"—has the minister finished? Has he exhausted himself once again?

"Family Expenditure in Canada"—

Hon. Mr. White: Just between thee and me, the member cooked the books didn't he?

Mr. MacDonald: I didn't cook the books. I'll send the minister the page numbers by registered mail, through the government services.

Mr. Lewis: We heard the man who paraphrases.

Mr. MacDonald: And so, Mr. Speaker, the point I wanted to get to is that the Treasurer's table simply doesn't stand up. I'm not going to spend a lot of time arguing about this because it's nitty-gritty and it's difficult to deal with on the floor of the House.

Let me give the Treasurer a few examples. In the $5,000 income category, for example, he indicates that $14 a year is the sales tax that the family will likely have to pay. Well, from examination by this detached, impartial study here by Statistics Canada, the figure they come up with is just 50 per cent more—$21 a year.

And here is the most glaring of all. For the seven per cent tax on heat and light, the Treasurer estimates an annual tax of only $7. Isn't this mind-boggling? He is suggesting that the total heat and light bill for the year is only $100. Well, obviously it's absurd.

Mr. Stokes: Just double that.

Mr. MacDonald: This is Ontario, not Tahiti. Statistics Canada fixes it at $18. Quite frankly, my common-sense judgement would be that since the Treasurer himself fixed it at $28 for the $10,000 income bracket, it would be approximately the same cost—

Mr. Lewis: Surely!

Mr. MacDonald: —and rebate for a person who is in the $5,000 bracket. Well, let me quote the member for Chatham-Kent.

Mr. Stokes: For sure; that's right!

Mr. MacDonald: He argued that they each use approximately the same amount of heat—and it's regressive; it's regressive. So the Treasurer has got a total error of at least $18—and heaven knows that $18 could go up to $28—on those two items alone.

And when you get down to the property reduction tax—well this is why I am not going to pursue it too far, because you get into an argument and nobody can prove anything on this particular point.

The Treasurer says that the family of $5,000—according to his table—is going to save $15 during the year; well maybe. But there's plenty of chance he's going to get none of it—particularly if he happens to be a tenant. And tenants represent a very significant proportion of the people.

To sum up, the Treasurer's miscalculations suggest that the $5,000 income family will save $30. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they are going to be lucky to break even—lucky to break even. So the lower-income group—the worthy benefactor of the provincial Treasurer's elaborate exercise in tax raising and redistribution—will get back about the same amount as he pays out.

And as for the growing number of taxpayers to be found in the $10,000 bracket, there is no doubt that they will be paying out in taxes far more than the mythical $9 saving the Treasurer suggested they're going to have when the tax credit and property tax reductions get back to them.

So the whole exercise, Mr. Speaker, isn't just sleight of hand; it comes close to being a fraud—and an expensive fraud at that.

But there's a final point; and with all his skilful political footwork, the minister has managed to conceal it until now. I take pleasure in revealing it.

All these tax credits paid out of the revenues raised from the regressive sales tax, are designed to correct the inequity of the two per cent hike in sales tax. Even if one were to assume that they did correct that inequity—and I have just submitted pretty solid evidence that they don't, or may not—the government is doing nothing about correcting the inequity in the basic five per cent sales tax burden under which our people have laboured for years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: In fact, the government tacitly concedes that the inequity is going to be built into our tax structure in perpetuity —or for at least as long as the Tories are in power. And thank God, that won't be in perpetuity.

If the government is willing to live with the $400 million deficit level in this budget, how much better it would have been for them to have used the $350 million to $500 million or more hidden revenues that will come in during the year to have made tax credits available to eliminate or at least reduce the inequity in the basic five per cent regressive sales tax. Instead the Treasurer has compounded the regressivity of our tax structure by adding two per cent on the sales tax and extending it to energy for light, heat and cooking.

As my hon. friend from Lakeshore would say in one of his bursts of righteous indignation, "Shame on you, White!"

The member for Lakeshore didn't even hear it! He responds more to the Treasurer!

Mr. Lawlor: He is becoming more shameless every day.

Hon. Mr. White: I don't think he is aligning himself with the rich the way the member for York South is.

Mr. Martel: Where is the Treasurer standing now?

Mr. Lewis: Well, the problem with giving the budget is that one can't defend it; it is indefensible.

Mr. MacDonald: In case the provincial Treasurer hasn't found it, I am just reminded the quote from Maslove is on page 73. I am sorry I haven't got the line for him.

Mr. Lewis: Page 73. Beside a coloured picture, if the Treasurer has difficulty finding it.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: If the provincial Treasurer could only read the famous quote.

I would like to turn now to two areas of the budget, the so-called farm and municipal packages, where I have some qualified words of commendation, and I hope this comes as a bit of relief to the provincial Treasurer.

First the farm: The provincial Treasurer says that in moving to a 50 per cent rebate on property taxes, he has in effect lifted property taxes off farmland altogether. I don't know that that generalization will accurately reflect the situation in every case, because it will depend on what portion of farm property is in land and what proportion is in residence and buildings. But generally it is no doubt true, and that being the case, I want to congratulate the provincial Treasurer.

In 1973 the government has moved to implement a measure of property tax relief for farmers that was included in the NDP programme when the party was founded in 1961. That's about the normal pace at which the Tories come to grips with urgent problems and I suppose one shouldn't be ungrateful for little blessings that finally have been received.

I am going to move on to the second area; the property tax stabilization plan. Again I want to congratulate the provincial Treasurer, because what the government in effect is now doing is implementing the municipal tax foundation programme which I first detailed in this Legislature in 1968.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into any detailed analysis of this new so-called property tax stabilization plan. I am going to be very frank with you. We would like a lot more time to analyse its impact and to compare its advantages, if any, and its deficiencies, some of which are obvious, with the municipal tax foundation proposal which we made some six years ago.

There are one or two obvious weaknesses. For example why, when you move with the resource equalization grant—which is to

eliminate the assessment base inadequacy of any municipality—why when you move to eliminate that, do you eliminate only 50 per cent instead of 100 per cent? Of course, it is the Tory way to do it. If the Treasurer is going to remove the inequity, remove it totally! It would only cost $52 million more, and in a budget of nearly $7 billion, surely if you are going to do it, do it whole hog and remove the inequity completely; but no.

I want to come back to that later, because I don't think we should drag our feet in finally coming to grips with this point.

Hon. Mr. White: I just love the way the member says, "Only $52 million." That really touches me. As C. D. Howe said, "What's a million?"

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I will come to it. I will come to it in a moment.

The second weakness that stares out at one is that once again this government is short-changing the north. Now, I grant you that the north is going to get higher grants. In every instance it is going to get higher grants, whether they be the general purpose grants, or whether they be the resources equalization grants which are available to municipalities all across the Province of Ontario.

Surely in the year 1973 we have come to recognize as a basic in our policy consideration that in the north we have got unique problems that are a product of weather, of rock and topographical conditions, and many other things. This government was beginning to meet some of these unique problems of the north by the mine revenue payments. In fact, last year this extra payment to the north—because of the area's unique problems and the costs involved in meeting them—through the mine revenue payments was going to be about $13 million; minus a bit that's peanuts which may go to a few southern municipalities. What is the government now going to pay specially to the north in the so-called grant that meets the special needs of the north?

Mr. Stokes: Wait until the government hears from Manitouwadge; just wait until it hears.

Mr. MacDonald: It is going to be paying $8.6 million. So it is chiselling about $4.5 million from the north once again in terms of a special grant to meet the special problems, the unique problems of the north, apart from anything else that is given across the board equally to all constituents.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): We are always being short-changed down here.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this property tax stabilization plan that I just want to throw out quietly to the provincial Treasurer for some consideration. Quite frankly, this is another reason why we want to take a more detailed look at this before we come to a final conclusion.

I think the time has come for the province to practise what it preaches. The province has always preached that it was entitled to a fair share of the growth taxes from the federal government. I think the time has come for the province to practise, at least on an experimental basis to begin with, the giving of some of the growth taxes, some points in the income tax field.

I think there are other advantages that would flow from this. As the government moves toward—and I know this is in the mind of the provincial Treasurer—moves toward trying to restore some of the lost autonomy at the local level through the development of more efficient administrative units, whether they be regional government or not, one of the best ways to restore that autonomy is to give these municipalities money that they know is theirs as part of a growth tax, so that they won't always regard themselves almost as a "kept woman", looking for a living allowance from sugar daddy at Queen's Park.

Mel Swart who, apart from being provincial president of the New Democratic Party in the Province of Ontario today, is a member of the regional government in Niagara and a past president and secretary of the Ontario Association of Mayors and Reeves, has been preaching this for years. Dave Crombie has been arguing for it with more and more vigour.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit a slight interruption, this matter was discussed by the municipal liaison committee and by me earlier today. I am looking into the matter.

Mr. MacDonald: I am reading the Treasurer's mind even more than I thought.

Hon. Mr. White: The meeting, incidentally, is still going on, but I tore myself away to listen to my hon. friend.

Mr. MacDonald: That is rather good because the Treasurer sees the quality of the ideas by coming over here.

The point I was making was that people who are leaders, acknowledged leaders in the municipal field, have been arguing this. Indeed I understand, although I wasn't there to be able to share it, that at the trilevel conference that was held down in the Four Seasons Hotel this was one of the main considerations. So I repeat, perhaps on an experimental basis to begin with—on what basis, whether it has to be regional government or county level or what, I have no definite conclusions—the granting to municipal governments of some share of the growth taxes, mainly the income taxes, is something that should be worked in. How the Treasurer works that in with his new model, the property tax stabilization plan, I don't exactly know. But we'll do some thinking on it and give him the benefit of our thoughts at a later date when we get into the estimates.

Mr. Speaker, we in the NDP have always operated on the basis that, while it is our responsibility as an opposition party to criticize the budget, it is also our obligation to present some alternatives.

Mr. Stokes: We are always positive and constructive.

Mr. MacDonald: I want to do that as briefly as possible. The Treasurer shouldn't get too excited because it won't be as brief as perhaps he'd hope.

I have already indicated that we oppose the sales tax increase. Instead, living with the $400 million deficit level which the government itself has presented, it would have been possible to use the greater revenues which will come in during the year to make tax credits and higher municipal grants available, thereby eliminating some of the inequity in the basic five per cent sales tax and the property taxes. All that could have been done, achieving the objectives of the budget without imposing more regressive taxes.

But in our view this government need not and should not rest there. There are other pressing needs, such as—as I just pointed out—the 100 per cent rather than the 50 per cent resources equalization grants, to move more closely to producing a capacity for all municipalities to bring their services up to an appropriate provincial standard.

Let me illustrate another pressing need. The government is playing games with this vital issue of housing. The shortage today of adequate housing at a reasonable price is surely one of the most serious problems facing the province. The government has long since tacitly admitted by its support of the OHC that the private sector cannot deliver the amount nor the kind of housing that is needed.

The number of OHC housing starts has declined seriously in the past year. From a record 11,430 in 1971, housing starts for the OHC rent-geared-to-income programme declined to 6,012 in 1972. Grasp that, Mr. Speaker—from 11,430 down to 6,012.

This is no time to gear down on the housing programme in the Province of Ontario. The children of the postwar baby boom are now in their mid-twenties, housing demand is rising and prices are skyrocketing.

One might have hoped that the government would make a vastly increased financial commitment to the OHC as a sort of cornerstone of its budgetary programme. The Treasurer seemed to indicate that such was the case, and I quote:

> . . . the government has been able to effect a shift in investments to the fields of housing and urban development. . . . During a four-year period, the amount of capital investment in education has declined from 60 to 25 per cent of total investment; investment in public housing and development has increased to take up the largest share at 41 per cent of the total . . .

He includes a table showing an investment of $269.9 million in housing this year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, on close examination, this $269.9 million turns out to be a sham. It resembles the infamous $500 million, 130,000-job housing programme promised in the 1971 Throne Speech.

Mr. Lewis: The Allan Grossman special.

Mr. MacDonald: The members will remember that fiasco. The promise evaporated within a couple of days.

The government's financial statements appended to the budget contain a detailed breakdown of government investments. Investments in housing and urban development take the form of loans and advances to three institutions: the Housing Corp. Ltd., Ontario Housing Corp. and Ontario Student Housing Corp.

Here is what has happened, Mr. Speaker. The provincial government's investment in housing increased from $94.3 million in 1970 to $134.9 million in 1971, with a further increase to $137 million in 1972 and a decline to $125.9 million in 1973. The difference between the intended investment in housing this year of $125.9 million and the $269.9 million figure that is listed in the budget, is

the $144 million in that elusive North Pickering suspense account.

Quite apart from the fact that the $144 million will produce no housing in 1973 and therefore it is an illusion, it is likely that most of the $144 million will not be spent at all.

In summing up his budget the Treasurer stated, on page 33, "We have provided this full amount [$144 million] in our estimates but our own net cost could be substantially lower if a satisfactory agreement for CMHC participation can be reached." He then goes on to suggest, "Ontario's public debt will be reduced by between $100 and $200 million in 1973-1974 largely because of the unutilized portion of the $144 million North Pickering suspense account."

Mr. Speaker, when the provincial Treasurer wants to show that the province is investing large amounts of capital in home construction he adds the $144 million. When he wants to show that the province is reducing a public debt, he again uses the $144 million. That's what I would describe as a case of duplicity.

Mr. Lewis: Right! It is like his tax credit. He uses the same amount for everything.

Mr. MacDonald: This government shouldn't be playing this sort of game with the housing shortage. This should be the centrepiece of any social and economic strategy for a government today. Social, because in no other way can we do more to remove the hardship suffered by people living in substandard housing and paying exorbitant rents. Economic, because a massive housing programme could do more than anything else to create jobs in large numbers.

How can we do all this? This, of course, will be the provincial Treasurer's legitimate question. All these pressing needs, how are they going to be paid for? I'm going to suggest three tax sources, none of which would seriously counter the desirable expansionary thrust of any budget today.

First is succession duties; second, resource taxes; and third, a full capital gains tax. I want to take a look at each one of those in some measure of detail.

First, the succession duties. A couple of days ago, with the assistance of our research department, I released to the public a statement on succession duties which is, for the most part, an analysis of the report of the advisory committee on succession duties which the government appointed and the minister in his budget has thanked so graciously for its report.

One of the most neglected fields of taxation in this country, in our view in the New Democratic Party, is the transfer of wealth between generations.

Mr. Martel: It gives some a head start.

Mr. MacDonald: I want to quote one or two sources to indicate that this isn't a wild doctrinaire socialist concept. It's a concept which is quite frankly advocated by many people who take an objective approach to the whole question of tax structures and equity within the tax structure. For example, even the advisory commitee on succession duties, in its own report, had this quote:

> To the extent that the income tax ignores capacity to pay as represented by ownership of capital assets, the whole revenue system departs from the principle of ability to pay. Taxes based on wealth can mitigate this deficiency.

It's to be found in the appendix, on page 3.

Even the member for Chatham-Kent, in 1972, after the federal government had announced its intention of moving out of the estates tax field, had this to say in a speech to the Estates Planning Council of Ontario: "The principles of equity and ability to pay both demand maintenance of some form of wealth taxation, in spite of the recent introduction of capital gains taxation."

Prof. John Bossons of the Institute for Policy Analysis at the University of Toronto has made a very careful study of this field. He revealed an estimate to the Canadian Tax Foundation in 1971 that there's something like $4.5 billion owned by approximately 200,000 Canadians, who are escaping a fair share of taxation. His observation was: "It is difficult to find any social or economic rationale for eliminating the estate tax."

Now let me put it on the record, without going into the details, that this government from the days of Charlie MacNaughton through the member for Chatham-Kent and now confirmed by the present provincial Treasurer, has indicated that its intention is a phased elimination of the succession duties.

When one reads between the lines of the report of their own hand-picked advisory committee on succession duties one comes to the conclusion that the committee doesn't agree with that. They bow out and say that it is not their job to say whether there should be succession duties; that's a political de-

cision—and they are right. They also bow out when they are discussing the level at which succession duties should be fixed because, they argue, that's a political decision—and again they are right. It's interesting, though, that they suggest that for purposes of illustrating their point, the level should be kept at what it was then; namely, about $75 million.

But the most important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the report of the advisory committee on succession duties, a report from a committee appointed by this government, shot down the three oft-repeated premises that the government is always using as an argument against succession duties. Just let me note these for you.

The first premise is that Ontario's duty has an undesirable impact on small business and family farms. Well, the committee sent out 277 questionnaires to farm estates and 294 to small business estates, and it got a phenomenal response—78 per cent from the farm estates and 67 per cent from the small business estates. Only 10 farm estates and only 12 business estates reported that the burden of succession duties or estate tax had any effect on the decision to sell, and the taxes were not the only reason in most cases.

Mr. Martel: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacDonald: Surprisingly, 161 farms out of 271 responding were not sold, and 157 businesses out of the 197 reporting were not sold.

An hon. member: Of course not!

Hon. Mr. White: It's the ones that were sold that worry me.

Mr. Renwick: The ones that were sold were sold for a multiple of reasons.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the NDP's response to the succession duties on farmlands?

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the hon. member going to give us the NDP response to the need for succession duties on farmlands?

Mr. MacDonald: We agree. As a matter of fact, on this occasion we, with the Tories assisting, badgered the Liberals in Ottawa to change it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right. So why is my friend putting the position forward that it has nothing to do with the sale of the farms?

Mr. MacDonald: I am reporting what's in the report of this committee that was set up by this government—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is called a straw man.

Mr. Renwick: It is not a straw man at all.

Mr. MacDonald: I am trying to undercut the proposition that they are using in these arguments. It is the usual kind of straw man raised by the Liberals. There was so little in their criticism of the budget that they—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The hon. member is cranking up to be knocked down.

Mr. Martel: What was that policy they stated yesterday?

Mr. MacDonald: The second premise is that the succession duties and estate taxes have an undesirable impact on Canadian ownership.

The questionnaires returned—and note this, Mr. Speaker—indicated that in no case did a sale occur that resulted in control passing to foreign ownership, either for farms or family businesses. And I assume that this questionnaire was scientifically distributed and scientifically framed.

The third premise is that the taxation of capital gains under the income tax system is an adequate substitute for inheritance taxes. Well, the committe points out that less than one-half of the assets held by Ontario estates are capable of producing capital gains or losses. The principal residences, retirement plan benefits, insurance proceedings, savings and fixed-interest-bearing investments, for example, are unlikely to produce capital gains or losses.

The committee does recognize that there is a "double whammy" effect on estates from succession duties and that the deemed realization of capital gains is a debt. It suggests an Ontario succession duty credit to offset this, but does not consider this to be a perfect solution and would prefer a change in the federal income tax law to solve the problem.

It goes on to mention many other things, Mr. Speaker. It refers to the Act as a quaint Act, like the Dower Act and Line Fences Act. It points out that the Act is so out of date that it has actuarial compensations prescribed on the basis of 1937 annuity tables based on "male lives only" and the use of a four per cent interest assumption. Now, that's really up to date.

It goes on to point out that the Act is so out of touch with modern reality—and here, I am sure, our swinging provincial Treasurer would agree—that it puts all non-relatives in as "strangers," so that you've got "relatives" and "non-relatives." It comments: "People do not leave property to strangers, but to friends or lovers," and chooses to head one of its tables in appendix B as "non-relatives" and in brackets "friends, mistresses, etc."

Mr. Lewis: No, no!

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, it was a swinging committee.

Mr. Lewis: No!

Mr. MacDonald: It was a swinging committee. It goes on to talk about tax avoidance, and the simple proposition of families setting up companies in Alberta. A sort of domestic tax haven—and all of the other tax havens around the world. It has something to say, for example, about the rates of duty, but I repeat, it adds that whatever be the rate of duty, it is operating on the assumption that we should be maintaining at least the present level of revenue, which was $75 million at the time that it was doing this study.

I want to get to the question of potential revenue, because I think this is of significance for this—

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member leaves that subject, he inadvertently misled the House by using what he purported to be my words, namely, "phased elimination of succession duties." I have never contemplated any such thing. The words used are, "phased decreases in succession duties." I quite agree that there should be substantial taxes on very large estates.

Mr. MacDonald: That is rather interesting. That's rather interesting, because if I go back to his predecessors—and I don't know whether I happen to have the quotations right here; let's take a look at what a former Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) said:

> The government intends to continue its policy of gradually reducing the level of succession duties as the capital gains tax matures.

I suppose, to be fair, that doesn't necessarily say explicitly that they are going to reduce them to zero.

What about Charlie MacNaughton?

> As capital gains taxation becomes fully mature in the years ahead, undue accumulations of wealth will be moderated. In Ontario's view, therefore, the need for taxation of estates will diminish and such taxation should be gradually eliminated.

Mr. Martel: Oh, oh, oh, oh!

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I understood the hon. member was quoting from my document.

Mr. MacDonald: No, no. What I said—

Hon. Mr. White: I would never contemplate eliminating death duties on very large estates.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, okay; I am very glad to have that assurance.

Mr. Cassidy: You will tax only five a year, is that right?

Mr. MacDonald: It's a small measure of progress if we've had this retreat.

What I said was that there had been statements by two former Treasurers, now confirmed by this minister, toward phased elimination. I was a bit inaccurate. The previous Treasurer wanted it as a phased elimination. The minister is now saying that as provincial Treasurer he is not in favour of complete elimination; it's a retreat. I'll take note. It's a little new story. The 2,000 or 3,000 families across the province who are paying estate taxes will be very interested.

I want to get around to the potential revenues. The committee notes that the succession duties are yielding about 25 per cent of taxable estates, but with the broader exemptions now in effect, from those announced in the budget, we can expect the effective rate of tax to drop to about 20 per cent or less. And the committee's revised schedule of rates and exemptions would have resulted in an effective rate of about 20 per cent.

We in the New Democratic Party question whether a rate of 20 to 25 per cent is an adequate return to the state on transfers between generations, especially if there is a generous allowance for widows and dependants. The balance of beneficiaries are generally receiving windfall gains which they have done nothing to earn. It doesn't seem to us to be unreasonable to expect an effective return of 50 per cent from the estates—

Mr. Martel: I'll buy that.

Mr. MacDonald: —of the approximately 17 per cent of the persons dying each year in Ontario who have sufficient wealth to be tax-

able under the exemption proposals of the committee.

We don't advocate a flat rate of 50 per cent, because we think that there should be equity in tax structures at all levels and therefore the tax should be graded. The fairest way of taxing inheritance is the method recommended and argued by the Carter committee, to make it part of the income of the inheritor and to tax it at full income tax rates so that his ability to pay is taken into account.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's get this in figures. We estimate that a 50 per cent return on succession duties would bring in twice what the province received in 1970-1971 before the exemptions were drastically altered—that is about $160 million. There will be some natural growth in the tax base in the period since 1970-1971—it has been averaging about 10 per cent a year up until then—so it would not be unreasonable to expect $175 million to $200 million, assuming the exemption pattern proposed by the committee is adopted. This means an increase in revenues over the present budget figure—which incidentally is now down to $59 million. It means that there would be an increase in revenues of anywhere from $116 million to $141 million.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): In 1970-1971 you could only leave your wife $75,000 tax free. Is the member suggesting that this is your policy?

Mr. MacDonald: No, it went up to, way beyond—

Mr. Good: It went up to $125,000 and then $250,000 and then $500.000.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Good: You want to take money from widows.

Mr. MacDonald: That's right.

Mr. Good: Your figures are three years old.

Mr. MacDonald: Where does the member stand on this?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. MacDonald: Where does the member stand on this?

When we heard the Liberal criticism, they took the basically irresponsible position of saying that they have the right to criticize the government, but no obligation to present any alternatives. Now we have a few interjections from which the members can guess as to what their alternative may be.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): They wouldn't have a clue to start with.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer will shake his head. The Treasurer will shake his head at these figures and say that the estate taxation at that level—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: What a raucous noise that is up there.

The Treasurer will say that the estate taxation at that level will reduce funds available for investment. Well, everyone knows that the bulk of investment funds come from the returned earnings of big businesses and capital cost allowances; and estate taxation may be an incentive for owners of capital to put it to work. Both the Treasurer and the committee may feel that a greater inheritance tax will encourage tax avoidance schemes, and the flight to tax havens.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that it's the job of this government to close as many loopholes as possible and to co-operate with the federal government in shutting off tax havens; not to throw in the sponge and eliminate the tax altogether. I also say that we cannot be certain of the amount of tax avoidance until we try the new rate. If then we find they are detrimental to our growth at home, that is the time to reconsider the question.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is one source of revenues that can be got without countering—I repeat—any of the economic and fiscal thrust that a budget today should have.

I want to turn now to the resource industries. For years we have been saying, Mr. Speaker, that resource industries are one of the great untapped sources of revenue in this province. And for years the government has been saying that imposing higher levies on them would discourage exploration, stop the development of new mines and jeopardize mining jobs. For years, they have been saying that the mines are the lifeblood of the north, and that exporting minerals is one of the chief sources of Ontario's wealth.

Only last month, for example, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) spoke to the Prospectors and Developers Association and assured it that he was still on the government's wavelength. He said:

> Nor can we in Ontario assume, as some have suggested, that we can continue to load the mining industry with taxes and other basic costs of refining ores in Ontario, raising our prices to a non-competitive level.

You know, it's really a make-believe world that he lives in—a make-believe world.

And the Treasurer, in the budget this year, reiterated the government's position by pledging "to maintain a total tax burden on the mining industry approximately at its present level." Well, I'll show you a little later that that burden is a flea-bite.

And now Eric Kierans has come along.

I just want to pause here, Mr. Speaker, because I have been fascinated in watching the Pavlovian-dog reaction from that side of the House; and particularly that of the Minister of Natural Resources, who gets all his documents written by people who have moved out of industry.

This government is a trustee on behalf of the people of Ontario, to protect their wealth. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if anybody, and particularly if it happens to be a man who has been a successful businessman, who is a former president of the Montreal Stock Exchange, a former cabinet minister, if he comes forward with ideas with regard to the mistaken policies of the past, we are entitled to something more than the Pavlovian-dog reaction; because what government spokesmen prove by their reaction is that they are not trustees of the people's wealth.

Mr. Laughren: They are highgrading it from us.

Mr. MacDonald: What they are doing is playing patsie for the industries, and I think it is about time we took a look at what these industries have been able to get away with. I am not going to do it in our terms, I am not going to do it in the terms of what some people might choose to describe as socialist, doctrinaire socialist or what all. I am going to do it in terms of Eric Kierans' analysis, because he was invited in to take a look at it in terms of the Manitoba situation.

Mr. Martel: It's a ripoff!

Mr. MacDonald: In analysing Manitoba's resource policies, he has exposed the pattern of Canadian resource policies generally, and he shows that it is basically a sellout of the people's own wealth. Let me quote one paragraph from his recent report on natural resource policies in Manitoba, to be found on page 7:

> A province may boast that it is rich in natural resources and point to the variety and size of its deposits of extractive minerals. Physically, the evidence appears to be there. Economically the boast is idle if the costs of bringing the resources to markets are less than, or simply equal to, the value received by their sale. There has been merely a consumption of the wealth and some activity during the process.
>
> Similarly, a province may decide to turn over its wealth for exploitation by others, to whom the surpluses or rent will accrue. In return the province will receive some small addition to its labour force as people are employed in extracting its wealth. It is the province which is defining its people as drillers and miners and incapable of fulfilling a role as owners, managers and developers of their own wealth.
>
> In this instance there may well be surpluses, but the province cannot on that account continue to call itself rich in resources, because it will have given away all its claim to the surpluses generated. The wealthy will be the operators, the corporations to whom the benefits now belong; the province would merely preside over the consumption of the wealth while receiving little or no income; and as the wealth is slowly eaten away the landlords become poorer.

That is what is happening in Ontario. In exchange for a few jobs and some mining and processing activity, we have given away great quantities of our priceless, irreplaceable resources. The dollars earned have not come back to the people of the north, they have not come back to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Martel: The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot) thinks so.

Mr. MacDonald: They have not been available for investment in secondary industries and new job-creating activities. Our mineral weath has been transformed into another form of wealth, but the results of the transformation have accrued to the benefit of a few whom we have allowed to exploit this wealth.

I don't deny that the jobs which have been created are very important to us and to the people whose livelihoods depend on

them. But in recognizing their value we have averted our eyes from our disappearing wealth, the disappearing billions which could have created more jobs and underpinned both our northern and southern communities, knitting them together rather than letting them develop in isolation and at a lesser rate.

Kierans sums it up this way:

> Resource-rich nations that continually yield up the value of their wealth in return for the labour employed in its exploitation, will never be more than resource nations. They lose the opportunity to form their own capital, capital which will enable them to break out of that very reliance on their resource base and reduce their independence on foreign investments.

The few jobs, the economic activity and the export of dollars which we have gained, have not been anywhere equivalent in value to what we have given to the exploiters. Because they have been dealing in commodities which have a real or an artificially scarce value, they have been able to command what the economists call "economic rent."

Mr. Martel: The robber barons!

Mr. MacDonald: And what Eric Kierans calls super-profits, profits above and beyond the normal returns on their investment.

An hon. member: The Treasurer knows about economic grants.

Mr. MacDonald: Kierans and outstanding economists like John Stuart Mill and Professor A. C. Pigou claim that such super-profits on natural resources belong to the public, who own the resources, and assert that it is the obligation of governments to ensure that these excess profits flow to the people.

In his report Kierans charges that the governments in Canada have failed dismally in discharging this responsibility. He sums it up on page 39:

> Governments have been willing to sacrifice not only the present but the future stream of revenue flows from their resources. In return for the direct costs, wages principally, being spent within the province, they have given up not only the normal profits on the capital employed, which they could have easily found within themselves, but also the rents and surpluses that come from owning scarce resources in a period of rapidly increasing industrialization and population growth.

He concludes in another passage:

> To be satisfied with the new jobs created and to forgo the surpluses and profits inherent in the development of its own endowment is hardly the mark of a strong and mature government.

Mr. Martel: There was one-third of one per cent last year for the budget!

Mr. MacDonald: Kierans calls for an evaluation of governments' stewardship of the vast natural wealth of this country. I put his searching questions to the government of Ontario:

> Has the government, as landlord of the public resources, received any rent, any net income at all from the private sector to which it has transferred the right to exploit that wealth? If so, how much? How much new capital has been generated out of the transformation of the natural resources? What proportion accrued to the agents, the operators? What proportion was added to the treasury of the landlords, the people of the province? If these proportions are judged to be unfair, what measures can the government take to rectify the imbalances?

Mr. Martel: Leo the lion says we won't change it.

Mr. MacDonald: To the first question we already have the answer. The provincial government has received in rent or tax receipts from the mining industry an annual average of just under $25 million from all forms of taxation in the three years from 1968 to 1970. The industry paid another $23 million to the federal government and an average of $5 million to local governments in the same period. Complete figures are not available for the later years, but the trend is downwards.

In the same three years average value of production was $1.2 billion, so that the net return to the people of Ontario was 2.1 per cent of the production.

What should we be getting? Again, Eric Kierans shows the way to evaluate this. First, he knocks down the myth that mining is a high risk industry that requires lots of capital. That done, the argument that they need special tax treatment disappears.

Then he calculated the actual rate of return before taxes on capital invested, both equity and debt, for the three sectors of the mining industry. He found that it ranged, Mr. Speaker, from 10 per cent for firms

engaged in mining and smelting only, to 28 per cent for integrated companies, and almost 46 per cent for those in mining alone. He regarded these figures as low, since some excess returns are probably hidden in some overhead costs of mining companies which could be reduced.

He suggested that any return over 15 per cent be considered super-profit or economic rent and that government should aim at regaining this excess for the people. This could be done by a variety of tax policies or by setting up Crown corporations to carry on operations where excess profits exist.

Kierans recommends the latter for the highly profitable mining and development sector but not for the smelting and refining sector, which does not appear to have super-profits on the average, though individual companies such as Inco may have such profits. For governments taking the tax route he suggests the following package, and I draw this to the attention of the provincial Treasurer:

First, a 15 to 20 per cent tax on the value of production instead of a mines profits tax. This is the pattern in the petroleum industry now. He prefers the production tax to the profits one, because of the enormous difficulties in separating mining income from smelting and refining profits in integrated companies. Where mining lands and rights are held in freehold, a tax on production might be considered an indirect tax and be ultra vires. There is no problem where mining rights are held by the Crown and leased out, as is the case in most of Canada, but not in all parts of Ontario. This is something we would have to look into if we adopted Kierans' proposal.

Secondly, he suggests a tax on the value of reserves. As Kierans notes, it's remarkable that this form of property has not been subject to assessment and tax, where all others are. Not only would it bring in substantial revenues, but it would force companies either to develop reserves or to release excess ores often held for no other purpose than to deny them to competitors.

Thirdly, he suggests a mineral tax of $1 an acre on all existing leases. It would not be primarily a revenue device, but a means of speeding the return of all mineral rights to the province.

Since the Ontario government doesn't seem inclined to consider the Crown-corporation approach as a means of obtaining the economic rent for the people from their resources, I recommend that it consider these three tax proposals. We estimate they would bring in an extra $300 million a year from the mining industry.

A tax on the value of production at 15 per cent would bring in about $225 million, since production is now running at about $1.5 billion a year. The yield of tax on reserves is difficult to estimate, but a 10-cents-per-ton levy on Inco's reserves alone would bring in over $38 million. I think we might expect $100 million from such a tax overall.

Mr. Stokes: Instead of that we have a depletion allowance.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. A doubling of Ontario's 50-cent acreage tax would bring in $650,000 more, but its purpose would not be primarily revenue. A little more might be obtained if the higher rates were imposed on areas under lease, where the government desired to spur repatriation of the mineral rights to the Crown for immediate development.

The combination of these taxes would yield about $325 million, which is $300 million increase over our present take.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the heavily financed lobby of the mineral industry will say that these taxes would kill the industry. But the government cannot be unaware that many minerals are becoming in very short supply. It cannot ignore the fact that royalty rates are being raised all across this country, and even the federal government has admitted recently that it has been taking too little from the industry from leases.

I will let Kierans have the last word in giving advance to this government:

> The problem is the political one of designing a programme of orderly transition from the mistaken policies of the past to the new institutions and tax policies that will capture economic rent, prevent their dispersion through inefficiency and the waste of excess investment and exploration, and apply the value of replacing the depleted wealth to the needs and priorities of the people concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I wonder if I might interrupt the member for just a moment to make an announcement which I have to make before 5 o'clock.

In accordance with standing order 27(g), I have received two notices from members that they have been dissatisfied with certain answers given during the question period. I have notice from Mr. Deans, noting his dissatisfaction with the answer given by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Develop-

ment having to do with lack of flood control effort by the government. I have notice from Mr. Nixon, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, of his dissatisfaction with the Premier's answer concerning certain information about logbooks, etc. In accordance with section 28(a), these two matters will be called for discussion at the close of business this evening.

The hon. member may continue.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to turn briefly to a third source of new revenues, because another source which has not been fully tapped is capital gains. Our party agreed with Carter that "a buck is a buck" and that there should be no differentiation in the tax burden on the dollar earned on the assembly line and that gained in the marketplace.

Unfortunately we were not able to convince the Liberals at Ottawa that this principle should be part of their so-called tax reform. Instead they gave us a capital gains tax which applies to only half of the capital gains, less losses.

The Ontario Conservatives, in true Tory tradition, did not support the Carter principle but instead favoured the lightest possible kind of capital gains tax when they saw that such a tax was inevitable. They suggested a flat rate of 25 per cent, something like the very inadequate US capital gains tax.

Since the federal government in effect stayed out of half of the capital gains tax field, we see no reason why the provincial government shouldn't move into this vacuum and put into effect the principle that a buck is a buck.

This means that Ontario could obtain from all net capital gains of Ontario taxpayers the same amount as both the federal and provincial governments now obtain from that source. It should be quite feasible for the federal government to collect this extra tax for us simply by doubling the capital gains figures in the income tax returns of Ontario residents.

While capital gains will not provide a great amount of revenue in the first year of the new tax system, they could be expected to build up. We estimate that in the first year of our gap-filling tax the province could expect about $75 million and at the end of five years from $275 million to $300 million.

This is based on the application of full income tax rates to net capital gains of Ontario residents. It can be argued that there are certain kinds of gains which merit even heavier taxation and justify a departure from the buck-is-a-buck theory. I refer particularly to capital gains from land speculation, where the beneficiary does little or nothing to earn his gain. Rather, the development of the community and the provision of urban services is the cause of the gain—and in our opinion such gains should go back to the community in toto, or in large degree.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the full income tax rate stops at 61.3 per cent, federally and provincially, and therefore we suggest that if the top rate for gains for land speculation were raised to 75 or 80 per cent, there would be additional revenue for the province to use to help the municipalities meet the problems of urbanization. We realize there are difficulties in defining speculative gains and for that reason I am merely throwing out this proposal for further study and have not attempted an estimate of the revenue available from this source. However, I would think it would be substantial over time.

So let me try to wrap this up, Mr. Speaker. Let me recapitulate the potential new revenues from these three sources.

First, resources taxes levied in accordance with the Kierans proposals would raise $325 million, some $300 million more than the pittance the people of Ontario now get. Second, succession duties raised on an equitable level could bring in from $115 to $140 million in new revenue beyond the $59 million expected this year. And, third, full capitals gains in the first year would net $75 million, which would rise to $275 or $300 million in the fifth year.

Now there are hundreds of millions. These measures would not only represent potential new revenue but would progressively increase it. They would build greater equity into the tax structure, presumably one of the great concerns of the provincial Treasurer.

Obviously we don't want or need to raise all of this potential at once. These new sources could be progressively taxed as meeting the needs of the province and its people were carefully planned. While we share and while we support the general criticisms of the budget made in the Liberal amendment, they are not enough. We would go further.

Therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Lewis, that the following be added to the amendment:

That his House deplores the fact that the government proposes to raise regressive taxes at the provincial level, ostensibly to relieve equally regressive taxes at the municipal level;

That this House urges the government to finance sales tax and pensioner credits and larger municipal grants from the greater revenues which come in during the year, beyond the under-estimates of the budget; and

That further needs of our people, notably a fully implemented property tax stabilization plan, a sharing of the income tax field with local governments, and a massive housing programme, should be financed through a progressive tapping of the new revenue sources in the resources, succession duties and capital gains field.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have just now learned from a document handed to me that Statistics Canada announced today that Ontario's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in March was 3.9 per cent, so we must be doing something right.

Mr. MacDonald: A question, Mr. Speaker: Does the provincial Treasurer imply by that, that he is going to revise the 4.4 per cent average for the year?

Hon. Mr. White: I imply by this, Mr. Speaker, that this being the lowest rate in years, and by far the lowest in Canada, we must be doing something right; and I think my budget will prove that we are still doing it right.

Mr. Speaker: I am waiting for the next speaker, a motion, or some notice.

Mr. Deans moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. G. Hodgson in the chair.

ESTIMATES, PROVINCIAL SECRETARIAT FOR JUSTICE

(*continued*)

On vote 1101:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Was the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) speaking previously?

Mr. Chairman: No, it was the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy).

Mr. Bullbrook: I just want to make a few general remarks in connection with the statement that the hon. Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr) made on Friday last. I recognize that to some extent there will be some reiteration; as a result, I'll make brevity the essence of my adventure.

The problem that we face on this side of the House is that we were told about 18 months ago, as a result of the third report of the Committee on Government Productivity, that the reorganization of government itself would be an exciting enterprise and that we would see a new thrust in the development of policy in the social, the resources and in the justice fields. I have to say, notwithstanding a fraternal affection I have for the incumbent Provincial Secretary for Justice, that this really has to be about as vacuous, trite and platitudinous an exposition of responsibility in connection with justice policy as one could possibly envisage.

One thought that the opening remarks of the Provincial Secretary for Justice would be an exciting doctrine. One thought, especially one involved in the profession, that we would hear, as it has been litanized by some of my colleagues in the House, the attitude of the Provincial Secretary for Justice and his advisers in connection with federal-provincial relations; in connection with constitutional matters; and in connection with contemporary situations that involve us in the House and the people of this province and the people of other provinces and the Dominion of Canada as a whole.

We would have thought, having regard to the present situation relative to the position taken by Premier Lougheed in Alberta, that we might have aptly considered some response by the head of the Justice policy field in this province as to the constitutionality of the position taken by the Alberta government. We might have thought, with some justification, that this particular Provincial Secretary, without disclosing the confidence of his position, would have told us what would be the thrust of his government in responding to the position taken by Premier Lougheed.

I want to digress for a moment and say that in the vacuum that has been created by the Committee on Government Productivity —one of the authors of that committee being the present Deputy Provincial Secretary for Justice—is the sad personal commentary that

that very Deputy Provincial Secretary for Justice is no longer with us in the active treatment, on a day to day basis, of guiding the Attorney General of this province in and out of the labyrinth of sophisticated and esoteric legislation and guiding him in the House itself. I know I am embarrassing him probably, but in my short term here I've found him to be, without reservation, probably the most astute public servant there is in assisting his minister. To see him placed in the position of almost a eunuch, as is his Provincial Secretary as far as involvement in this field is concerned I find most disenchanting.

Nothing was more attractive to me than to sit in private bills or to sit in this chamber and deal with a man of the stature of the former Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), within his provincial limitations—and I use the phrase provincial in the connotation of being a lawyer from Sault Ste. Marie—being assisted by the Deputy Attorney General at that time, to respond to our queries from time to time.

That really has to be the essence of the opposition's response to the opening statement of the Provincial Secretary for Justice. What a terrible waste of opportunity! I'm not going to reiterate. I'm not going to go over again what my colleague from Downsview (Mr. Singer) and what the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) have catalogued in connection with those opportunities.

Really, if this is forerunner of what we are going to get from the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch), if it is a forerunner of what we are going to get from the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence), then I don't think there is any doubt that we are going to be involved in the vote that is before us now—that is a vote to reduce the estimates by the amount of the Provincial Secretary's salary. We are going to support this on—

Mr. Chairman: Order. That is not the motion.

Mr. Bullbrook: What was the motion?

Mr. Chairman: That vote 1101 to be reduced to the sum of $1.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): The salary is statutory.

Mr. Chairman: It is the whole programme.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'm sorry if I misled myself in connection with what the motion was. Basically, the generality of my remarks continue in their validity because we must take the position that there's been no exposition on the part of this Provincial Secretary as to what his responsibility is.

If you read through these nine pages you find it very difficult to accept that the Deputy Provincial Secretary for Justice had anything to do with the composition of this document, because one would have thought that he, having been an author of that Committee on Government Productivity, would have seen to it that the potential that was envisaged by those senior public servants would have been conveyed to those of us who have been waiting with such great anticipation.

I just want to dwell on this one subject for a moment. From the time that I entered this House in 1968, we have seen Mr. Robarts' Confederation of Tomorrow conference and we've seen at least four—that I recall—federal-provincial conferences on the constitution; on the question of repatriation of the constitution.

Think of the excitement available to a Provincial Secretary for Justice to stand in his place and to exhaustively analyse the position to be taken by the Province of Ontario in connection with, not only the continuing secretariat, but what we might do as leaders in connection with the whole question of a new look at our constitution; a delineation of those federal and provincial responsibilities that we see every day as being really the middle net of a ping-pong game as to who is responsible in the fiscal fields, in social welfare fields, in the justice field, in the question of the control of our economy.

I just invite your consideration, Mr. Chairman, as to what an exciting opportunity that would have been. Instead we got pap. I think that was the word used by the member for Lakeshore; I'm not sure. Maybe that's too strong. But I regard this pap and, really, nothing has been said by the minister.

So I take it that in the estimates of the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko), we'll get into the question of the establishment of police commissions. There's no doubt the minister is coming around to the right direction in this connection. I suppose it would be less than respectful to say that we've attempted to guide in this regard. We know that there have been some public statements as to the intention of the government, but we'll go into this in greater detail in the Attorney General's estimates—we'll get into the more practical application of what the

minister calls the streamlining of the court system. We'll be very interested in this.

So, in the essence of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I want to convey a great sense of disappointment to the Provincial Secretary for Justice; a great waste.

If these things have been done behind the scenes; if the responsibility of the Provincial Secretary for Justice is nothing more than a co-ordinating official between Correctional Services, Solicitor General and Attorney General—and that's all it would seem to be—then we think the whole superstructure of government as it presently exists is a terrible waste of time—but more importantly, it is a terrible waste of money.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): I would like to reply very briefly to the hon. member for Sarnia.

As he says, he has repeated, pretty well in all his remarks, what has already been said in this debate.

Mr. Bullbrook: I really didn't; no I really didn't. I said I could have.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: And I think it was said mainly last Friday, when he was here.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): He's so flamboyant.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Really, a great deal of research has gone into those remarks, but at the same time I would like to deal again with the statement, which apparently is the one thing that he has read, and I will agree that it is possibly too broad and too general, and I regret that. I think, for example, I could possibly have avoided the criticism of the statement that has been made during the course of these debates, if I had taken part in the Throne Speech debate, for example, and made may of the points that have been raised during the course of the debate of this particular estimate.

But there is some sensitivity, and I don't mind admitting that, between the Provincial Secretary and the four ministers within the secretariat, as to what our respective roles are. I'm hoping that will be overcome. And that, I think, was highlighted to a certain degree in respect to the opening remarks I indicated I would be making about their respective ministries.

There was, for example, a certain amount of editing that went on as far as my opening statement was concerned, because each one of them will be making an opening statement, much more detailed than mine was, dealing with their particular ministries.

So I'm not trying, really, to make any excuse. I'm just saying that it could have been done much better than it was, but I would hope that, not only during the course of these estimates, but on very many other occasions, that the information the hon. members wanted and felt wasn't forthcoming here as far as objectives are concerned and long term policy is concerned, that this information will in fact be made available to hon. members.

Now again, the hon. member raised the question of federal-provincial relations and the constitution and the current negotiations that are going on between the Province of Alberta and the Province of Ontario. As I indicated yesterday to the hon. member for Downsview, we were asked for an opinion and we gave that opinion to the Premier (Mr. Davis) and to his parliamentary assistant.

He has that information, based on the information we had as to the reasons for the Alberta position and its plans to, for example, invoke a two-price system.

We also had the opportunity to peruse some of the existing legislation in Alberta, for example in respect to conservation of resources, upon which that government is relying to some extent in withholding gas from some of the companies with which it has contracts at the present time.

I don't want either myself or any member of the Justice policy field, in some way to affect the current negotiations and talks that are going on. I think there is some headway being made. The two premiers are talking to each other. There is still a great deal of hope and optimism that some sort of an agreement will be made. To pronounce, enforce or stand on legal rights and indicate what steps we might take vis-à-vis the constitution, we think at this time is a little premature.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I mentioned last night there were two or three matters I wanted to continue to discuss with the minister. I have endeavoured in the two topics which I have raised with the minister so far—the question of the considered view of the government with respect to the field of capital punishment and the considered view of the government with respect to the decision of the court of appeal

on the questions asked under the Constitutional Questions Act relating to chequerboarding—I have endeavoured to indicate to him, and to those ministers associated with him in the Provincial Secretariat for Justice, the kinds of topics which I believe are conceptual ones and practical ones, and which at the same time fall into the category of urgent government business, and are ones in which there should be no vying for position among the ministers who are involved in the secretariat with the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

One could list any number of topics. I am going to take the liberty of listing, and not for purposes other than to list, matters which I consider to be of an urgent conceptual nature which, if carefully considered by the Provincial Secretary for Justice, would result in effective practical administrative and legislative and procedural improvements in the Province of Ontario.

The areas to which I want to refer specifically are the whole question of the field of insurance in the automobile and other casualty fields which was the subject of such a damning report by the McWilliams committee. That report was tabled in the Legislature during the course of this session, and regardless of what the insurance industry has to say, or regardless of the polite phraseology which is expressed in the McWilliams report, I would suggest to the Provincial Secretary for Justice that it constitutes a damning indictment of the insurance industry in the automobile and in the other, related, general insurance fields. It calls for the collective consideration by the government, under this Provincial Secretary for Justice and his related ministers, of the whole field of insurance with a view to developing some effective and sound policy of the government toward that industry.

It is not sufficient for us to be faced a little bit later on with a piecemeal amending statute to the Insurance Act, designed to correct a number of isolated faults. Nor is it sufficient to use it as a propaganda document for the purpose of having the insurance industry say how pleased they were that these faults were drawn to their attention, but that they were already moving a long time ago to correct them.

Anyone reading that report as an objective matter can only say—and I repeat, for the last time—that it is a document which condemns the insurance industry as it practises in the Province of Ontario. And I think it is a matter which certainly deserves the consideration by the group of ministers of which this particular minister is the first amongst the equals.

The second area into which we are about to stumble as a matter of legislative enactment of this assembly, but which is a conceptual matter—which can only be dealt with on a conceptual basis—is the whole question of what we are going to do to preserve the right of privacy of citizens of the Province of Ontario. It is just not sufficient that we should be faced with a credit reporting agencies bill, which is a vested interest bill as can be readily observed by those members of the assembly who were in the committee when we were faced with some of the higher priced law firms in the province and the constant lobbying which was done for the purpose of seeing that that bill was enacted.

The ambit of that bill, the validity of the concept behind that bill, can only be conceived in relation to the overall view of the government as a matter of justice with respect to the area of individual privacy and the protection of that area under our law.

These are not matters which require long and extended discussion and they don't require broad reference to the Law Reform Commission or other group. You can if you wish to, direct the Law Reform Commission to produce its views within a stated period of time. There is ample literature on the whole question of the right of privacy in Canadian periodical legal journals; there is ample further material in the Crowther report in the United Kingdom and in the writings in the United Kingdom; and there is ample further law in the United States in the area of privacy.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The government already has a report from Queen's University commissioned by the government.

Mr. Renwick: I simply would like to say that that concept of privacy and its ramifications in the field of legal protection is, in my judgement, one of the fundamental areas that this government has to deal with before it is dealt with in a piecemeal fashion for the purpose of the credit reporting agencies which are the prime movers behind the bill which has been before the assembly now on two occasions. The third occasion will be during this session, as I understand it from the Speech from the Throne. That is the third area which, I think, falls predominantly within the field of the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

The fourth area, which is of immense concern to me and was brought again to my attention this morning, is the concern which

I express about the relationship between the Ontario Securities Commission and the financial markets in the major city in the Province of Ontario, the city of Toronto, and the Toronto Stock Exchange. Whatever improvements have been wrought within the field of securities legislation were the result of financial disasters which took place in the Province of Ontario and the result of a great deal of study.

The institution of the Securities Commission itself is now faced with a situation where it is considered by those in the financial industry downtown to be not a sophisticated instrument. It is considered to be more performing a role which tends to be not exactly one which should be done away with, but which falls more in the area of a nuisance category for the financial industry than otherwise. They look more and more to the Toronto Stock Exchange for guidance in sophisticated areas of financial transactions which, of course, are part of the heartbeat of the Province of Ontario as the centre of economic development in Canada and of the wealth of Canada.

What I am suggesting to the minister is that he has to give serious consideration to reconstituting the Ontario Securities Commission on some sort of a rotational basis which will bring into government service for stated periods of time persons who are members of, sophisticated in, and participate in, the financial market. There may very well be the need to have an adequate mix of strictly government appointees for the purpose of making certain that the government's position is clearly known. But the government must bring into the governing body of the Securities Commission, in my judgement, persons who are knowledgeable about and sophisticated in the financial markets of the city of Toronto and of the Province of Ontario.

On a rotational basis, that may very well be the way in which we can safeguard ourselves—but not by multiplicity of regulation—against financial disasters in the future. Everyone who has been around long enough knows very well that these things tend to go somewhat in cyclical patterns and that our game of paper-playing, prospectus-filing, ongoing reporting, and all of the rest of it usually ends up with us faced with a disaster which we are unable to overcome. But we can overcome it, if we insist that the sophisticated leaders of the financial community participate in the regulation of that industry in the public interest.

I simply put that across to this minister as a matter which deserves his consideration in consultation with those ministers who are associated with him, particularly the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Clement) and, of course, the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) as well. Certainly it is in the Solicitor General's area also, because the whole area of fraud prevention, fraud detection and the punishment of fraud is an area of police work in this province with which we here on this side of the House are very dissatisfied, insofar as the capacity of the police to deal with that kind of illegal activity goes.

There has been some improvement, but I am suggesting that all of the crime in the Province of Ontario is not overt. One cannot say that it doesn't exist because one doesn't know about it. The greatest threat to our society is not the overt, known crimes that occur. The greatest threat is through the intrusion into the business and financial community of fraudulent practices, poor business practices and money having its origin in the criminal society. Those are matters which I think require the minister to seriously consider the reconstitution of the Securities Commission along the lines to which I have referred.

Another conceptual area which I think the Provincial Secretary for Justice should give his attention to, along with the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps), the Solicitor General and the Attorney General, is the way in which we look at the other end of the system of the administration of justice—that is, the question of the results of the whole of the process from arrest through to conviction through to detention in the correctional institutions and the result which comes out at the other end.

I am suggesting that one of the principal ideas which the ministry could adopt would be to make use of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, particularly in the field of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, for the purpose of placing our emphasis on making certain that each person who is admitted to the Minister of Correctional Services' institutions is given an individual assessment in detail and in depth, for the purpose of providing that person with the upgrading of his educational qualifications and for the purpose of making certain that that person in addition receives the retraining which he is able to undertake for the purpose of entering the economic life of the society when he returns.

This would be done not with the view that one can put a person into an institution for the purpose of completing the whole of that process, but rather, so that not only during the time that he is within the institution but after he leaves he has a continuing pattern of upgrading and retraining.

Regardless of those who believe that there are innately criminal persons, a substantial number of the people who are enmeshed in minor criminal offences of one kind or another and lead a repetitive pattern of non-acceptable criminal behaviour, would benefit, if they had that kind of individual assessment and that upgrading of their educational qualifications and that retraining—through a special branch of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, or if necessary, by establishing a separate College of Applied Arts and Technology that would deal primarily in this area. It would deal not just in retraining but would be able to provide the educational upgrading, and the staff would be able to have at its service those persons who could give the individual assessment, to see if there weren't some way that those particular persons rejected by society could be brought back into a meaningful existence.

I am not one who believes that the project would be 100 per cent successful. All I am saying is that we can make a significant contribution in eliminating, if nothing else, a very substantial cost to the province of Ontario, but more importantly, of course, in providing some avenue for persons to become involved again in a meaningful way within the economic system.

I would recommend that that concept of a much closer relationship and, indeed, a special branch of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, be devoted to that specific area. In my judgement, it is the revolving door of the return to the labour market where there is no work, and the return to the lower socio-economic levels of the Province of Ontario that lead to the greater part of that delightful term that we apply to those who return to the institution — recidivism.

I would suggest that that is a conceptual area which this minister could very well consider with his colleagues, because they are all intimately involved in that system and how it works—from the Solicitor General to the Attorney General and the Minister of Correctional Services.

I think another area which requires very clear thinking and a very clear statement by the ministry—and again this does not take very long to do—concerns what does happen to a person who has been involved in the court process and been convicted, in terms of the after result of that conviction.

Let me give you an example. I had occasion to defend two young sisters, 16 and 17 years of age, who were engaged in petty shoplifting. They were members of a family who lived in my riding—a first-class family—and fell to the temptation of picking up something in one of the stores and came before the court and pleaded guilty on my advice.

What had happened to those girls of 16 and 17? First of all, they had been released on their own recognizance at the police station. They had then been given a date at which they were to attend at the Metropolitan Toronto Police headquarters for fingerprinting and photographing. They were now in the position where they were before the court and on pleading guilty they were given a conditional discharge subject to three months' probation.

I think the sentence was quite proper and I think the provincial court judge, in the way in which he spoke to those girls, reinforced the sense of concern which they had about their conduct, and I'm quite certain they'll never appear again in the court system.

At the end of the probation period of three months that conditional discharge will become something called an absolute discharge and most of the public think that that means that person has no criminal record. But of course that person does have a criminal record, because there's been a conviction in the court. He's been granted something called a conditional discharge, then an absolute discharge at the end of the probation. Then that's sealed in some kind of an envelope in somebody's depository, presumably in the office of the Solicitor General in Ottawa—I'm not certain about that—and it is still a record, but no one can have access to it except under certain circumstances in the future.

But if anyone were to ask whether or not in the court records of this province a person had been convicted, the record would not show that that person hadn't been convicted, it would show that the person had been convicted but had been granted a conditional discharge which had become absolute—which is just as damning as if there were never any such conception as the absolute discharge.

So the second thing is, I'd like to know in what way one can remove the pictures and fingerprints of those girls from the

police records of the city of Toronto, apart altogether from what the courts of justice have done in the case of their conviction.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. The hon. member is dealing in detail and should be asking these questions under the Attorney General's estimates.

Mr. Renwick: No, Mr. Chairman, with great respect, I'm talking about a conceptual matter which affects the Provincial Secretary for Justice and affects the Attorney General and affects the Solicitor General, and I will be unable to be before all of them.

I don't want to go on at any great length, but I want to ask the Provincial Secretary for Justice exactly what is the net result of a conviction of young persons before the adult courts so far as their future record is concerned, and particularly whether or not we should have such persons fingerprinted and photographed, and if that appears to be necessary, what can be done in order to remove the fingerprints and the photographs from the police records?

I think it's a serious problem, because a request to the police department for whether or not a person is of record in that department has no bearing, as I understand it, on what has happened in the court system. There must, I think, be some consideration given by the Provincial Secretary for Justice to that particular area.

I have mentioned a half dozen areas. I'm quite certain that other members of the assembly could think of matters which are of concern. Those are the ones which are of principal concern to me, other than one, and I want to close my brief remarks on that note.

On this question of the reorganization of the courts, while there is very real necessity for improvement in the efficiency of the procedures and systems of the courts—which I share with a number of people who consider that lawyers aren't the best ones to devise methods of improving the efficiency of the court system—I want to ask the Provincial Secretary, along with his colleagues, to give consideration not just to the efficient movement of persons through the court system, but to substantially restructure it. The problem with the system is that the entrance into the system of persons who have been apprehended by the police in the city of Toronto is still one of the most demeaning processes that any citizen can be subjected to.

Anybody who wants to go down to the bullpen at the city hall can still see the procedure that is followed; it comes up regularly for people to comment about. I'm one of many who, over the last 30 or 40 years, have commented about this question. The men are herded into the bullpen; the women are herded into their area of the bullpen. The legal aid plan purportedly has a duty counsel in the court to assist each one of them in being introduced into the system as quickly and as expeditiously as possible—not from the point of view of that individual, but because of the number of minutes that any duty counsel can spend with any one of them.

I don't speak from any great experience, except that I do have occasion to appear in those courts and to practice in them. I have done so now for a sufficient length of time that I have some very vivid impressions—if they are not all scientifically provable—about what is happening.

The first step is to get the mass of people into the system. That's the attitude. How they get into the system does not appear to be of concern to anybody, so long as they are introduced into the system and so long as the appearance—not the reality, but the appearance—of equality continues to exist.

Now I happen to think that the family division and the criminal division of the provincial courts, and the small claims courts, are class-structured courts. The upper courts are available to some other people, and I'll leave it to those who are best able to speak for those upper courts to deal with the problems of their reorganization. But until the criminal process of the arrest and the intake of those persons into the system is improved, you are not going to improve the way in which the court system operates.

My suggestion, and my recommendation—and out of deference to the Chairman, I don't want to go into any detail; I only use it by way of illustration—is that you are going to have to slow up that original process. I think one of the ways that the government is going to have to do it is to establish a foundation to which the government will pay the funds which will enable that foundation to provide the lawyers, the law students, the law clerks and whatever the complement is, for the protection of persons who are under arrest and brought into that system without other available means of retaining individual solicitors to act for them, for the initial stages of that procedure.

Instead of the bullpen being crowded on Monday morning and going up to 21 court

and 22 court and having them marshalled through, with the duty counsel playing his part to grease the machinery so that they will get distributed out into the system, the first part of that process should be to segregate the persons who are arrested from those who are criminals already convicted. This may mean, for the present time, dividing the Don Jail into parts; that is, for those who have already been convicted and those who are still presumed to be innocent.

Then we should provide adequate accommodation where persons in the employ of this foundation would be able to interview for a period of time—the kind of time that a private citizen with the resources to hire his own lawyer would have—in terms of a personal interview with that person, sufficient information with respect to the dope sheet that has been prepared about him, sufficient opportunity to consider what the alternatives are, sufficient possibilities to consider courses of remedial or punitive treatment to which he may be subjected when he comes into the court. Instead of the court sitting on Monday morning, the court sits Monday afternoon for the purpose of hearing each of these individual cases in a way which is not demeaning to the individual and is an enhancement of our conception of how justice should be dealt with.

I am suggesting that this is a proper topic for the Provincial Secretary for Justice, Mr. Chairman, because it involves the Solicitor General; it involves the Attorney General; and it involves the Minister of Correctional Services. They are all involved in a bureaucratic system which is so structured that without the kind of co-ordination which is represented by the four ministers—with the Provincial Secretary for Justice—it will not be possible to think of a reorganization of the system which will also result in a humanizing of it.

We all recognize very clearly that there is the question of the processing of persons, who are apprehended for alleged offences, through the courts. Until that initial stage of their introduction to the system is corrected, we will not have done anything to reassert in the courts of the province the kind of justice which we should be concerned about and, indeed, very much alive to.

I am quite certain that there is nothing new about what I say. I am quite certain that with the Minister of Correctional Services and the Solicitor General and the Attorney General and the Provincial Secretary for Justice, we could go down to the bullpen at the city hall on a Monday morning and we could all shake our heads about it and consider that it's not a very satisfactory method of dealing with the problem. We could also, if we looked at it objectively, say that the duty counsel does the best he can. It's a vast improvement over not having him but such counsel can't possibly deal adequately with the questions which come up in the initial stages because they are not adequately prepared. They haven't had the kind of time to spend with their clients to ask, in an orderly and effective way, the very basic questions which initially affect that person's rights. Very often the whole way in which that person is dealt with in the court is determined at the outset of the system—and the outset of the system is seriously defective at the present time.

I wanted to raise that as a proper matter for the Provincial Secretary for Justice because of its overlapping considerations affecting the other three ministers who work with him.

I will have the opportunity, perhaps, in the specific estimates not of dealing at any great length but at least exchanging views with the appropriate ministers about that kind of problem. It means an investment of some capital; a reorganization of the space available in the old city hall—using downtown Metropolitan Toronto as the principal example—and a re-thinking of the intake processes, if I can use that dreadful term, of persons through the criminal court system. The great majority of people who come in contact with the criminal law come in contact with it through the provincial court system and not through the upper court system. It is becoming more and more rare that you hear counsel in the provincial courts' criminal division electing for trial upstairs.

There are occasions and legitimate reasons but for practical purposes the great bulk of the decisions, the impact of the system and the ultimate result as far as the individual before those courts is concerned, is determined in that very small compact processing system which starts in a very degrading and demeaning atmosphere. I think that the calibre or the quality of our administration of justice fails to be answered—if one is going to give a decision about whether it's good, bad or indifferent—fails to be determined in the way in which those cases are dealt with in those courts.

I think anyone who has had any experience in those courts is not personalizing any part of the problem. I think that the provincial judges as a group try to do a good job. I think that the Crown attorneys, and the

assistant Crown attorneys in the courts try to do a good job. I think the lawyers who appear in the courts try to do a good job. But the facilities which the province provides and the basic framework within which this system works is so traditional, is so entrenched, and is so ingrained in the way we think about our courts, that it is only if four ministers such as yourselves would take a cold hard objective look at what is wrong with that system that there can be any proper restructuring and reorganizing of it.

And in these days of very few dollars being available for this kind of a change of attitude, I think the kind of systemic change which I am talking about is one which can be accomplished for very few dollars and that the benefits of it to the administration of justice in the province would be immense in relation to the number of dollars which it would require to be put into effect.

Some other aspects of this, as I said, we can deal with at the time when the particular minister's esaimates are specifically before us, but I wanted to mention that area. The other area that I have mentioned is one as I understand which specifically falls within the co-ordinating activities of this policy minister.

I share, in a sense, the disappointment which other members have expressed. I am, however, prepared to be patient, in the sense that from what the Provincial Secretary for Justice has said that there are problems in developing a co-ordinated consideration of concepts that require attention. Maybe next year there will be an improvement and we will see some really effective consideration being given to the group of policy concepts to which I have referred and others which I am quite certain are of equal importance.

We will vote because it is our only way of pointing out that there is a long way to go if the purposes as set out in the report No. 3 of the Committee on Government Productivity are to be realized and if this reorganization of government, given a fair trial, is to show that it has any value. And I think that the Provincial Secretary for Justice, along with his colleagues, plays a very essential role in improving the quality of the environment within which we live, where they are so very much concerned with the initiation of the whole of the process of the administration of justice from beginning to end. That is the beauty of this particular secretariat and why I have taken up this much time to deal with the matters which are of concern to me.

Mr. Chairman: We have an amendment to vote 1101.

Mr. Lewis moves that vote 1101 be reduced to the sum of $1.

The committee divided on Mr. Lewis' amendment to vote 1101 that the sum be reduced to $1, which was negatived on the following vote.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 30; the "nays" are 51.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Vote 1101 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the study of the estimates of the Justice policy secretariat.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

WCB official, point of privilege, Mr. Sargent 1047

Presenting report, Task Force Hydro, Mr. Winkler 1049

Great Lakes flood damage, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Deacon, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Paterson 1049

North Pickering development, questions of Mr. Grossman and Mr. Bennett: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Roy 1051

Sales tax on energy, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 1053

Gas rate hearings, questions of Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Bales: Mr. Lewis 1054

Effect of energy tax on educational costs, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Dukszta, Mr. Burr 1054

Funds for purchase of Niagara Escarpment, questions of Mr. Snow, Mr. Carton, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Winkler: Mr. Lewis 1056

Niagara Escarpment Commission, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Sargent 1056

Pollution problem at Canadian Gypsum, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Young 1056

Use of Indian programme funds for Wounded Knee expedition, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. R. F. Nixon 1057

Uranium resources, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Reid, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Roy 1057

Air pollution at Happy Valley, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Martel 1058

Sales tax on energy, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Sargent, Mr. Good 1059

Condition of Timmins high school, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Ruston, Mr. Ferrier Mr. Cassidy 1060

IJC meeting on lake levels, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Haggerty 1060

Auto pact safeguards, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Bounsall 1061

Effect of energy tax on hospital costs, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Bullbrook 1061

Constitution of trade missions, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Foulds 1062

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Paterson, first reading 1062

Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. MacDonald 1063

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deans, agreed to 1087

Estimates, Provincial Secretariat for Justice, Mr. Kerr, concluded 1087

Recess, 6 o'clock 1095

No. 25

Ontario

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1973

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Eglinton.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there are some Boy Scouts from the 23rd troop of St. Clement's Church in the west gallery tonight. I'm sure that you and the members of the Legislature would like to welcome them here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): There's a lot more of them up there than on the government's side.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of the Ministry of the Solicitor General. Does the minister have a statement?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Chairman, the new Ministry of the Solicitor General has been in existence for about one year. I don't know whether or not the anniversary date has passed but a year will suffice. I should like to highlight for the members some of the activities of the ministry office.

The ministry organization is one in which the ministry is organized around the ministry office concept, a new concept within the government reorganization. Within this concept, each programme reports to a ministry office composed of a ministry executive—the minister and deputy minister, and four senior advisers of which three have already been appointed. That is, an adviser on policy development; one on planning and evaluation; one on management services; and one, on communications between the public and the ministry, yet to be appointed.

The ministry has been highlighted by a series of senior appointments. Mr. Harold Graham has succeeded Mr. Eric Hamilton Silk, QC, as commissioner of the OPP. I take this opportunity of placing on the record the appreciation of the government and the people of Ontario for Mr. Silk's almost four decades of service within the public service, starting as he did in the office of first legislative counsel, culminating in a decade as commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police during which he gave complete leadership to the rebuilding of the administrative organization, the force structure, and developed principles upon which the force has been developed and in which the members of the force and the people of Ontario can justifiably take pride.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): You forget what he did for the tendering system.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There has been a series of other senior appointments which are in the public realm now.

Mr. Elmer Bell, QC, succeeded Mr. Percy Milligan, QC, as chairman of the Ontario Police Commission. The latter also completed almost a decade of service as chairman and has returned to a lifelong career in eastern Ontario.

Dr. John Hillsdon-Smith has been appointed as first director of forensic pathology for the province;

Dr. Ross Bennett has been appointed as deputy supervising coroner;

Prof. C. G. Simmons has been appointed chairman of the Ontario Police Arbitration Commission.

Mr. Chairman, a basic concern from the very beginning of the ministry was the organization and management of policing services. I recall for you the task force on policing set up to examine the organization, administration and efficiency of policing in Ontario; to analyse present and future needs; and to study alternative approaches to meeting these needs. This task force is in full swing.

There are expanded advisory services from the Ontario Police Commission to the police forces in the province. There is a new police arbitration and bargaining system through creation of the Ontario Police Arbitration Commission.

We believe that one of the fundamental tools of immediate use for the police is police information and communication. Ontario was the first province to implement

CPIC, the Canadian Police Information Centre, a central information system for effective police action; also a very necessary tool for the operation of the Bail Reform Act, parole procedures, and the like. There are now grants to regional municipalities. We have initiated grants to regional municipalities for radio communication systems co-ordinated through the Ontario Police Commission. The ministry will provide grants for a co-ordinated police radio network across the province. Two common frequency channels will be provided.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, a very basic requirement is police training. I mention the new police college at Aylmer and an experimental in-service training and development project within the Burlington police force funded by the ministry. We will introduce a special Indian recruitment programme in the OPP to attract and train native police officers.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It's about time.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): You can't have everything.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We will expand the role of the police and the community. We are providing support for a province-wide series of seminars on police community relations sponsored by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews.

Other necessary tools relate to scientific crime analysis. The people of this province will soon enjoy the most modern forensic science laboratory in North America which is presently under construction.

We are arranging for a more effective collection of evidence through better liaison between the Centre of Forensic Sciences and police forces by the creation of laboratory liaison officers. There is the establishment of a forensic pathology branch to supervise regional pathologists across the province and to provide training of pathologists in medico-legal aspects.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to outline for you and the members the direction of our thrust in response to organized crime areas. There will be additional staff for the criminal intelligence analysis section of the Ontario Police Commission. We are stressing the OPP capacity to deal with organized crime. We will provide more financial support to joint force operations under CISO, the Criminal Intelligence Services of Ontario.

There will be formed a drug squad in the OPP deployed across the province to deal with trafficking in hard drugs. I recall for you the royal commission to inquire into the possibility of criminal activities in the building industry in Toronto.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): In Ontario, not just Toronto.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): The minister may not be aware of that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I recall for you, Mr. Chairman, the new Coroners Act and the regulations which set out the basic duties of coroners and clarify the rights of witnesses involved in inquests.

Mr. Chairman, the formation of the ministry has created a provincial focus on law enforcement at a time of rapid social change and growing public concern over the apparent spread of crime and violence in society and the ability of police and public safety agencies to cope with this phenomenon.

These estimates reflect this government's commitment to a society characterized by law and justice.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Listening to the Solicitor General reading his prepared statement, and not being too sure what he is reading, is typical evidence of what we have come to expect from the policy field of Justice.

He is the best evidence of the mediocrity that exists in that policy field. He is reading a prepared statement there stating that the royal commission is looking into the question of organized crime in Toronto. Hasn't the Premier (Mr. Davis) told him that it has been extended to the rest of the province or to any area where there is evidence that this exists?

An hon. member: Thanks to the member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Shulman: The minister wasn't in the House that day.

Mr. Roy: Possibly the Solicitor General was not in the House that day. He talks in his statement about highlights. One thing is for sure, he is not the highlight of that ministry. It's a sorry sight to see the provincial police or the police forces of this province led by a policy field and by a minister whom I consider to have no imagination and no foresight whatsoever, Mr. Chairman.

I recall our opposition when the Solicitor

General's department was first created, not only to the portfolio of Solicitor General but to the individual who was going to lead this portfolio. I can remember an article appearing in the Toronto Star back in the month of April of 1972—which I pointed out to the minister last year—which said that the 13,000 police officers of this province were being led by what was called a law-and-order man.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Well, well, well. That has to be right. Now we know. You and the member for High Park.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Now we have got the same situation as in Ottawa.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): It's about time the member changed parties.

Mr. Roy: When it comes to the question of organized crime we have to keep a united force to protect this province. Obviously we are not getting it from the Solicitor General's department.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Who bails who out?

Mr. Roy: Just to give you some idea how up to date you people are in that department, I was just handed the text that you were reading, by the member for High Park—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: —and, apparently your department is not aware that the commission has been extended outside Toronto as well, because what you are reading here is the royal commission to inquire into the possibility of criminal activities in the building industry in Toronto. Weren't you here in the House when we were discussing these things? Was none of your department around?

Mr. W. Newman: Where were you?

Mr. Drea: Where were you?

Mr. Roy: Where have you been? Weren't you around?

Mr. Kennedy: Is the member for High Park writing the member's speeches?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: God help us—

Mr. Good: Who's the one who started the move to extend it across Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: God help us with you leading the Ontario Provincial Police and the police departments of this area; you're not even aware of that.

Mr. Drea: Why don't you give credit to the member for High Park?

Mr. Kennedy: Sure, he is writing your speeches now.

Mr. Roy: In any event, as I was pointing out, Mr. Chairman, the police forces were to be led by a man who is a law-and-order man. We've not seen too much evidence of that if you don't even know what is going on in your own department.

The thing that's interesting—one of the highlights of your statement again—is the fact that you have created this special service called the Criminal Intelligence Service of Ontario. I can recall in the Throne Speech when they discussed the question or organized crime in the construction industry in Metro Toronto, it said that it was after extensive police investigation, and obviously you weren't even aware that there was any organized crime activity in other areas, like Ottawa. At that time I was accused of going on a witch hunt until I gave the facts to the Premier and he extended the commission. If that is the kind of service that your Criminal Intelligence Service is giving you, God help us.

The thing that is most frightening about it, Mr. Chairman, is that apparently the Criminal Intelligence Service of Ontario, according to the minister — this department, with a 28-man governing body—is made up largely of senior provincial and municipal officers and is in the business of fighting organized crime in Ontario.

I can recall the minister being questioned about this force in relation to one individual apparently being dismissed from that force. The minister at that time was quoted as saying, when he spoke about this CISO, "which will become one of the most effective groups for combating organized crime in Ontario."

First of all there is certainly no evidence of that. Secondly, when he was asked to give details of the suspension of Mr. Thurston, the hon. Mr. Yaremko was quoted as saying, "I have no control over this force. I don't have to ask anybody; they don't have to answer to anybody."

I ask the minister, since when is any police force in this province not answerable

to a minister of the Crown or to the elected officials of this province? Are they answerable to you or not? Do you have any control over them?

If it's security that you're after, isn't it time that you and your cabinet colleagues asked yourselves whether a police organization is answerable to anyone in a democratic society? It should be accountable, I say to the minister, to the elected representatives. I would appreciate the minister, when he discusses this in more detail, telling us what type of controls you have over this secret service, because, first of all, we are not too impressed by the results that we have obtained from this service, if they didn't even know that any organized crime was going on elsewhere than in Metro Toronto, and secondly, about the fact that it might have been organized in other areas in the lathing industry.

I would point out to the minister as well that, back some time ago, the deputy commissioner of the RCMP testified before the Quebec crime commission that they kept a list of something like about 1,000 to 10,000 names of people in organized crime; and he said at that time that 25 per cent to 30 per cent of these individuals apparently were operating in this province. But when we on this side inquired of the deputy commissioner of the OPP, he advised us that he knew nothing of this. So I suggest that when the minister mentions in his statement that he is trying to get people involved in the investigation of organized crime, possibly he should get more information from the RCMP.

The minister went on to mention the fact that a task force has been created to look into the efficiency of the police of this province. This is something we would like to hear about from the minister as well. Who are the people on this task force? We would like to discuss some of the individuals who have been appointed to this task force.

We mentioned as well—and this has been mentioned to the minister in previous estimates—the fact that police commissions should be more public. I see some evidence of this in some areas. We mentioned to the minister our concern about the fact that judges were being appointed to police commissions, that there might well have been a conflict when you had a judge sitting on a police commission who very often was a judge sitting in a court and had police officers testifying regularly before him. In those circumstances there very well could be a clear conflict. We have seen some evidence that this might well change.

I might point out to the minister that in some areas he has appointed to these police commissions some lawyers who practise in the criminal courts. I suggest that there may well be a conflict in that area as well, when a lawyer has a practice in the criminal courts and has police officers either as witnesses or cross-examines them on a regular basis, and the same officers are being guided somewhat by this individual who sits on a police commission. I would like the minister to give us some answers in relation to this matter.

We also feel that the minister is not giving any leadership in the area of upgrading not only the Ontario Provincial Police but all the police forces of this province. Some time ago I wrote to the Ontario Provincial Police inquiring about how many individuals on the force had obtained a university degree. I think the minister will agree that as our community becomes more educated and more sophisticated, it is important that our police forces keep up. I was advised that in the Ontario Provincial Police there are apparently only seven individuals with university degrees out of the 3,000 or 4,000 officers on the police force.

Mr. Shulman: That is seven more than there were two years ago.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West) I wouldn't put too much stock in a degree.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): That's a big advantage.

Mr. Roy: The Metro Toronto Police apparently have about twelve officers with university degrees. And I ask the minister, are you doing any recruiting at all in the universities for police officers? I suggest that you are not; and that's the type of thing you should be looking into, because in this day and age our police officers are dealing more and more with sophisticated crime, and on an educational level they must keep up with the society at large.

Mr. Drea: Not much hope for people like me.

Mr. Roy: I think the minister will admit that when we have only seven police officers who have university degrees out of a force of more than 3,000, it's not a very good percentage.

Next I inquired of the Ontario Provincial

Police how many OPP officers had been murdered in the last year. Fortunately, as far as the Ontario Provincial Police is concerned, the rate is very low.

Another question I asked of the Ontario Provincial Police was how many times they had to use their guns or how many times they had to draw their guns. And I would point out to the minister that he should be involved in serious research into this question of the use of guns by the police or against the police. He should be conducting serious research in countries like England, where the police time and time again overwhelmingly vote not to be armed. Yet their crime rate is much lower than it is here in North America; and much lower certainly than it is in the US.

That is the type of research, I suggest to the minister, that he should be involved in. If we keep arming our police—which comes first, the chicken or the egg? Is it because the police are armed that the others are using guns against them, or is it vice versa? This is the time for imagination. This is the type of leadership that I suggest you should be giving to your police forces.

I suggest to you as well that in many areas of the province where the police officers are dealing strictly with traffic—and for the provincial police a good part of their budget is mainly traffic—is it necessary for these police officers to be armed? This is something I'd like to ask the minister.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Oh, come on!

Mr. Roy: Yes, I am asking the question. I am trying to educate you. In any event this is a type of research you should be involved in.

Another matter I discussed with the minister was subsequent to a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, the Brownridge decision. I can recall I discussed it with the minister before. You will recall that the Supreme Court ruled that an individual had the right to consult his counsel before blowing in the breathalyser machine. I would ask the minister to advise us what directives he has sent to the police.

One of the directives was—you sent me a copy of the directive—that an accused, upon his request, should be allowed reasonable opportunity to use the telephone in an attempt to retain and instruct counsel. I suggested to the minister at the time why should it be only individuals who know the law who are entitled to this right to consult counsel? When the police officers are involved with cases of impairment—considering that the Supreme Court of Canada said that it is a right to consult counsel before blowing into the machine—why do they not advise the accused of the rights? It is not only the accused who know the law who shall take advantage of it but all accused. If it is a right, is it not a right for everyone? The minister apparently has not done anything about this.

The second problem, obviously, with this type of warning for the accused is that you are faced with a two-hour period in which you have to take the test and you felt some concern about that. I suggested to the minister at that time that what he should be doing is getting together with the legal aid system and providing duty counsel so that if an accused requested, or was advised of his rights and wanted to consult counsel, he would have counsel available at that time.

Obviously, if you start chasing around for his counsel in the middle of the night you would be missing out on the two-hour period in which he had to blow. I advised the minister that he should be getting together with the legal aid plan, with the Law Society, in organizing a roster of counsel who would be available. If an accused called and could not reach his own counsel immediately he could call someone from the legal aid panel. Apparently nothing has been done about this. In that sense people accused in this province are not getting full benefit from the Supreme Court of Canada decision.

I would ask the minister another point that has been raised or discussed with the minister. This is that apparently the federal government has instituted a plan whereby there will be 100 summer jobs for law students with the police force. The idea of this was to get law students to work with police forces to understand how the police worked and to get some co-operation.

I recall reading some time ago that apparently the police forces in the Province of Ontario will not be taking advantage of this plan. I could be wrong but I would like the minister to advise me if that is the case.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member is completely wrong.

Mr. Roy: They are taking advantage of it? Well, some police forces have complained that apparently you were not. If I am wrong, fine. They are taking advantage of it, are they?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We initiated a programme and the federal people are coming in and participating.

Mr. Roy: You initiated a programme including students, not law students. Don't try to mislead us here. That was strictly students and this is a programme involving law students. Are you taking advantage of the federal programme? I would like to know from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The federal programme has decided to join ours.

Mr. Roy: Is the federal government giving you any money for it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, $60,000 I believe.

Mr. Roy: That is what I like to hear, that you are taking advantage of it.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): That is why you are joining them, for the $60,000.

Mr. Roy: Another matter I discussed with the minister last year—and I have heard nothing about this at all in his comments—was that police officers under the Police Act did not have the rights that ordinary individuals who were charged with any other offence had. The result is that if police officers don't have the same rights when they have problems as other individuals, how do you expect them to respect the rights of the accused?

One of the great deficiencies in the Police Act—and I have pointed this out to the minister before—is that very often the chief of a police department can act as an informer; he can investigate the charge; he can lay the charge; he can prosecute the charge—and he can be the judge as well.

I would have thought that it was a simple matter for the minister to se that there was a clear conflict; that it was not basically what has been learned under the English system of jurisprudence. There is always a conflict when you have a fellow who can lay a charge and sit as the judge; who can prosecute and sit as a judge. I pointed out to the minister the unfairness of this, and how this should be changed.

If a police officer investigates or lays a charge, surely he should not be the one to judge the charge. It would seem very basic that if he laid the charge in the first place, he must have had some grounds for thinking that the person he was laying the charge against was guilty. How could he then give an objective decision?

I have pointed this out to the minister before, but apparently there are no changes to the Police Act forthcoming.

Now, a further matter I would like to bring to the minister's attention — and I have brought this up with the police as well—is again the question of police sometimes lacking direction. As you know, the Ontario Provincial Police are able to decide on the issuing of certain licences. And one of the licences over which they have control are licences for security guards. And I have brought this to the minister's attention before that police officers should be given sort of a sense of direction. When they run into a situation like the one I will outline, they should use a bit more common sense.

An individual was convicted apparently in 1933 of a charge of theft for which he received a suspended sentence; and in 1942 was convicted for indecent assault. This individual has not committed an offence since that time, but on Dec. 5, 1972 he was refused a security guard licence for a record dating back some 30 years.

I would have thought if the police would have received this direction that I've been talking to the minister about, the police should have advised this individual that since about 1970 under the Parole Act an individual can get his record erased.

This individual has had good conduct for a period of 30 years; surely he has paid for his crime and he should not have been refused a licence just on this basis. Fortunately, we were able to correct this situation. How many other situations like this exist that we do not hear about?

Now, there is a final matter I would like to bring before the minister. I suggest to him that very often police officers are abusing their right to fingerprint individuals. Under the Identification of Criminals Act only individuals charged with indictable offences may be fingerprinted. I don't know if the minister is aware of this or not. I see sort of a puzzled look on his face. I suppose I should come to expect it from this minister.

In any event, police officers regularly take fingerprints and photographs of individuals who are charged with summary conviction offences. For instance, charges of driving while over .08 or other summary conviction offences. They are fingerprinting all these people when, in fact, they do not have a right to do so under the federal statute called the Identification of Criminals Act. I would like the minister to look into this problem so that if the police are abusing their powers, then the situation can be corrected.

Mr. Chairman, these are all matters that we should bring to the attention of the

House; and all matters which are evidence, as I mentioned in my opening statement, of what I consider to be the mediocrity of the Justice ministry's police section. My God, just the fact that the minister is sitting so far away from the Premier is some evidence that he isn't wanted nearby—having the minister away over there to the right.

Mr. Lewis: That may be.

Mr. Roy: The other matter that's very interesting is seeing about four ministers doing the job that apparently Arthur Wishart was able to do all by himself.

Mr. Lewis: And better.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): And do well.

Mr. Roy: What a man he must have been.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Does the hon. member realize how close he is to the edge of everything?

Mr. Roy: That's right. And I can get at the minister pretty good right from here—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, but he's got prospects and the minister hasn't.

Mr. Roy: I don't want to get any closer to the minister.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, it would seem that in these troubled times, in these very difficult times, it is important that the police receive a sense of direction—a sense of direction that they will not get from this minister. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is incumbent on us that I bring an amendment before the House.

An hon. member: One dollar.

Mr. Roy: The amendment is that we cut either vote 1501, item 1—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Not at this stage.

Mr. Roy: Pardon me?

Mr. Chairman: Not at this stage.

Mr. Lewis: Why not?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, I want to cut $15,000 off their estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but we're not at that stage in the discussion. That will come at a certain vote, at whichever vote you wish to reduce.

Mr. Roy: Well, I want to go on to the first item.

Mr. Chairman: We're not on 1501 at this time. We're not on that.

Mr. Roy: I just want to advise you we want to cut that down by $15,000. That's what we think of the minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Pretty half-hearted from the Liberal opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I want, as usual to make my remarks brief.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Except that you go over them more than once.

Mr. Lewis: Now, now, you must have been to the chiropractor's.

Mr. Renwick: I will only repeat where emphasis requires the repetition.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): He must think a lot of emphasis is needed.

Mr. Renwick: I don't quite share the views of my friend, the member for Ottawa East, about the need of this particular ministry or the competence of the minister. I think time alone will tell about the competence of the minister and about the need for the ministry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How much time do you need for that?

Mr. Renwick: Well, we haven't had a Ministry of the Solicitor General for some time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We have had this minister since the beginning of time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Don't be so envious.

Mr. Renwick: I expressed my view at the time the ministry was established on a couple of matters which are on the record. I would like to join with the minister in expressing my appreciation to the former commissioner of the OPP for the service which he rendered to the province. I know that we were significantly critical of him in the very difficult position in which he was placed because of the particular matter which led to the royal commission. But, apart from that, there is no doubt in my mind that Commissioner Silk brought the Ontario Provincial Police into the modern age, so far as policing is required,

and established for it a reputation for professionalism which will be difficult for his successor to match. At the same time, it does not at all absolve us from our necessity of making criticisms of the Ontario Provincial Police when we come to that vote.

I think my concern, Mr. Chairman, centres on the immense pressures felt within the metropolitan community in the early months of this year as the result of the killing of the two police officers and the wounding of another police officer. I think there were four deaths in a very short period of time and a serious wounding of a police officer. I share, of course, with everyone, the sympathy which anyone expresses to those who are bereaved by the loss of life of those police officers and the injury which was suffered by the other one.

But I want to make it perfectly clear that that does not extend, in my judgement, to permitting—or even, for those in responsibility, condoning—the kind of police pressure to which the community in the city of Toronto was then subjected to achieve ends, which to them may very well be legitimate but for which I think they used very illegitimate means to pressure the community into accepting. I need only draw to the attention of the minister the scare headlines which appeared in the newspapers about the statements made by Sydney Brown, the president of the police association. They were, in fact, that the police were going to shoot first and ask questions afterwards. That was one of the headline stories.

There was also the immediate declaration by the chief of police of Toronto that the inadequate radio communications had caused the death of the police officer, and there was the abject surrender by the new elected city council of the city of Toronto to that pressure for the establishment of that kind of communication network.

We had in the city of Toronto the year previously—and I didn't comment during the last session because it was too close to the time when the report was made—the unauthorized and illegal use of the mounted force at the time of the presence here of the representative of the Russian government, at the time of the disturbances which took place opposite the Science Centre on Don Mills Rd. The report was closely documented and very politely worded by Judge Vannini, but it indicated that the mounted police had no business having been led into the particular part of that disturbance at the time when they were. Lack of adequate police control or communication was again blamed for it. I happen to doubt that that's the reason why the mounted police are used. It's because of a failure of police training.

We have had this tremendous pressure on about the two-man patrol car. We have had it based on the question of cost. Yet at the same time we find an immediate authorization of the two-man patrol car by the chief of police in a limited sense immediately after the police officers were killed in the city of Toronto.

We had, in addition to that, the granting of authority to police officers to wear their weapons to and from their residences, as I understand it, again, as part of the degree of hysteria which was orchestrated and escalated by the police association and by the statements of the chief of police of the city of Toronto.

Nothing was done either by the police commission of the city of Toronto or by the city council of the city of Toronto to indicate quite clearly that there was a counter-statement to be made about the circumstances in which these pressures were generated. The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that so long as the police commission of the city of Metropolitan Toronto is unresponsive and does not include elected representatives of sufficient number to carry weight in the councils of that commission, there is no voice in Metropolitan Toronto to counteract that kind of police pressure.

I am a person who has much respect for and realization of the need for the public protection of persons in our society so that the streets are free of crime, so that the principles of law are adhered to and so that there is order in the society. But the only way that can be accomplished by the police is if the rules are so laid down that there is not only a recognition that there are rules governing their conduct, but that there is an appreciation by the police forces of the province of the reasons for the rules. There are vast areas of the operation of the police in the Province of Ontario, certainly in the city of Toronto, for which there is a total vacuum with respect to the rules, the extent of their meaning and the need for them.

I may say that if one looks at the Police Act and I bear the same responsibility as others on this side of the House for not having examined it with this particular aspect in mind, the Police Act of the Province of Ontario sets out in great detail the regulatory power that the Lieutenant Governor in Council is to exercise with respect to the

regulation of the police within the framework of the Police Act itself, divided as it is between the municipal police forces, the Ontario Provincial Police and the police commission. The Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorized under the Police Act:

> To make regulations for the government of police forces and governing the conduct, duties, suspension and dismissal of members of police forces, providing for the payment of fees and expenses of witnesses at hearings, governing the qualifications for the appointment of persons to police forces and for their promotion, establishing the ranks that shall be held by members of police forces, prescribing the minimum salary or other remuneration and allowances to be paid to members of police forces, prescribing the minimum numbers of members of police forces that shall be employed, governing lockups and providing for their inspection [and a number of other similar matters, as well as all of the incidental authority that one usually finds in a regulatory power] prescribing courses of training for members of police, prescribing or regulating the numbers of meetings to be held by boards and the times and places at which they are to be held, prescribing the records, returns, books and accounts to be kept and made by police forces or the members thereof, and respecting any matter relating to the commissioner and the Ontario Provincial Police as is considered necessary . . .

Now there is an ample grant of regulatory authority under the Police Act and I was surprised to find that for practical purposes there has been little, if any, exercise of that regulatory power. The Ontario regulations cover two or three minor areas with respect to that, but for practical purposes there has been a total abdication under the Police Act of the need to promulgate regulations which will provide for the governance of the police in the Province of Ontario.

I don't know the reason for it. I don't know why the Ontario Police Commission, having been established now for some years, hasn't seen to it that there are adequate statutory regulations passed which will promulgate and set out the rules of conduct, the courses of training, the methods of recruitment—all of the standard basic requirements that are necessary for a professionalization of the police force, in the very best sense of that term. I don't mean professionalization as an in-group within a society. I mean persons with a high respect for their professional obligations to the society in which they live.

For example, there is no statutory requirement that the police, in carrying out the very necessary part of the interrogation and questioning of citizens for the purpose of detecting and apprehending those responsible for crime, and the arresting of persons whom they believe on reasonable and probable grounds have committed that crime, there is nothing in the regulations that embodies a legal requirement that we should abide in the Province of Ontario by the judges' rules which are set out in England and which I understand are part of the course of training at the Ontario police college. There is nothing to indicate this government has said that it is the obligation of police officers in the detection and questioning of suspects with respect to crimes that those citizens upon their arrest are entitled to the protection of the judges' rules. I think it is fair to say that there is not a lawyer practising in the criminal courts in the city of Toronto who is not under the impression that there is a disregard, on a significant number of occasions, of the obligation of the police with respect to those matters.

I don't think it is any answer to say that there are some police officers who are scrupulously fair. There are officers in uniform and detectives who are scrupulously fair in the way in which they deal with and talk to, and elicit statements or questions and answers from persons who are apprehended by them and who have some appreciation of the disadvantage which a person is under when he is apprehended and taken to the police station for questioning. There is some consideration of that.

I think one of the major steps which this Solicitor General's ministry could accomplish would be to require the police forces in the Province of Ontario to abide by an Ontario version of the judges' rules with respect to the questioning of suspects and the questioning of persons after arrest. The greater part of our problem with police administration is the lack of clarity about the stages that are to be recognized in the course of questioning, detection, apprehension and charging of persons in the criminal process.

I dealt with one other aspect of it in the ongoing further stage of the criminal process in the Province of Ontario this afternoon. One of the major problems is a lack of a clear understanding of the stages of the police work.

I want to use as another example of my concern about that the very question which I mentioned earlier about the use of the mounted force for demonstration crowd-control purposes. I've said this before in the House on another occasion and I'm going to make it very clear. There are—and I have taken part in political demonstrations of one kind or another—matters to which the police are sensitive.

I'm speaking of matters such as the war in Vietnam. I'm speaking about matters such as, at one point, the grape boycott in the city. I'm speaking about matters such as the protest by Canadian citizens of Greek origin against the oppressive government in Greece. That kind of demonstration which has something in the nature of political overtones alerts the police in a way which I think requires a very skilful handling of the police force. The rules are all there but the rules are not obeyed.

In substance, what the police in Metropolitan Toronto, in face of a political demonstration of any significant size, seem to be saying, according to those who perceive it in operation, is "We will let it go on for a certain length of time and then we will disperse it."

They do not follow the carefully laid out rules of the common law and the rules which are now embodied in the Criminal Code to distinguish between a lawful assembly, the lawful assembly becoming unlawful, an unlawful assembly becoming a riot or the point at which the police can legitimately ask the citizens to disperse because of their obligation to preserve the public peace.

As long as you keep the whole thing in one process you leave it open to the kind of illegal activity which took place in front of the Ontario Science Centre. That is to put the mounted troops in.

I want anyone in the House who hasn't had the experience, to be on the sidewalk when there is a political demonstration taking place at the point in time when the police make the decision to move in with the horses. Be near the horses to find out whether or not it is not one of the most frightening experiences that a citizen could be subjected to.

I'm saying that the rules have got to be perfectly clear. The citizens have got to be made aware, by the police, of the occasion which requires a change in the action taken by the police in the course of carrying out their legitimate duties. Again, it's the lack of a clear appreciation of the steps or the stages which delimit one area from the next stage and the next stage and the next stage.

A good part of the problems with respect to political demonstrations in the city of Toronto could have been avoided if there had been a clear understanding by the police of those particular stages and steps.

Another aspect of this immense pressure in Metropolitan Toronto and throughout the province—all, as I say, part of this orchestrated and escalated operation—is with respect to the attitudes of the police toward the question of capital punishment. There is also the question of the attitude of the police toward the very necessary steps which were needed in order to correct and modernize the bail system and to eliminate its pressure on persons without money or property to put up by way of security.

The result of the lack of a sensitive police commission in Metropolitan Toronto, and the lack, if I may say so with great respect to the minister, of any countervailing statements by this minister at the time of the escalation of this pressure on the system means that in very important and sensitive areas there was so much pressure that the police administration and the police association, with the support of public opinion because of a highly inflamed situation which existed in the city, subjected the community to unwarranted pressures.

I'm not going to go on at any further length. There are a number of matters which we can deal with in the course of the various votes under the minister's estimates, but the kind of thing that I want to hear from the minister in the course of those remarks is what the attitude of his ministry is as a matter of policing, not as a matter of individual conscience, on the question of capital punishment.

I want to know what the position of the Solicitor General of the Province of Ontario is with respect to the present Bail Act as it now exists throughout Canada and the way in which it is operating in the Province of Ontario. I want to know the position of the Solicitor General on the question of whether or not police commissions should be responsible, by way of elected representatives on those commissions, to the citizenry with whose protection they are charged.

I want to know the attitude of the Solicitor General on the question of the two-man patrol cars.

I want to know the opinion of the Solicitor General on the question of whether the

judges' rules should not be given some statutory force in the Province of Ontario.

I want to know whether or not it is the opinion of the Solicitor General that police officers should carry their weapons to and from their place of residence.

I would like to know the position of the Solicitor General on the question of gun control laws in the Province of Ontario, and whether or not there is not some role to be played by the provincial government in the question of the control of hand guns and the requirement that they be registered.

I want to know what the position of the Solicitor General is with respect to the role of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in the city of Toronto in the intelligence work they are engaged in, in photographing persons who take part in political demonstrations.

I want to know exactly what the role is going to be of this special drug law enforcement programme which the minister has set out in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Is the minister making a note of these things?

Mr. Renwick: And I want to have some comment from the minister about the question of the royal commission which is to be looking into questions of alleged criminal activity within one area of the construction industry.

These, to my mind, are essential gut questions which we must have answered to understand what the ministry's response is as part of a programme of responsiveness to what can otherwise be an undue pressure by the association of police chiefs. My colleague, the member for Lakeshore, mentioned the other night about the association of police chiefs with the broadcasters and the way in which news perhaps is to be filtered in some form of a special interest for the police. That is another matter which has been in the press.

I happen to think there are sufficient significant factors to indicate that obviously it was most advisable to have a task force created for the purpose of looking into some of these problems. But I would also like to have some sensation of what the government's response now—not the response of the task force later on, but the kind of thinking which guides the Solicitor General as he assumes under the first vote of his ministry the overall responsibility for the co-ordination of police programmes throughout the Province of Ontario.

These are matters which are essential ingredients in the combination of, on the one hand, an adherence to the principles of law, and, on the other hand, the maintenance of the kind of public order which is required in any civilized society.

Mr. Chairman, I await with interest any comments that the minister may care to make.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have made notes of the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa East and the member for Riverdale. Most of the items fit within one or two of the major votes and I shall undertake to the best of my ability to deal with each of these matters when the relevant vote comes up.

Mr. Roy: Does the minister admit he was wrong on this question?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1501.

The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Roy: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Renwick: I just want to protect the vote.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1501, item 1, I would move an amendment that the amount of $250,000 be reduced by $15,000.

Mr. Chairman: Has the member got it in writing?

Mr. Roy: Pardon me?

Mr. Chairman: Has the member got it in writing?

Mr. Roy: Okay. I will put it down.

Where does it say that I have got to have it down in writing?

Mr. Chairman: I want it down here in writing.

Mr. Renwick: It becomes meaningless if we do it every bloody time.

Mr. Chairman, on that first vote under item 3 there—

Mr. Chairman: Wait till we finish with item 1—if it's the wish that we stack these things.

Mr. Lawlor: What are we waiting upon, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Lewis: I would like to point out for reasons of history, Mr. Chairman, that this is

the only minister who has evoked from the opposition a wish to eliminate his salary in every ministry he has held.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I may draw to your attention it was without any success whatsoever—the opposition has struck out every time.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Might makes right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, it just shows the effect of quantity over quality, brains over brawn, of the great battalions opposite.

Mr. MacDonald: My hon. colleague means brawn over brains.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Brains over brawn; he is right.

Mr. Lawlor: I thought the brains were all over here.

Mr. Lewis: The Chairman is unduly formal tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Roy moves that vote 1501, item 1 be reduced by $15,000.

Mr. Lewis: We'll support it under protest, because it doesn't eliminate everything the minister earns.

Mr. Chairman: Is it the wish of the members that this vote be stacked—there may be some more coming in—or do they want to vote on it? Stack it! Okay.

All right. Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment or the motion?

Item 2.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I have a couple of questions on vote 1501. When is it anticipated that the task force will have completed its task and reported?

Mr. Chairman: That's item 3?

Mr. Renwick: Item 3 of vote 1501.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 is carried then, I presume.

Mr. Haggerty: No!

Mr. Chairman: Item 2. We will deal with 2 before we go to 3.

Item 2.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question on item 1. Is it the people within your main office who prepared for you the opening remarks that you made in the committee today? If it is, maybe you should question them about the fact that on page 3 they mentioned that the royal commission is to inquire into the possibility of criminal activities in the building industry in Toronto, when clearly this matter was debated at length in the House, as you will recall. I take it the minister must be aware of that.

The Throne Speech mentioned that it should be limited to Metro Toronto. Then, after a strong debate here in the House, the Premier acceded to our request that it be extended to other areas—to Ottawa, Hamilton or other areas where there is evidence of criminal activity. I would just ask the minister who prepared this statement for him?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I assume the responsibility for that statement, regardless of who was involved in its preparation. I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I was present during all of the debates, the presentation by the hon. member and the response of the government. If there has been a slip in the words, I will take the responsibility. If Ottawa feels slighted that it has been overlooked in my remarks, I amend the statement to include, Mr. Chairman, the terms of reference as laid out by the Premier of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, since the hon. minister has brought to our attention in his opening remarks the appointment of the royal commission that is presently under discussion, particularly as to the ambit of its responsibility being expanded to Ottawa, did the minister have anything to do with the decision to appoint Mr. A. E. Shepherd—Q.C., I presume—to be the counsel for the royal commission? If so, does the minister recall that when we availed ourselves of Mr. Shepherd's services in the royal commission having to do with Atlantic Acceptance—

Mr. Renwick: That's the same one. Isn't that a coincidence?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —the total cost of his services as counsel for that royal commission was $130,480? That is, his personal cost for acting as counsel to the royal commission—which was in operation, as far as the estimates were concerned, over a period of two years—was $115,746 for his personal fee for services over the two years, which we presume were not full-time services, and his general expenses were $14,734.

I wonder if it would be appropriate for us to ask the minister at this time if we have any formal agreement with Mr. Shepherd, so that his services in this connection are not going to be open-ended, as far as the expense and the costs are going to be concerned?

Mr. Lewis: The member for Lakeshore will do it at half the price.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) would like to get in on that too.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I won't make any comment on that. I have too much respect for the member for Lakeshore. The minister had nothing to do with the appointment of the commission and counsel. I believe that that would be a matter for decision for the commissioner. The terms relating to the payment of the expenses of the commission would be out of the estimates of the Ministry of the Attorney General.

Mr. Haggerty: Aren't you responsible for it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I simply raised it this time, since the minister in his opening remarks had indicated that he was accepting the responsibility for the decision.

If I might, I would just go on to another matter which, in my view, would fall under the first vote, perhaps the first item. In his opening remarks the minister indicated that the OPP is moving toward the formation of a special group of Indian officers. I would like to ask the minister for some more information about that. If he chooses to answer under another vote, that would be all right.

But, since this is a departure of some importance and basically a change in policy, could he indicate whether it's the thought that these Indian officers would have special responsibilities in those communities serving the Indian reserves or whether they would be distributed uniformly through the force? Or does he perhaps feel that it should be a special group which would be used from time to time whenever there is a special need, such as, for example the situation on the Six Nations Reserve a year and a half ago I guess, when a group on the Six Nations Reserve seized the council house, and the local detachment of the OPP found itself in a very sensitive position indeed in order to maintain order with fairness expressed on all sides. The minister no doubt recalls the situation.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the matter actually comes under vote 1505—it has to do with the OPP—but I think we can discuss it either when we deal with the Ontario Police Commission or the OPP. The recruitment programme will be dealt with through the OPP. That is where the programme is going to be, and it may be that we may get into a full discussion at that time on policing with relevance to Indians and Indian communities.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, possibly the minister could direct me if this question is related to another area of the estimates. But I would like to ask the minister a question in relation to your royal commission to inquire into the possibility of criminal activity in the construction industry. The Throne Speech clearly said that it was after extensive investigation by your law enforcement agencies that the decision was made to establish a royal commission. Am I in the right area to ask it now, or do I have to wait until we get into the OPP to discuss this?

Mr. Chairman: It comes under vote 1504.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That comes under the supervision of police forces, the OPC.

Mr. Chairman: The Ontario Police Commission and so on comes under vote 1503.

Mr. Roy: When the Throne Speech mentioned police forces, was it in fact the OPP who were doing the investigation of organized crime, or was it your special force, CISO?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was a joint operation, Mr. Chairman, between the relevant police forces. This is not the appropriate time to discuss that.

Mr. Chairman: Votes 1503 and 1504 are more appropriate for this to come under.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask two questions so that I could know where I could raise the points? First of all—I would like to discuss it sometime and I would assume it would go through the entire range of the force—there is no doubt in my mind that in the police services, those of the OPP and of the individual services, this is one area where there has been open discrimination against women in the field. This is the first time I have raised this issue. I don't know where that question properly comes.

Mr. Chairman: I think it could very well come under 1503 or 1504.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I wonder if I might be of assistance, Mr. Chairman?

Mrs. Campbell: I wish you would, because this is a new procedure to me.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I know all members of the House would be interested in following the estimates. If you look to the summary, there's the ministry administration, then public safety, and then we have the supervision of police forces, in which the very broad questions of police in general—including the pertinent remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale—would be brought in. The Ontario Provincial Police has three votes: the administration; criminal and general law enforcement; and traffic law enforcement. So we have the public safety function, the supervision of police forces, and then the OPP. The hon. members should discuss—

Mr. Chairman: Under vote 1503 and 1504.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. members should be discussing this under vote 1503 and 1504.

Mrs. Campbell: I note in the opening statement the funds to be made available for radio communication. Where would I discuss in these estimates the possibility of funds being available through the traffic computer, as is being done in other cities on the North American continent? Is it under communications?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The matter of communications, Mr. Chairman, would come under vote 1503.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 agreed to.

Item 3, task force on policing.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, does the minister have any idea when the task force will in fact report?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have not set a real target date for the task force. The task force has really begun to go full swing as of the beginning of the year.

I was speaking, as it happened, to the chairman today, and I know that they have commenced their hearings within the city here; they will be travelling through the province. They have terms of reference. They have a large committee which is unique in its makeup, so I have not set a target date for them.

I would hope that during the next session a report could be filed. But when the hon. members recall the breadth of the terms of reference, the job to be done, and the fact that this was actually a first—they are going to other jurisdictions to see what has been done, but to date nothing has been tackled equivalent to this—the process is very important so that really I would be looking forward to their report.

I don't like to take action in anticipation of the report. But on the other hand we can't, as the hon. members say, stand still. There are things that have to be dealt with immediately, so we will try to come up with a combination of doing the right thing while we are awaiting the report.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it may possibly make sense, as has happened in the case of the Committee on Government Productivity and in the commission on the book publishing industry, for interim reports to be submitted on various aspects of their terms of reference. There must be some areas which can be given priority, and with such a large committee appointed and decentralized in such a way, we can begin to have the benefit of their interim reports in a series of reports, rather than to wait for one omnibus report at the end.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, one of the points that I discussed with the chairman today was that he and I will be meeting shortly after the Easter recess, and I think this is a very pertinent matter for me to take up with him to discuss the feasibility of the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I would think that this is possibly the proper place in your estimates to take up the remarks made by myself the other day with respect to the role, function and general ranging possibilities of chiefs of police of this province, with respect to the self-discipline which they might exercise, and if they were incapable of doing so, which you might.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't like to interrupt the hon. member, but that would be very appropriate under—

Mr. Lawlor: You want to put that in 1503?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It would be very appropriate under that particular vote; very pertinent and very appropriate to 1503.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the task force on policing throughout the province. I must confess I am not familiar with the complete terms of reference, but since we have an assurance from the minister that they are going to do a complete analysis of policing in the Province of Ontario, and since this minister has had responsibility for policing—I am not sure whether I have brought it to his attention; I know that I have brought it to the attention of two of his predecessors who were responsible for law enforcement in the province—I am wondering about the problem of policing the far northern reserves.

I know they make periodic trips to the far north to places like Big Trout Lake, Sandy Lake, and wherever there is a problem of that nature. I have had considerable dialogue with the minister's predecessors on coming to grips with this problem. It seems to me that in these communities that are so isolated, you have 90 per cent of the people who are good law-abiding citizens and then you have a small minority in any community that is unsupervised on an ongoing basis and that causes a good deal of problems.

I am not speaking specifically of Gull Bay; that is another matter. I am talking about areas that are accessible only by air, where we get law enforcement officers who, on a more or less routine basis, will go up maybe once a year or twice a year or more often as they are called, but by the time they get there the event is passed.

For instance, we had a particular problem at Ogoki post up on the Albany River, where it was feared that a person who had disappeared had gone through the ice during freeze-up. It was three or four months, I think, before they got a law enforcement officer in there to even investigate the matter.

I brought this up with the then Provincial Secretary for Justice, the former member for St. George, but I never did get a satisfactory explanation of why it took three or four months to get a law enforcement officer up there. Apparently there was a change in territorial responsibilities. The detachment that normally would have gone in to investigate was from Kenora or Sioux Lookout or some place in northwestern Ontario; then the responsibility for Ogoki post was changed to the Timmins region. As a result of this change in responsibility the event didn't get investigated for a period of three to four months. This seems to be typical, Mr. Chairman, of the kind of service that—

Mr. Chairman: Could we have some order for the hon. member for Thunder Bay? It's pretty hard to hear him with so much talking going on in the background.

Order, please!

Mr. Lewis: Come on you Philistines, sit down!

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): What's that?

Mr. Renwick: The Chairman said "order."

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Sorry.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, this seems to be typical of the kind of complaint that I get from far northern areas. They may go in once or twice a year, and, if the chief of the band council insists on some law enforcement presence on a far northern reserve, the crisis is passed or the culprit has fled. It seems to be a very poor way of providing law enforcement services to people in this province who feel, quite justly, that they have a right to protection from law-breakers in much the same way that we do right down here in Metropolitan Toronto.

I do appreciate there are logistical problems in getting law enforcement officers into these areas, and I had suggested a flying police force for the far north to the former Attorney General, Mr. Wishart; I think he was just about to institute it, but I suspect that some of his ministry personnel talked him out of it. I don't know why; it seemed to be a reasonable way to approach the situation. In many countries they have flying doctor services, flying nursing services, flying dental services and so on. The uses to which an aircraft is put are almost unlimited; yet in the far north they haven't taken advantage of air services to bring much needed law enforcement services to bear on culprits.

It seems to me that if the task force on policing in the Province of Ontario is going to come to grips with that problem, it will have to go up there to engage in dialogue with the band officers to document the kind of problems that all of us have been bringing to the attention of law enforcement personnel down here. Hopefully, as a result, we'll come up with some kind of a solution that will give them the kind of protection they deserve and need so badly.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the minister will give me his assurance that it will be a part of the task force's terms of reference, and that they will go up there. Don't take my word for it; go up and talk to the chiefs of band councils who have become very

responsible people over the years. And I hope that you will pay heed to what they say and, in some fashion, try to come to grips with the problems that they're facing in those remote communities in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I give the hon. member the assurance that what he has referred to will be done.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, could we know at this time what the terms of reference are for the task force? Secondly, who is the task force?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I shan't read all of the terms of reference but the important points are: An analysis and forecast of future needs; the division of policing responsibility; and financing of police services; the process of designation; police manpower planning and development; the administration of police forces, including the concept of boards of commissioners of police; the functions and role of the Ontario Police Commission; and the relationship between the police and the public.

The member will be interested in knowing that this particular task force, as I announced, was unique in its makeup because it included—and includes—all the various sectors of our community which would have an interest in the matter and input to offer. For example, from the municipal side we have Ald. William Archer, who is known to the member from the provincial-municipal liaison committee; Reeve Allan N. Masson, of the town of Oakville, also from the provincial-municipal liaison committee. We have Assistant Commissioner Erskine of the OPP, representing a provincial agency; His Honour, Judge Graham from the Ontario Police Commission, also representing a provincial government agency.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have Mr. Picherack from TEIGA, a provincial agency; Mr. Pollock from the Ministry of the Attorney General, a provincial government agency. We have from the police side, the chief of police of Barrie, Edward A. Tschirhart; we have Mr. Syd Brown of the Police Association of Ontario; and from the public sector we have M. O. DesLauriers, he is president of the Association Canadienne-Francaise de l'Ontario. We have Mrs. Isserstedt of the city of Toronto; Miss Marua Jemmott, a lawyer from the city of Toronto, representative of the general public. We have Mr. Valorie Swain, QC, from Kingston; he probably will have been known to the member. He is a former mayor I believe. Then from northern Ontario we have Mr. Pianosi from Copper Cliff; I don't know whether that is far enough north for the hon. member.

Mr. Stokes: Copper Cliff? That's Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have Mr. Don Pitt, a town councillor from Kenora. As it happens a vacancy has occurred and I am going to be looking to Thunder Bay, or that vicinity, for a suggestion. I find that Copper Cliff is not far enough north and Kenora may be too far north, so we have to get someone to make it a happy medium.

Mr. Stokes: I'll be happy to make a recommendation.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1501, is item 3 carried?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the minister a couple of questions on item 3, on the task force.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: The task force, I think, was set up close to a year ago, wasn't it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was announced almost a year ago—the complete appointment was announced in November of last year.

Mr. Roy: Have they had no public meetings yet?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, they have had a series of them.

Mr. Roy: Where have they had public meetings?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They had their first one in Toronto last week, and now they are beginning to move across the province.

Mr. Roy: They have just started, then?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They have had a whole series of internal meetings and briefings in order to acquaint all of this very broad membership with all of the facets—the members really had to become aware of all of the problems in depth. A good deal of research has been done and now they are moving on to the public hearing—and about 150 briefs have already been received.

Mr. Roy: I can see some problems in educating this group of people, because the minister seems to have an awful lot of them on this commission. Does the minister not think it is too large and somewhat unwieldly?

Or does the minister expect—let's say when he is up north—to only have people from the north sitting up there; and when he has people from another area to concentrate on people from that area? How many members are on that commission?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are 19, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Roy: Nineteen?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and size may be a bit of a logistical problem. On the other hand, if we were going to have the kind of input and the kind of participation in which everybody who had a role to play did play a role, we had to have a committee of this size.

Mr. Roy: I don't particularly agree with the minister's philosophy, because basically a task force is to get input from the public—that's where he is going to get most of his information; hopefully it's from the public when he goes to various areas of the province. The minister doesn't need 19 people.

I take it most of the input would not necessarily come from the people on the committee, but from briefs received from various associations—including Crown attorneys, police forces and that; from various officials in various areas of the province.

What I am trying to say is that the minister seems to have created a commission where he expects the input or the results of it to come from the members themselves, rather than from the public. I am suggesting to the minister that if we are going to wait—he has 19 people; he is just starting to brief now; he had the first public meeting just last week. We are going to be quite some time, possibly on the eve of the 1975 election or something, before the minister comes out with a report.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member has difficulty in recognizing the fact that it is a very complicated process. There will be participation by and input from the members directly and from hearing the views of the public and the briefs. It is a total process group.

Mrs. Campbell: Would it not occur to the minister that perhaps since he has the chief of police of Barrie and Syd Brown, and quite a large group of politicians, that it might be useful to have someone like Superintendent Fern Alexander on the task force for the kind of input she might have? As my colleague points out, the input seems to be internal in this task force.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I pointed out to the hon. member that there were two women on the task force—

Mrs. Campbell: That was not my question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am sorry, I didn't quite get the name the hon. member mentioned.

Mrs. Campbell: I believe the highest ranking female in the police force in this province is Superintendent Fern Alexander, who is at the head of the youth bureau. Surely it might occur to the powers that be that she could give something to this task force. I am not particularly asking that it be her because she's a woman, but she has the position and could give something of unique quality, it seems to me, to this task force.

An hon. member: I know her very well.

Mrs. Campbell: She may not be a Tory; I don't know that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we asked the various groups to put forward the names of people who would participate from that sector, and the police chiefs' association put forward the name of Chief Tschirhart, which was acceptable; and the Police Association of Ontario put forward Syd Brown, which was acceptable; and that is all we dealt with.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, something in relation to that just occurred to me. Since the minister has made mention of the fact there is a vacancy, will you consider appointing a native person to fill that vacancy?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, at the time the makeup of the committee was established, we considered all of the facets and we didn't relate any specific appointment to any particular group. We tried to get a cross representation from across the whole province in the makeup of the committee.

On the other hand, I have asked the chairman specifically that when he comes into this sector he have a very close relationship and dialogue with the native people of Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: All right! I will accept the fact that you didn't do it on the terms of any ethnic background or any nationality, but my colleague, my friend the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle), knows there are a minimum of 15,000 native people, stretching over a third of the province geographically, from the CNR mainline right through Hudson and James Bays, and

they haven't got any representation. If there is any problem with regard to policing, that has got to be one of the worst. Why wouldn't you consider appointing a native person for some valuable input to your committee—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): He is a white supremacist, that is why.

Mr. Stokes: —on a geographic basis?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it so happens that the particular vacancy that has occurred is because one of the people from the municipal sector was unable to continue to participate, and so we will be constrained, I believe, in getting that kind of input again. There isn't a vacancy from the point of view of the public sector.

As I say, I have no hard position in this regard. The one thing I will share with the other members is that I have made it very clear to the chairman that I want to have a complete input on behalf of the natives with respect to their point of view in policing.

Mr. Stokes: Well, just add one more and make it 20.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Let me ask a question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we have been criticized for the size and unwieldiness —that is not my word—of the task force.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Criticized by whom?

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I'd like a point of clarification. The minister said these people have not been chosen from any group. Could he tell us then the criteria for the choice of those in the public sector?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We tried to get a package of qualifications which would be representative and reflect, as far as we could, the general population of Ontario.

Mrs. Campbell: Other than the native population.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried?

Mr. Stokes: No, I want to know. I don't think it ever occurred to the minister to have somebody speaking on behalf of native people until I brought it to his attention. And just lately—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is wrong. It did occur to me.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Why didn't you do it then, if it occurred to you?

Mr. Stokes: How are you going to have a significant input into the deliberation of your committee on policing if you haven't got one native person there who even has the remotest idea of what is going on in the far northern reserves or in Indian communities? I think maybe you should have learned by the experience you have had over the past several months right in the community of Gull Bay.

It is quite obvious that after about 18 months of trouble in that community you have never come up with anything significant that would lead to the resolution of those problems. That, I think, is why you need somebody representing the Union of Ontario Indians or treaty No. 9, some presence from the Indian population to tell you what is really going on and what is needed.

You also said in your opening remarks that you were going to have a programme whereby you were going to bring native people into police forces wherever possible. If you are going to do that, if you are really serious about it, why don't you at least make a token gesture and appoint one native person to your task force?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in the habit of making token gestures.

Mr. Deans: That is exactly what you are doing now.

Mr. Stokes: You are not making any.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, it has not been possible to mirror the total population. We did it to the best of our ability within the constraints of the number of people who could serve on a task force. The hon. member for Ottawa East would probably have chosen one commissioner to oversee the evidence from his point of view.

Mr. Haggerty: You certainly have enough from Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We now have a group of 19.

Mr. Roy: These are mostly from Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I make the point to the hon. member that I have specifically asked and stressed to the chairman that he assure that he gets the complete input from the native sector in respect to its points of view on policing.

Mr. Haggerty: How is he going to get it?

Mr. Stokes: When I asked you specifically whether or not that will be a part of the terms of reference of the task force you said, "I make that commitment to the member," that you would go forward from this place and make that commitment and so direct them. Now you say you've already done so.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, Mr. Chairman, the itinerary of the task force does mention the north very specifically and has done so from the very beginning. I say to the hon. member I have had conversations with both the chairman and members of the task force in respect to the matter that he and I are discussing.

Mr. Stokes: Will you make available to me a copy of the itinerary, so that I'll know where they will be at any given point in time?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh, absolutely. We would be very happy to provide the hon. member—as a matter of fact, I will—

Mrs. Campbell: All of us.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will see to it that whenever the task force—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): It's like a road-show—they have an advance man.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —is in a particular community that the local member be advised. I just made that basic assumption that that would be done.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, just one matter, because the hon. minister obviously didn't get the point we were trying to bring forth. In your attempt to satisfy all segments of the Ontario community, some of which I suggest to you is a form of tokenism, you've ended up even by missing the boat, as the member has pointed out, because you have no one from the native people on that committee. I'm saying that since you have not satisfied even that basic, you'd be better off to have fewer people on the commission and it would be less unwieldy and it might be more efficient.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 agreed to.

We'll move back to item 1. Before we ask for the vote to be carried, I have an amendment moved by Mr. Roy that vote 1501, item 1, be reduced by $1,500.

Mr. Roy: Fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. Chairman: Fifteen thousand dollars, excuse me.

Mr. Roy: He's not worth it.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on the minister's salary if I may. I suppose this is what's under review at the moment and it has to do—

Mr. Chairman: The minister's salary is statutory.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, well, it will just take a moment. Statutory or not, the member for High Park as a matter of policy is asking this of every minister of this government, as we come from estimate to estimate, and I'm his deputy on this occasion to do so.

Mr. Haggerty: Where is he tonight?

Mr. Lawlor: We did so with the hon. Provincial Secretary for Justice last night.

What airplane trips at government expense have you taken recently? Has your family accompanied you? Where did you go—outside the province, inside the province? Please give us dates; we want to know. If we can't get a log officially, we'll get it one by one.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore is out of order.

Mr. Lawlor: I am not out of order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Morty didn't ask about my family.

Mr. Cassidy: He is absolutely in order.

Mr. Chairman: You are out of order.

Mr. Lawlor: It's part of the vote.

Mr. Chairman: No, it's not.

Mr. Foulds: He is absolutely in order and the question must be answered.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What do you mean it must be answered? He is not on the witness stand.

Mr. Roy: The public has the right to know.

Mr. Chairman: It has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. Lawlor: It certainly has something to do with his salary.

An hon. member: With the main office and the expenses.

Mr. Cassidy: And the activities of the minister whose salary is on this vote.

Mr. Stokes: Where would one ask that question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I would think you would ask that in transport—main office—

Mr. Foulds: The activities of this minister?

An hon. member: You would think so, would you?

Mr. Chairman: It is not to do with the minister's salary, I can assure you of that. That is statutory. If you want to revert back to item 1, which we have a resolution on—

Mr. Lawlor: It has to do with the main office vote and I want an answer, Mr. Chairman, otherwise I'll challenge your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: Well, you can challenge my ruling but we have dealt with the main office vote except for the amendment. Now, I'm putting the amendment.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm speaking to the amendment and adumbrating a little thereon and ranging somewhat afield. If you don't mind I'd like an answer.

Mr. Renwick: Do you want to know how to vote on it?

Mr. Chairman: You're still out of order. The member for Lakeshore is out of order. We dealt with item 1 except for the amendment.

Mrs. Campbell: Challenge him.

An hon. member: Out of order.

Mr. Chairman: And we passed it, except for the amendment.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, if you want to make this difficult, you blockhead, we'll do it—if you want to be challenged. I think the minister is prepared to answer the question if you'll just let him get ahead with it.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right, yes.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): You have had your say.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am one who abides by the rules completely. I am subject to your ruling.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, don't pay so much attention to them!

Mr. Chairman: The ruling is that we are voting on the amendment. We have heard the amendment. All in favour of the amendment please say "aye."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of—

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If you don't know what a challenge means—

Mr. Chairman: I know what it means and I'm going to put the question if you'll just sit down for a minute! Take your seat.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm telling you.

Mr. Foulds: A little temper there.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the Chairman's ruling, please say "aye."

All opposed say "nay."

In my opinion the "nyes" have it.

Mrs. Campbell: The "nyes" have it?

Mr. Deans: No, the "nays" have it.

Mr. Chairman: The "nyes" have it. The "ayes" have it.

An hon. member: The "ayes" have it.

Mr. Henderson: Indecision over there all the way.

Mr. Deans: You said the "nays."

Mr. Stokes: We won the vote.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Answer the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I said, "All in favour of the Chairman's ruling, please say "aye."

Mr. Stokes: That's right. They said "aye" and we said "nay" and you said the "nyes" have it.

Mr. Chairman: I did not.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, you did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: You said the "nyes" have it.

Mr. Chairman: I did not. In my opinion the "ayes" have it. That's what I said.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: You can't reverse your decision.

Mr. Chairman: I didn't reverse it.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, we did believe you to say the "nays" have it. Would you take the vote again so that we can have the procedure done properly?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Deans: We believe you to have said the "nays" have it. We heard it quite distinctly. We might have been in error but we'll try it again.

Mr. Cassidy: And he ruled it out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You were about to stand up.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): He said the "ayes" had it. I heard him say that.

Mr. Chairman: All right then. Nobody stood up so the ruling stands.

Mr. Foulds: What is the chairman's ruling?

Mr. Deans: What is the chairman's ruling? Would you tell us what your opinion is?

Mr. Chairman: That you're out of order and the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lewis: Imagine ruling the hon. member for Lakeshore out of order! He has more respect for this House's rules than the Chair will ever have in your entire tenure here. You don't have that much in stature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, we're voting on the amendment. All in favour of Mr. Roy's motion, that vote 1501, item 1, be reduced by $15,000, will please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Let's stand up.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

Mr. Henderson: Three, six, seven Liberals over there. Let the record show that.

The committee divided on Mr. Roy's amendment to vote 1501, which was negatived on the following vote:

The Clerk Assistant: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 30, the "nays" are 49.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Vote 1501 agreed to.

On vote 1502:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale. Item 1.

Mr. Renwick: I've lost my book.

An hon. member: Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: You should see what the member for Sudbury East lost.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my comment is on item 4.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4? Just before then, is there someone on item 1?

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in item 3.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3? Anyone on item 1?

Mr. Renwick: No, 3.

Mr. Roy: Item 3.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 1 carried then?

Carried.

Item 2 carried?

Carried.

Item 3.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, item 2, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Roy: Item 3.

Mr. Chairman: Two?

Mr. Roy: On item 2.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre on item 2.

Mr. Cassidy: It's Ottawa East, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Ottawa East?

Mr. Roy: Ottawa East.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It doesn't matter.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister. He mentioned in his opening remarks a new forensic centre—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Is it in this item here that we are discussing? I would like to know—

Mr. Chairman: Could we have order in the chamber, please?

An hon. member: That's controlling them; that's controlling them.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That is a good start; that is the way to get yourself into trouble.

An hon. member: The gavel works.

Mr. Roy: The first question I would like to ask the minister is on the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: —necessity for a new forensic centre. I thought the one we've been working with for the past years was quite adequate. What brought on the new building; the expenditures for a new forensic centre?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the present facilities down at the foot of—is it Sherbourne St?—

An hon. member: Jarvis.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —at the foot of Jarvis St. are very crowded, very inadequate; the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Has the minister been there yet? Has he been to see it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The personnel are called upon to do very important, very painstaking work under almost impossible conditions.

Mr. Roy: Of the amount to be spent on the new centre, how much of it is capital cost?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, there is no figure for capital in these estimates; that would be in the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services. Incidentally, the building is going up presently on Grosvenor St., and if you walk along Grosvenor from Yonge to Bay, it is on the south side.

Mr. Roy: Was this a tendered contract that was awarded, or how was this handed out?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would assume that it was the normal government procedure in respect of the construction of public buildings.

Mrs. Campbell: Proposal! Proposal!

Mr. Roy: What is the normal procedure? Does the minister mean proposal?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, now that question could be directed to the Minister of Government Services during his estimates.

Mr. Roy: Well, we are voting money for this now, aren't we?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No. There are no capital expenditures.

Mr. Roy: No capital. Okay!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is operating expenditure.

Mr. Roy: Okay. Well, then my next question—

An hon. member: Vote on it.

Mr. Roy: Pardon?

An hon. member: Move into another area.

Mr. Roy: Yes. Well, I'll go somewhere else. If I could ask the minister about this centre, Mr. Chairman. Can basically such a centre serve the purposes of the police when they are doing investigating work and this type of thing? Is this open to, let's say, an individual or an accused; or a law firm or a lawyer who wants to obtain some evidence—wants something analysed? Is this open to him if he requires the services of this centre, let's say, to help in his defence; or is it limited to government agencies or Crown agencies?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the users are the police, the pathologists, coroners, and the services are available to defence counsel on a purchase-of-service basis.

Mr. Roy: On a purchase-of-service basis? Does the minister mean he has to pay to—

Mr. Lawlor: That's right. Keen experts.

Mr. Roy: Well, why is that? Why, for instance, if you are defending an individual on a legal matter?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Why shouldn't he? Look at the fees he charges.

Mr. Roy: On legal aid? The member doesn't know anything about legal aid. Let's say he was defending on a legal aid matter—

An hon. member: Rip off.

Mr. Yakabuski: A licence to steal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister not think that if it's open to the police, it should also be open to an individual as well?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Yakabuski: Doesn't the member know what is going on?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: It's good to have the member for Renfrew South back.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, when I referred to defence counsel, it's not—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —the regular procedure in criminal matters; it relates to civil cases.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Defence in civil cases.

Mr. Roy: I could see some merit if you were charging in a civil case, where you are defending a client on an ordinary fee basis. But what about it in a criminal case if defence counsel requires the services of this forensic centre? Are you saying that you would charge him something?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the services are impartial. If a defence counsel in a criminal case requests the services, they are rendered, on condition that a copy of the information also goes to the Crown attorney.

Mr. Roy: Why would it have to go to a Crown attorney?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are maintaining an impartial basis where the centre is dedicated to producing factual scientific analysis. It doesn't take sides.

Mr. Roy: There is no obligation on the Crown to disclose its case or send a copy to defence counsel. So why should it go the other way?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that frequently a copy is given by the Crown.

Mr. Roy: Yes, at the discretion of the Crown.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, I would be very happy to look into the matter to make sure that the impartiality of the centre with respect to scientific analysis is maintained.

Mr. Roy: Just so that this point be very clear with the minister, I take it as a matter of policy, if a defence counsel in a criminal case requires the services of the centre, you are saying today in the House that it is open to him to have those services, let's say, to assist him in the defence of his case.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That's the established practice.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, under that particular heading and in continuation of that statement, that's very interesting. To what extent, for instance, does the defence counsel in criminal cases require analysis, say, of poisons or the analysis of the boring in a gun? To what extent do they turn to your forensic laboratory in order to obtain this kind of evidence, rather than going out into the private enterprise field in order to obtain this? My feeling is that that is not extensively used.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have no knowledge of the services ever being refused. Within the constraints of their capacity to deal with requests, they provide the impartial scientific analysis.

Mr. Lawlor: On the other hand, is it commonplace, therefore, for defence counsel in criminal cases to approach the forensic laboratory for detailed analysis in various areas of the criminal law? Fingerprint evidence and guns and so on?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't have statistics. I wouldn't think it would be common, but whenever the necessity arises the centre will respond.

Mr. Roy: I suggest to the minister, Mr. Chairman, with respect to his statement about the use by defence counsel, that this use in the past has been extremely limited, because there has been a somewhat unwritten rule on discouragement of the defence. I suggest that if you look in your statistics, maybe subsequent to the question by the member for Lakeshore, there are very, very few occasions where defence counsels have used the forensic centre. One of the reasons for it is that, first of all, it is not common knowledge that it is open to them, and it should be.

Mr. Lawlor: Certainly, they don't invite them.

Mr. Roy: Secondly, there has not been any encouragement for them to use it in a defence of their case. Basically, it's a centre that's devoted usually to Crown agencies, the police, the Crown attorney's office, and so on.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, I don't dispute that that is the basic use of the centre. I think there are about 50 cases a year with respect to use by defence counsel. But I may say this, in a year I have not had any complaint from any defence counsel that his requests haven't been met. I don't get the hon. member's point. What is the hon. member driving at?

Mr. Roy: The point that I am driving at is that this centre operates on taxpayers' money—on public money. Especially in light of the fact that more and more criminal defences are taking place under our legal aid system, and that very often legal aid counsel in certain situations is not aware of it, I think the minister should make a point of publicizing the fact that you have a new centre, which in fact you take a lot of pride in. And I think you should take pride in it, because even in the old centre I had occasion to work with some of the people and to see their evidence. They do a good job these people. But I think it should be publicized that this is open to the public as well, to the individual and to counsel, and possibly in this fashion they would make more use of it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to give the hon. member an undertaking that when the ribbon is cut full publicity be given to the people of Ontario that they have the finest forensic centre on the continent available in the public interest, including those from defence counsel's side.

Mr. Roy: Will you invite the chairman of the Law Society as a sort of token gesture that this is open to the profession and to the public? I would suggest that you do that.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member for Lakeshore have further questions?

Mr. Lawlor: I want a continuity of that. That is precisely the point. Up to now it has been a closed corporation. I would like to know the number of times that G. Arthur Martin has been in to use your facilities over against his own investigative staff and his own analysis of weapons, and his own analysis of chemicals, and his own analysis of blood, coming from an extra source to bring as expert witnesses into a court? If this is available it is excellent.

The thrust of this argument must be that you spoke and prated a little of neutrality as between opposing counsel. This opens a bonanza, this opens a new field for them. I wish it were more advertised. I wish it would become more accurrency in the profession, and if you want it to perform a function—I think it should perform a function—its staff should be available as witnesses on both sides of the fence, just as the Clarke Institute sends in a psychiatrist on both sides of the fence with relative freedom.

I have never been aware of this. I thought that the forensic clinic was your special preserve, a little island of isolation servicing the Crown, which again of course was far overreaching against the accused, who either didn't have the wherewithal or anything else. Certainly, working in conjunction with legal aid at least it can be highly beneficial. If this is the policy then it is a relatively new thing and I think you should give it some public currency.

Is that the position—complete neutrality?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Impartiality—as pure science should always be.

Mr. Lawlor: Serving both parties?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Serving both parties. During the past year about 50 defence counsel have made use of the services to my knowledge—

Mr. Lawlor: Out of thousands of cases.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and to my personal knowledge I have never heard of anybody being refused. Certainly nobody has brought to my attention that they have not received service from the centre, and that answers the question.

Mr. Lawlor: One expert—one inch and you welcome the approach of defence counsel to the laboratory.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The services are there and within the capacity of the centre to give the service they will render that.

Mr. Lawlor: That is pretty weasely.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, what is the maintenance cost of the new centre going to be compared to the old quarters? What would the cost have been had the location been a long way away—say

a matter of 25 miles away—from the highest cost real estate in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Again, Mr. Chairman, we are not voting on capital expenditures.

Mr. Deacon: I am talking about maintenance costs.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Those costs are in the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, is there no accountability under the new system of checking out costs of government services for the space that these operations utilize or require? Is there no way that you have any requirement in this operation to account for the cost of space provided?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the Ministry of Government Services provides space for the various other ministries. In this instance the ministry—then the Department of the Attorney General—would have placed before the then Department of Public Works a request for space, and it was arrived at that this space would be made available.

Mr. Deacon: Well, Mr. Chairman, why was it necessary to construct this new centre on the most expensive real estate in Canada? Why could it not have been built 25 or 30 miles away from here? Why should this centre be just another place attracting more people into this already overcrowded city?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I won't go into all of the aspects of the location of the building. Certainly it's probably in the centre of the largest users. It is central to the hospital complexes in the immediate vicinity. It will provide space for the ministry offices. It's near the university for pathology training. There are logical reasons for the building to be located there. I sense the thrust of the hon. member's questioning, and the ministry is not adverse to the concept of decentralization and the dispersal of its delivery programmes wherever feasible.

Mr. Deacon: Well, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Connaught Laboratories, for example, are a long way away from the University of Toronto, and other facilities are quite a distance away from the crowded centre of this city, why couldn't these facilities have been placed in Mississauga or some other place? Actually, they could have been a long way from here in my view. I can't see why we continue to provide all the opportunities for highly technical employment in the centre of Toronto. I would appreciate an answer, because the minister hasn't indicated any reason why it had to be right down here on Grenville St.

Mrs. Campbell: Grosvenor.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member is correct. It's Grosvenor; it backs on to Grenville.

Mrs. Campbell: It's part of the superblock.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, just one further question on this.

Under the item for the Centre of Forensic Sciences, there is $144,200 for supplies and equipment; shouldn't we be voting another $2,500 for this, since the budget handed down on Thursday will add another two per cent? I take it that it's going to cost more money for the supplies and equipment as a result of the budget. Have you taken that into account?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the province is in the unique position of being totally exempt from sales tax.

Mr. Roy: You mean that you're not paying the sales tax for your equipment and supplies, that if you buy supplies, you don't pay sales tax?

Mrs. Campbell: Or on energy.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: On vote 1502, item 4, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Well, first of all, are there other speakers on item 2?

Mr. Haggerty: Item 3.

Mrs. Campbell: I have a question. Could I ask the minister when the Centre of Forensic Sciences is going to open?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would imagine in the next year or so. Construction is in full swing; some of the floors are already up. I don't know what the target date is.

Mrs. Campbell: The reason I'm asking is that I see the item for salaries and wages. Do I take it that this is for the present location, and therefore is not the new Centre for Forensic Sciences as it's spelled out?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is for the operation of the current facilities.

Mrs. Campbell: Does that include the salary of Dr. John Hillsdon-Smith, or does he not take over until the new centre is open?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He would be under item 6, forensic pathology.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you.

Item 2 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3.

Mr. Haggerty: I would like to direct a question to the minister. Has he had any requests to provide assistance in disaster areas resulting from the high waters of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario? I believe that the minister is responsible for emergency measures and I think the request has to go to him.

What assistance has he provided in these areas that needed help?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the emergency measures branch does not deliver —if I may use the term—hard services. It's a planning and a process agency, and any requests which are received through our branch are directed to Mr. Giles, who is the chairman of the task force which was announced by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence).

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, if I can recall, I believe emergency measures is set up for planning, that's true, but also it has a programme in case of any emergency or disaster. I am thinking in particular of the Niagara Peninsula, where they do have emergency measures set up there and where they have specialized equipment to handle any emergency. I was just wondering why you haven't acted to provide some assistance to these municipalities that have been requesting help. I am sure that there are additional funds that can be made available if you participate in that programme, or in that assistance.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the kind of hard services at the local level are provided under the aegis of the local aspect of the emergency measures branch. It would be part of the equipment that is available to that municipality through its own resources.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder, before you report, if I could just have a word. Earlier this evening the hon. member for Ottawa East made some reference to my seat and I had a sharp retort as to his location. I believe that every chair and every seat in this Legislature has equal importance.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment debate occurs, I would like to announce that tomorrow we will continue with the debate in committee of supply.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with our announcement this afternoon then, I deem a motion to adjourn to have been made, and will call the order of business as announced earlier.

In accordance with standing order 27(g), Mr. Deans had announced that he was dissatisfied with the answer given to him by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence). I now call on Mr. Deans and he has five minutes to present his arguments.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I may not require the entire five minutes.

I want to bring back to mind the matter which I have raised here this evening. On April 10, 1973, on page 725 of Hansard, I asked the minister in a supplementary question why he did not proceed immediately to make whatever is necessary available to the people on the lakefronts and the minister declined to reply in any way to that particular question.

I haven't been happy with the attitude of this government toward what has been a crisis on the lakefronts of the Province of Ontario for the last number of months. I simply charge that this government has neglected its responsibility. It seems totally incapable of dealing with a crisis in its response. Its response is simply that at some point in the obscure future, after the properties of the people have been damaged to the extent that they require repair, then and only then will the government move in with assistance.

I charge that this is not nearly adequate in this day and age. It seems that the gov-

ernment has a very warped view of what its responsibilities are.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It needs an administration with imagination, vision.

Mr. Deans: I want to make it perfectly clear that there are two problems involved in this particular situation. One is an emergency problem of flooding. It can be dealt with now, and can be dealt with by this government. It doesn't require the assistance of Ottawa; they can put to work some of the 3.9 per cent seasonally adjusted unemployed in the Province of Ontario, and they can sandbag and build the kinds of dikes that will protect the properties of the people of this province from the kind of flooding that has occurred and is going to occur in the next month. I say further that this government has known since last summer that the problem that occurred only a week ago on the lakefronts was going to occur. It was brought to their attention by members of their own party and by members of this party and, I suspect, by members of the Liberal Party that there were going to be problems of flooding in the lakes of the Province of Ontario and that there had to be some action taken.

This government adamantly refused to move over the eight months from last September, when I personally first met with citizens in the Niagara Peninsula in order to try to come to grips with what they recognized was going to be an immediate problem, a problem which eventually materialized much to their discomfort and to a great extent to some financial loss to them and to the loss of their property, which most of them can ill afford. I suggest that for a very small amount of money spent prior to the flooding of a week ago, and even yet for a small amount of money to be spent right now out on the lakefronts in the most vulnerable low-lying areas to try to ensure that further flooding doesn't take place, would be money well spent by this government.

Further to that, I want to say that this government has shown over 20 years a complete lack of responsibility in dealing with the whole matter of the erosion of the lakes of Ontario. They had it brought to their attention in 1953 and a substantial report was prepared for the government by a select committee that there had been an erosion problem at that point, and that this erosion problem required considerable action by the government. The government failed to act, and I charge that they have the primary responsibility. It is their responsibility to act, because they were the ones who asked for the study, they were the ones who were warned, and they have refused to live up to their responsibilities over those 20 years. As a result of this failure, they have caused unnecessary hardship on many people of the Province of Ontario.

Further, and one final point, I want to say to the minister that it is not a matter of dealing with erosion now or not dealing with erosion now, it is a matter of dealing with erosion now or dealing with erosion later. I suggest to the government that the erosion process will continue. It will inevitably result in the reduction in the shorelines of the Province of Ontario, unless this government acts now, as it ought to have acted over the last 20 years. I suggest the first step would be the development of the kinds of groynes that can be built out into the lakes and that do cut down on the current and the wash that very much results in the erosion that we have seen in the last month or two.

Secondly, this government should undertake a programme of the building of storm breakwaters along those areas that are of public ownership in order to protect those. Further, this government should embark on a programme of loans and grants, as it does in every other sector, to allow people who do have private property along the lakefronts to build the kinds of retaining walls and breakwaters that they themselves are prepared to undertake in order to try to protect what is in fact, and will some day be in absolute law, the sole responsibility of the Province of Ontario.

I want to say that I am completely dissatisfied on behalf of the people of the Province of Ontario with this government's negative attitude and the lack of concern that it has shown.

Mr. Speaker: The minister now has five minutes to reply if he wishes.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't in the time available to me try to address myself to all the different fields of activity in which this government is involved in the long term and short term with the federal government and with the municipalities, touching on every aspect of this general tragedy. Whatever is necessary, though, does trigger a response to the extent that we have received suggestions that the unemployed be used, that the jails be emptied and that students be let out of school.

We have had a number of suggestions, but the intriguing thing is that if, as the hon. member suggests, he knew and they knew and everyone knew that there were going to be problems with flooding, I do not recall a constructive suggestion coming from the opposition in the last year. Not one.

Mr. Deans: Check with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier). I wrote him a letter about a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: They bewail the waters! We had a whole afternoon's debate but there wasn't one constructive suggestion come from that four hours' debate.

Many of the things that the member points to, I think, are valid and we will assess them. There are questions of long-term insurance; questions of lowering taxes; questions of immediate loans; questions of getting our equipment on the ground faster. To all of these things, yes, we will respond quickly but we do not have the response to the total problem. The federal government doesn't have the response to the total problem. I would suggest that instead of weeping over the waters there be some constructive suggestions from someone in this House as to what we should do.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Get a new minister.

Mr. Lawlor: Put down some bloody sandbags. Help out.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: As a matter of fact, I don't suggest that those waters relate to either a Liberal flood or an NDP flood or a Conservative flood.

Mr. Lawlor: No, it is a neutral flood.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: It is the concern of all of us.

Mr. Deans: But the minister is the government, I cannot order the waves—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'm not sure of that. I think the member caused some of the storm.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I think, apart from the half-dozen programmes, some of the long-term programmes and some of the intermediate programmes that we have been considering, what I personally would like this House to consider is the role of an organized, civilian authority in some way.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): We have got EMO.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: We were left with the Emergency Measures Organization, which was spawned out of the atomic bomb, and the Russians and national disaster.

Mr. Martel: That's a farce.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: On the other hand, we do not have a National Guard and we wouldn't want one. We do not have a Home Guard and I don't think we would want one. What I would hope is that out of this problem, we would have—

Mr. Martel: Change the role of the EMO.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: —in a constructive sense, a debate over some sort of civilian supportive role generally in this province. To that extent I think that the suggestions of the hon. member are creative.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Nixon, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, expressed his dissatisfaction with an answer given by the Premier (Mr. Davis). The hon. Leader of the Opposition now has five minutes.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the matter that I want to raise at this time stems from the Premier's refusal, in response to my questions, to make the logbooks of government aircraft open to public inspection. His explanation that he refuses as a matter of policy is completely unacceptable and, in fact, irresponsible.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that just a few moments ago a specific question was put to the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) asking him to tell the House whether he, as an individual minister, had used these planes. The question was ruled out of order and, although the ruling was questioned, it evidently was upheld as might have been expected.

Mr. Lawlor: We will come back to it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The point, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier obviously has given orders that the government is to stonewall, if I may use that phrase, any possible source of information about the use of these aircraft, from whatever source it might possibly come forward.

Mr. Martel: That's sandbagging.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He must realize that the 40 or more planes in the government service are public property and the cost of their operation is entirely borne from public funds. The Provincial Auditor publicly called into question the unauthorized use of the planes in paragraph 116 of his report this year as follows:

> It was noted during the conduct of this audit that the costs of some charter flights were being borne by the environmental protection branch, even though the purpose of these flights appeared not to be related to the resource protection and development programme. For example, a review of the charter flight reports indicated that a number of flights were made transporting ministers, accompanied by their families on occasion, senior civil servants and others to and from areas within and beyond the Province of Ontario.

Surely the Premier cannot insist that full information relating directly to criticism by the Provincial Auditor can be withheld from this House nor from the public accounts committee.

Such an attitude flies in the face of responsible government and the democratic process. The members of the Legislature and the people have a right to know how the government spends our money. The Premier in his refusal has abrogated the basic rights of democratic responsibility. There can be no justification for his adamant refusal, other than to assume that the misuse of the planes was flagrant and would be embarrassing to the government if it became public knowledge.

Mr. Martel: He must have something to hide.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The fact that new policy has been announced and communicated to the auditor does not discharge the Premier's total responsibility in this matter, particularly during the years 1971 and 1972. Full disclosure is absolutely mandatory under these circumstances, and I call once again for the tabling of the full record.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. House leader.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to reply to the presentation by the leader of the Liberal Party, and I would like to say that there are no unauthorized flights by government airplanes; there are none. Therefore, I want to put the record straight in regard to the auditor's report. The auditor did not state that there were unauthorized flights; the auditor mentioned in his report—and if the Leader of the Opposition had been absolutely fair he would have stated this—that the question was in regard to the accounting of those flights.

Now, we don't deny for one moment that when an airplane is requisitioned by a minister, other people may attend on those flights. We don't deny that. We don't deny that members across the way might have been on some of those flights.

Mr. Martel: But what about the Tory organizer?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I think no one should question who a minister wishes to take with him for what purpose on a certain flight or at a certain time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Province of Ontario have an equal right to question the other parties on how their money, which is requisitioned by this Legislature, is spent in favour of the people of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By all means. By all means.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I listened for the other five minutes, and I hope I'm given that privilege as well.

Mr. Martel: Nothing but a red herring.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There are no red herrings.

Mr. Martel: It is a red herring.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: No, there's no point of order.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is a very interesting observation, Mr. Speaker, that I put a statement of government policy on the record last Friday and it wasn't questioned until yesterday. As a result of that, we are having this debate here this evening.

But I want to say that the statement put out by the Leader of the Opposition last night just used beautiful political terms without stating clearly or exactly what the purpose of the Provincial Auditor's statement was—and it had nothing to do with unauth-

orized flights; it was totally in regard to the accounting of the entire system.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Shame on the member!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right. Table the report. That's the government's best and only defence. Its only defence.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It's no defence whatsoever, and I want to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to say this, but since there is a little ruckus over there and not a word was said by me while the leader of the Liberty Party was speaking, I want to say that I was alerted to this last fall. When I was about to attend a meeting in northern Ontario to which the entire Legislature was invited, I invited three members who I will not name to come with me. Or I suggested that because I couldn't be there on a certain date, I would fly; they all accepted, excepting when the day came they wrote me letters and said, "We are sorry, we can't go." Then I knew what they were up to; it was a political battle.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Then I knew. Then I knew.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: An advanced case of paranoia.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, everything is fine when they are playing politics but not when they want to tell the truth; then it becomes a different story.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why not tell the truth and table the logbooks? It's the government's only defence.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now I want to say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in a very few days this matter will be before the public accounts committee and the members opposite will have every opportunity to put all their questions at that time. Therefore, with that knowledge, I say to you once again this might well have been somewhat of a political ploy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But will the minister make the information available?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh, I certainly am not.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I want to say one other thing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Ceiling zero!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —while there are 30 seconds left.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There are 30 seconds left.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I want to say one more thing, Mr. Speaker. I have never heard the Prime Minister of Canada questioned once when he uses Boeing 707s—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —which probably on one flight would pay for every bill in the Province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

This order of business is completed.

An hon. member: How often do you fly in that 707?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

I deem the motion to adjourn to have been carried.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:50 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

Estimates, Ministry of the Solicitor General, Mr. Yaremko 1099

Motion to adjourn 1124

Debate re answers to oral questions, Mr. Deans, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Winkler 1124

Adjournment 1128

Legislative Council Debates

No. 26



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Wednesday, April 18, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have guests with us this afternoon: In the west gallery, students from St. Lucy's Separate School, Toronto; coming into the east gallery are the students from the Martingrove Collegiate Institute, Islington. We have special guests who will be introduced by the member for York North.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Mr. Speaker, through you to the members of this Legislature, I would like to introduce our guests in the west gallery, the Ontario Championship Pee Wee DD hockey team and their parents and supporters from the great riding of York North and the village of Schomberg.

For the championship, they beat a very fine hockey team which came from the riding of Brant, from the Six Nations Indian reserve. They are a great little hockey team and really true sports.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I want, briefly, to add my congratulations to the fine hockey players in the gallery, because they must be good if they beat the Indian team from Six Nations. There was a lot of interest locally in that series and it is a great thing to have them in the gallery today.

ESTIMATES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I have a message here from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By his own hand, W. R. Macdonald, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1974, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, April 18, 1973.

Statements by the ministry.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make which will be in the hands of the members of the press in a few minutes.

I would like to take this opportunity to advise the House of certain further steps which the government has decided to take with respect to broadening our programmes of assistance to municipalities and to individuals afflicted by the combined high waters and storms causing erosion and shore damage along the shores of the lower Great Lakes.

Our current support programmes, as the House will recall, are capable of providing, on an 80-20 cost-sharing basis, considerable help to municipalities in relation to the building of physical works. In addition. where disaster committees are formed, compensation for damages can be arranged. We have also, through the Ministry of Agriculture and ARDA, been able to expand—and I hope with the co-operation of the federal government, to further expand—our programmes for the development of further and improved diking projects for the protection of agricultural lands.

Apart from programme assistance, Mr. Speaker, we have been able to make available to municipalities and the public, on an increasing scale, resources from within the government, primarily the ministries of Transportation and Communications and Natural Resources. During the past weeks we have also been in continuous contact with the Canada Centre for Inland Waters and with the officer of the armed forces responsible for ascertaining the role and practical capacities of the armed forces when their support is requested.

Cabinet this morning decided to take three further steps. Firstly, it authorized the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) to request involvement of the armed forces at the moment the federal government may offer the province assistance beyond the strictures of the present EMO arrangements. It should be repeated that the Solicitor General will of course call upon the armed forces, regardless

of cost, if at any time there is a threat to the lives of Ontario residents caused by the continuing situation on the lakes.

As I undertook in the House several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, and in response to suggestions coming from a number of private citizens, I brought before my colleagues a proposal for the development of a system of loans for the purpose of making cash immediately available to shoreline property owners undertaking protective and repair works. Legislation now has been drafted and will be introduced next week providing for the granting of loans. The initial funding for this programme will amount to $1 million.

Thirdly, I should advise the House that under the direction of Mr. Walter Giles, chairman of the flood damage task force, the government has decided to test the practicability of applying the system recently concluded by the Ontario seasonal employment programme in the cutting of dead elm trees. Recruitment of labour will be co-ordinated with the welfare agencies and the Manpower offices by the district offices of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. In addition to the direct assistance in the most seriously affected flood damaged areas, there will be some relief to the local employment situation.

Another part of the programme involves providing trucks and drivers to municipalities to assist them in their efforts to erect protective works or make repairs to existing works. This equipment again will be supplied to the extent it is available from both the Ministries of Transportation and Communications and Natural Resources.

We feel that with some ingenuity, such a programme can be tested immediately, and the municipalities will be notified of the details within a few days. In order that the response will be prompt, responsibility for these two programmes will be decentralized to the district offices of both ministries, which together will be developing an effective liaison with the local municipalities.

Despite the obvious complexities involved in these decisions, Mr. Speaker, we feel that they comprise a valuable extension to current support being given to those suffering damage along our shorelines and reflect the deep concern which all the people of Ontario feel for these people.

MERCURY CONTAMINATION WARNING

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, because fish in some waters in northern Ontario, particularly in the Wabigoon and lower English River areas, have been found to contain unacceptable high amounts of mercury, the Ministry of Health is taking further action to warn those people in the areas, who may be affected, of the health hazard in eating these fish. This action, Mr. Speaker, has been taken with the co-operation and active assistance of other ministries and their personnel who have also been involved in this matter in the past.

The warning will be conveyed in the following manner: A booklet will be made available through all channels that routinely provide information on fishing in Ontario. The booklet, prepared by the Ministry of Natural Resources, will cover all lakes that have been sampled. The mercury content of fish in any given area will be provided where available on request to the local office of the Ministry of Natural Resources. Each household in and adjacent to an area known to have fish that constitute a health hazard if eaten will be sent a letter outlining the danger and suggesting equally nutritious substitutes.

Members of government staff who normally come in contact with the public will be informed of the hazard and of the information available. Information will also be made available to tourists through channels appropriate to their needs, such as health units, offices of Indian affairs, municipal offices, tourist information offices, tourist camps and purveyors of fishing licences. The fishing licence will carry an appropriate warning as well, Mr. Speaker. This programme will be carried out immediately in the Wabigoon and lower English River areas, then in other areas of the province where it is deemed necessary.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The minister ought to be ashamed. Is that all he is doing?

INDUSTRY AND TOURISM EXPLORATION TEAMS

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to present for the information of the members of the House reports on eight out of the 10 exploration teams which were set up by the former Minister of Industry and

Tourism (Mr. White) in March, 1972. At the moment we have received, as I say, eight out of 10 reports over the last few weeks.

The teams were composed of leaders in the business and academic fields. May I inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that they were men and women who voluntarily gave their time and talent on behalf of Ontario. For the information of the House, there were approximately 80 persons participating in the teams and 10 out of the 80 were women.

Their purpose was to provide the minister with advice under the broad terms of reference, with an emphasis on wide-ranging discussion—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I am glad for a few gratuitous tidbits now and again.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am glad that at least we were able to make that point with the hon. member of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He is blushing. He is actually blushing.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: May I say that the emphasis was on wide-ranging discussions rather than on in-depth research. It was the purpose of the teams that they should not be interfered with by the bureaucracy of the civil service of this province, and that they should review ideas and suggestions that may be had been reviewed by government some time before but never put into practice. They examined a number of subjects to assist the ministry in adjusting present programmes and developing new programmes to meet the needs of industry, particularly small businesses, for the overall good of the province and its people.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that these reports to the minister are not to be considered at this time as government policy. They are now being reviewed by a special force of officials in the ministry, with input from other interested government agencies.

I would also like at this time to take this opportunity to thank the members of the teams for their considerable efforts in putting these reports together for the advancement of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism over the next few years.

RYERSON FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

Hon. J. McNie (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement having regard to the situation at Ryerson. With your permission, I may expand somewhat on the statement as such, but I think the matter deserves it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to report there's quiet on all fronts, but I'm afraid I can't. For those in the House who are not too well acquainted with this matter, there are a number of fronts involved, most of which at one time or another over the past few weeks have been alluded to in this House or in the press and in various public and private correspondence.

Our ministry has taken the position that the matter has been and still is one to be settled by the Ryerson community if at all possible. Notwithstanding many hard words, I honestly believe that a great deal of progress has been made.

On the financial front there are reassurances by the management that the books are open for all to view, if not always to comprehend. A comprehensive study of the administration organization will be completed shortly by a leading independent management consultant group.

On the academic side we have a non-confidence vote by the faculty protesting the way in which matters have been handled by the president recently, but not dealing with the essential conduct of the academic life of this school, which has blazed many new and worthwhile trails. With the resources available to them through current funding, there is no reason in the ministry's opinion why their "Open College" initiatives and others cannot be sustained if they accord it a high enough priority, even if station CJRT were to be lost to them. There are other ways in which the present 8½ hours of "Open College" broadcasting could readily be compensated for if necessary.

The administration and board of governors have reaffirmed that the CJRT station, notwithstanding its importance, does not enjoy a high enough priority at this juncture to warrant the expense involved in sustaining it. As a result, the government is prepared to provide interim conditional financing, as described in the following letter to Mr. Ian Kennedy, chairman of the board:

> I am writing with respect to the Ryerson board of governors' decision to close down radio station CJRT June 1 due to what they regard as more pressing priorities. In the light of this decision, our ministry is prepared to make the following temporary arrangements. These arrangements will afford the government the opportunity to

assess the future of CJRT in the context of a much larger review, presently under way, concerning educational broadcasting in the province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Pretty quick results!

Hon. Mr. McNie: The conditions are as follows:

1. Funds to the amount of $75,000 will be made available to Ryerson Polytechnical Institute for the sole purpose of maintaining the operation of CJRT for a period of approximately six months.

2. The station will be operated for that period in its present manner with its current staff, unless otherwise agreed to by the ministry.

3. The ministry must be a party to any discussions, negotiations or arrangements in which the officers of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute may engage with respect to the future of the station.

4. The financial accounts of the station will be made available to the ministry during the period of funding.

5. An initial payment of $25,000 will be made at the time you indicate your acceptance of the proposal outlined above. Subsequent payments up to $75,000 will be made at appropriate intervals, so long as the ministry is convinced that the funds continue to be put to proper use.

That's the end of quote and the end of a substantial part of the letter to Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt briefly with the financing, administration, "Open College" and radio station aspects of this particular problem. The last matter I would like to touch on is, in my opinion, the most difficult and the most discomforting one.

For some three weeks now there has been an occupation of the 14th floor by persons protesting the layoff of maintenance staff. It is my own opinion that these persons and their wives and children, most of whom speak little if any English, are being used by certain parties whose primary interest is not to secure gainful employment for them but rather to exploit them in the interest of discrediting and bringing down the Ryerson management. Whatever the shortcomings of the Ryerson management, these 14th-floor tactics are completely indefensible, in my opinion.

I am personally satisfied, Mr. Speaker, and I invite other members of the House to satisfy themselves likewise, that suitable alternative employment has been made available in other organizations for these unfortunate persons. I am further satisfied that representations, which I consider to be almost unprecedented in their scope, have been made to introduce these people to the prospective employers for interviews and to secure certain permanent employment in most cases at wages close to or larger than those being paid at present.

I am sorry to report, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of these unemployed persons have chosen not to follow up these leads, which is a great tragedy. At one point there were several specific listed potential opportunities for every unemployed worker. Although the lists were challenged by a few, they have subsequently proved to be essentially sound.

I might say that the community owes a debt to the many persons at Ryerson and many others in the private sector who have striven to resolve this problem under very difficult and trying circumstances. On behalf of the government and Ryerson, I want to thank the members opposite, and particularly the hon. member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), for the interest they have taken in this matter and for their forbearance.

In this statement I have chosen not to get into many side issues, important as they may be, because at this time I believe they will contribute nothing to the resolution of the basic present problems which I described the other day as essentially humanitarian. I am persuaded by the considerable information I have received that the institution does not need all the maintenance staff originally on its payroll, and I respect the autonomy of the institution to deal with this overstaffing, although I reserve the right, as members have and as the faculty has, to question the administration's handling of the matter. However, as I have stated, I am satisfied that suitable alternative employment has been made available and that other options continue to be explored by CUPE. And I would be prepared to examine this matter in full detail with the leaders of the opposition parties to reassure them also.

Just one other pertinent reference, Mr. Speaker. We invited ourselves, through the chairman of the board of governors of Ryerson, to make available our financial people to make an up-to-date analysis of the situation. They have accepted this invitation and I would hope we will be able to sit down with them very shortly and take a look at the financial situation.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, in the statement which I made a few moments ago concerning the support for Great Lakes funding, in relation to the loan fund I said, and the statement reads, "$1 million," whereas it should read "$50 million."

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before the oral questions.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, what is your point of order?

Mr. Shulman: Last night, sir, during committee of supply, members of this party asked the Solicitor General to outline what airplanes he had used in this past year and the chairman at the time ruled us out of order. I want to point out, sir, there was a precedent set the previous night. When the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Kerr) was asked the same questions the chairman did not object, the questions were allowed and the minister replied. But for some reason it was found very necessary yesterday not to allow the Solicitor General to answer that question, sir. I suggest that the chairman erred. I ask you to look at the record and overrule him and allow us to ask that question and find out just what airplanes the Solicitor General did use last year.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order in these proceedings of the House.

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member wasn't there last night.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order in the committee must be dealt with in committee. Was that the one where the chairman's ruling was challenged? If so, that matter was settled in that way.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): The member wasn't here, was he?

Mr. Shulman: It wasn't voted on. The point of order I am making, sir—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! That matter was duly dealt with when the chairman's ruling was challenged and disposed of at that time.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, the rules of this House state that if the chairman makes an error we may appeal to the Speaker. What I am doing at the present time, sir, is I am suggesting to you the chairman made an error. I am appealing to you to examine the ruling he made and to rule on that matter.

Mr. J. M. Jessiman (Fort William): The member never made an error, of course.

Mr. Speaker: If the chairman made an error then it undoubtedly was dealt with at the time. I am not familiar with the full circumstances, but any point of order must be dealt with in committee.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, on this point of order, I suggest to you that according to the rules of this House you are in error.

Mr. Henderson: Out of order! He wasn't there.

Mr. Shulman: If the chairman makes an error that is not dealt with in committee, we have the right to appeal to you, sir. If in doubt, may I suggest you consult with the Clerk of the House. If the chairman made an error we have a right to appeal to you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: May I finish my point of order?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): No. The Speaker made a ruling. It is in the debate.

Mr. Shulman: The Speaker hasn't made a ruling. All I am asking you to do, sir, is examine the transcript from last night; or if you feel you do not wish to do so, ask our permanent Speaker to do so; and determine if the chairman did make an error. If he has made an error I am asking you to have this matter reviewed.

Mr. Speaker: I will certainly review the situation, but I believe my answer is correct.

Oral questions.

MERCURY CONTAMINATION WARNING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health, following his statement regarding mercury pollution and the remedies that he is proposing for the Wabigoon and English River residents: How can he believe that a booklet pointing out the problems and risks to the local residents—almost all of them Indians—is sufficient when it is the responsibility of the government of Ontario for having permitted the original mercury losses and the methylmercury pollution which has made the Indians' primary food supply inedible, and in fact seriously

dangerous? Would not the Minister of Health think that they should take one further step and provide alternative food sources during the period when it is apparent that the Indian community is not as convinced of the real dangers in continuing to eat the fish from these polluted sources?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Does the minister want them to eat the booklet?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I was just pointing out what I was doing as Minister of Health, and my responsibility. I wasn't referring to what other action would be taken by other ministers.

Mr. Reid: No action at all. It has been going on for three years.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am merely accepting my responsibility in making known to the inhabitants in that area the dangers to them of eating fish contaminated by mercury. I'm taking every step possible to make them aware in areas where they shouldn't eat any fish. In other areas where the level is of such a nature that they can eat a certain quantity of fish, either daily or once or twice a week, this will be all spelled out very clearly to them, so that they'll know the hazards.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Who is responsible for the mercury?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm much in the same position as I'm in with alcohol, tobacco and other substances which are injurious to health.

Mr. Reid: There is a difference between those and starving to death.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I can point out the hazards but there is no way I can prevent people from indulging. There is no way I can stop an individual from going in there and catching the fish and eating it.

Mr. Haggerty: Stop the polluter.

Hon. Mr. Potter: But it is my responsibility to make certain that every effort is made to advise him that he shouldn't be doing it, and believe me we will do that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Surely the minister must be aware that he is the one person whose concern in this matter must be far more than simply to point out the dangers to the Indians of eating the polluted fish. To compare that with pointing out the dangers in drinking liquor and smoking cigarettes, in my view, indicates a serious misapprehension of the problem.

Mr. Speaker: State your question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the minister: Would he not agree that he is the one person in the cabinet who must take the primary responsibility to see that these people are provided with healthy food and not simply referred to as a group that might indulge in these polluted fish, which is their only source of food, when the minister knows perfectly well that over the years these warnings have been delivered and the Indian population chose to ignore them? Would the minister not agree that his statement is not sufficient and that he has got to take a much stronger stand in this situation?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I must further point out, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot provide food to the people in that area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They do not indulge in food; they have got to have it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is not my responsibility. I have no budget to provide food.

Mr. Reid: Their health is the minister's responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Potter: My responsibility is health, not providing food.

Mr. Roy: Food is health.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur. Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the minister's very limited view of his own responsibilities, and I don't for one minute grant that, given that—

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a question?

Mr. Foulds: —doesn't he feel that it is his responsibility and his ministry's responsibility to get a field person in that area, who speaks the language of the people, to go door to door to tell them of the danger?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, if this is necessary, we certainly will. I have had one of the members of my staff working on this very closely with the Indians in the area and

others concerned. The proposals that I have mentioned today have been recommendations from them. If there is a need for this, certainly it will be done.

Mr. Reid: What does the minister mean? Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can now advise me, in answer to a question I asked him some time ago, why his people did not inform the Indian people living in the English-Wabigoon area about the fact they had these high levels of mercury in their systems? Why did they wait almost two years, until March of this year, to tell them of this hazard?

The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, is, does the minister seriously think that giving them the choice of either eating contaminated fish or starving to death is really a choice?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, the answer to the first part of the question is that the delay was necessary because of the survey and the studies that were going on. All the people in that area had their blood samples taken and rechecked, as he is aware.

Mr. Reid: It took two years?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Again, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member realizes that while this is a staple food in the area, it is not the only food, and that some method must be devised for a substitute or even perhaps to have fish flown into the area. Here again the locals were very concerned about the possibility of having fish flown in from other areas and handed out to them. They said, "This isn't what we want. We don't want a handout." They said, "We have fished to provide food for our families. We'd be much farther ahead if we could be provided with other types of employment and then we could buy the fish if we wanted to if it was flown in."

These are areas, Mr. Speaker, which are really not within my jurisdiction to deal with but I'm sure the members will learn within a week or two from now what other steps are being taken by other ministries in this area.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have more questions?

Mr. Reid: After three years of inaction!

Mr. Speaker: This is the last supplementary. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Had the minister's ministry or any other ministry of government considered seeking restitution from the offending companies, so that if there is any assistance to be provided to any group in the area which is affected by the high mercury levels, that restitution will be sought from the offending company?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, once again I can't speak for the other ministries in this field.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

SALES TAX ON ENERGY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker: Can he qualify the application of the proposed seven per cent tax on energy to the agricultural industry? Would the use of electrical energy be exempt under the provisions of his budget as announced?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Yes. As indicated in the budget statement, and shown more explicitly on page 10 of the budget highlights, on all energy being used in the production or processing of goods, the primary and secondary sector will be exempt.

To be more explicit, a fuel used to heat greenhouses will be exempted, as I indicated yesterday to my hon. friend. Electricity used for milking machines will be exempted. Natural gas used for fowling houses will be exempted. I'll be introducing the bill in an hour from now and this will be made clear.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): We should start manufacturing meters. We would make a mint.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does this mean that the farmers will have to have separate meters on their power supplies for the various pieces of apparatus that the minister would consider to be exempt, that is as opposed to the electricity used for lighting purposes and the gas used in the farmhouse?

Mr. Bullbrook: Gosh, I didn't think of that.

Hon. Mr. White: No, sir.

Mr. Bullbrook: Will the minister supply meters?

Hon. Mr. White: We are right now obtaining data from those other jurisdictions where this tax has been in effect for a long time. For instance, in British Columbia there is a five per cent retail sales tax on all forms of energy, including domestic heating, domestic cooking, commercial heating and commercial manufacturing. We are finding out from Saskatchewan, which applies the tax to domestic electric heating and domestic electric cooking; from Manitoba which applies its retail sales tax to everything except domestic heating—

Mr. Roy: They're all NDP provinces.

Hon. Mr. White: From the Province of Quebec which applies eight per cent across the board to everything—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. White: —with a 90 per cent drawback for manufacturing only; and from Newfoundland which applies its retail sales tax of seven per cent—we are finding out how they apportion those costs. My initial report is that an arbitrary assignment of electrical power is made, for instance, of 75 cents per month for the farm household, to use the member's example.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the complexity of the decision to put the tax on power—as the minister described it in his budget—and of the problems that have been brought to the attention of the House over the last few days from members on all sides, would it not be possible for him to moderate this tax, or even more properly withdraw it—

Mr. Lewis: Withdraw it!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —before he actually brings in the legislation which, if passed—and I don't doubt that it would be passed—would in fact implement this monstrosity that has sprung full blown from the brow of the Treasurer?

Mr. Reid: A budgeting nightmare!

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I can't agree with that. I have indicated that British Columbia—

Mr. Lewis: A good thing the minister has a largish brow.

Hon. Mr. White: —to some extent Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Quebec and Newfoundland all have this tax.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What kind of justification is that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

An hon. member: I'd like to hear. I'm rather anxious to hear, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. White: As do many jurisdictions of the United States. The proceeds from this tax are being returned to our people by the new retail sales tax credit in a way that shifts the burden of this tax from the less prosperous citizens to the richer citizens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Lewis: That's nonsense, and the Treasurer knows it is nonsense. If the proceeds are being returned why apply the tax?

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker—this budget becomes more of a nightmare for the Treasurer every day. Is he now saying to the House that he implemented a pretty sophisticated tax, like a seven per cent sales tax on energy, without any advance calculation as to its effects on various sectors of Ontario's economy?

Mr. Bullbrook: Or how to have it collected.

Mr. Lewis: What kind of a Treasurer is he?

Hon. Mr. White: I didn't say that at all.

Mr. Lewis: Well, why is he now looking at his tables?

Mr. Stokes: He is now consulting with other jurisdictions.

Hon. Mr. White: We made close estimates of our anticipated revenues and of our anticipated sales tax credits. What perhaps hasn't been made obvious to this House and to the media, although I did touch on it a couple of days ago—

Mr. Foulds: It hasn't been made obvious to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. White: —is the fact that this tax is applied in the provinces I have mentioned—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, so?

Hon. Mr. White: —and now that the budget has been released, including highly confidential material, we are able to go out in a public way and consult with certain energy companies and those jurisdictions where energy has been taxed for years.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, what does that mean?

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, if I may, would the Treasurer advise if, prior to his budget address, he informed his cabinet colleagues, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), of the imposition of this tax and its effect on local boards and commissions of health and school boards—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! This is not supplementary to the original question.

Mr. Bullbrook: —and did he make a calculation—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! It may be a new question, but it's not a supplementary question at this point.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, may I suggest to you, with the greatest respect, that we are questioning in connection with the imposition of the seven per tax on energy sources—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): And whether he calculated the effect.

Mr. Speaker: But it is not related to the matter of a tax on farm energy.

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to secrecy respecting cabinet deliberations; that must be evident to the hon. member—

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, he has taken it upon himself to respond, and I didn't have the opportunity of finalizing my question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Bullbrook: If he did—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I did not hear the minister's response. The hon member will have his turn.

Mr. Bullbrook: He responded to my question, which you didn't permit me to finish. Now if you would permit me to finish the question—

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, I didn't even hear it.

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Bullbrook: Are you not going to permit me to—

Mr. Speaker: Not at this stage.

Mrs. Campbell: No?

Mr. Bullbrook: Then why do you permit the minister to respond?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would put a new question to the Treasurer. Can he inform the House what consultations were taken into account by the Treasurer with his colleagues in the other departments, and even with the other representatives of his party, if not the community at large, before he made this outrageous decision to impose a seven per cent tax on energy?

Hon. Mr. White: Well Mr. Speaker, we had many meetings—I suppose almost without number—with all of the experts available to us—

Mr. Foulds: They didn't include the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education, though.

Hon. Mr. White: —during which time we explored every alternative available with respect to the proceeds from those additional revenues, the implications for our economy, the costs of administration and so on. Not having gone through the process before, I can't imagine a more intensive and searching study of the alternatives than we had this year.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker! I believe it now to be in order to ask the Treasurer if he could tell us if he effected a calculation to bring to the attention of his cabinet colleagues what the cost of the imposition of this tax would be on local hospital commissions and local school boards.

Mrs. Campbell: And municipalities.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I may or may not have told my colleagues is a matter I cannot discuss, having been sworn to secrecy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Fortunately they are too.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking what the Treas-

urer told his cabinet colleagues. My question is, did he make a calculation as to what it would cost local boards of health and local school boards? Did he or did he not?

Hon. Mr. White: We made every possible calculation that we could make—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Except those.

Hon. Mr. White: —without revealing our intentions to the public, which would be a gross break with tradition and a very serious breach of ethics.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Bullbrook: One final supplementary: Since these calculations were made, would the Treasurer therefore now inform the House how much it is going to cost throughout the province to hospital commissions and local boards of health in connection with the imposition of this tax?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, the cost to the hospital system, including mental hospitals, general hospitals, mental health clinics and such like is approximately $1 billion. The energy costs for these hospitals and clinics is a sum which would yield $700,000, on the assumption that all of this energy was taxed.

Mr. Bullbrook: For this year? What about schools? Would the Treasurer provide that figure?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, the figure for school boards is $2 million.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Are nursing homes included in that calculation?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, anything that's in the public sector would be included.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Why did the minister not consider exempting school boards and hospital boards from the tax, as he did the corporate sector?

Mrs. Campbell: And municipalities.

Mr. Lewis: Well, supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary from the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Now that George Gathercole indirectly has described the Treasurer's proposal for individual meters as ridiculous. I am paraphrasing him—

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, I would say the member is!

Mr. Lewis: —but that was the gist of what I heard him say this morning. He said in effect it was preposterous, but he didn't want to say that to the Treasurer.

Now that he's described it in those relative terms, how is the Treasurer going to prevent landlords in Ontario from passing on the seven per cent energy tax to their tenants?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, it will be obvious that tenants will receive the benefits of the retail sales tax credit along with property owners. It will likewise be obvious the tenants fall into two categories: Those who have leases which will isolate them from this increase until the end of that lease, the cost being borne in full by the landlord.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: And those who rent properties without leases, who are subjected to rental increases if costs go up—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —or if the landlord perversely increases the rents anyway. I suppose the only protection the tenant has is to seek out a fairer rent.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Move out on the Scrooges!

Mr. Lewis: Right, so then, by way of supplementary, it is entirely possible—and in fact likely—that one of the direct effects of the seven per cent energy tax will be to have—

Mr. Speaker: Is it a question?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I've put it in a very obvious interrogative—very obvious.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A bit lengthy, but obvious.

Mr. Lewis: Lengthy, but obvious!

One of the obvious effects of the energy tax is to persuade and to encourage landlords to raise rents at this point in time, to pass it on to the tenant. And the Treasurer has no guarantee, has he, that that will be prevented?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: None at all, right?

Hon. Mr. White: No.

Mr. Speaker: We'll still have one more supplementary from the member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, Mr. Speaker, now that the Treasurer has met with some of the area municipalities, can he tell me what the effect is on the municipalities and their budgeting as they see it?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, we are shifting $440 million more to the municipalities, including $180 million in brand new grants.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Whatever additional costs they are faced with will be a very minute percentage of those very large transfers.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I should really allow one more supplementary because the member for Ottawa East was on his feet earlier.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask of the Treasurer, in light of the fact that we are presently considering all the estimates of various government departments, if he would advise us how much more money we'll have to put into these estimates, considering his seven per cent sales tax—for Government Services, for instance; Correctional Services; and all these institutions, which will have to pay the seven per cent tax.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the reason the estimates were late this year is because we didn't want to forecast the budgetary changes, so there will be no additional changes as far as I know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I think we've had enough on that subject.

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

EFFECT OF ENERGY TAX ON EDUCATION COSTS

Mr. Lewis: Well, just one further question of the Minister of Education on this: Since school board costs have now been increased unexpectedly by $2 million, does he intend to adjust the ceilings he has placed accordingly?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): We are presently studying that and I cannot give the member an answer to that at the present time.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): That was asked yesterday.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary from the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, is the minister considering, through the regulations, changing the weighting factors in the grants given to the local boards, particularly to those in northern Ontario, because of the extra increase in cost of heat and light in that part of the province?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, that is part of the study. I can assure the hon. member that for next year that will certainly be considered. As for this year, what we do will be studied in the next few weeks.

Mr. Roy: Well, that's all the minister can do is study.

An hon. member: No, we do more than those guys.

Mr. Roy: Give us some answers.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has a further question.

OHIP CUTS

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Minister of Health.

How is it that, in light of the estimates in the Social Development field, which we received on our desks just a little while ago, none of the intended or envisaged cuts in the area of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan are incorporated in the budgetary allocation?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The lid that the policy minister was talking about.

Mr. Lewis: The lid the government is putting on.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think members will find it there. Mr. Speaker, if they make comparisons between 1971-1972 and 1972-1973, when I think the increase was 14 per cent and 1973-1974 where the increase is something like six per cent, that's a considerable difference.

Mr. Lewis: By way of further question, then, can the minister explain to me how he justifies a jump of some $28 million or better, up to $600 million now, for the Ontario Health Insurance Plan, which on a fairly rough but reasonably accurate division works out to an annual gross income of $75,000 fee-for-service per practising physician in this province? Now how is that putting the lid on medical expenditures?

Hon. Mr. Potter: These are matters, Mr. Speaker, which will be discussed, undoubtedly, when the estimates come up. If we talk about this increase in that particular item, up until the present time there has been an annual increase of five to six per cent by increased usage of the programme. We have cut that back to four per cent this year. Then there is always an increase, which is necessary due to the increase in population, which has been estimated at two per cent. So that represents a six per cent increase in the total payments.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, even calculating the expanding number of physicians, it does work out to this extraordinary gross figure. I am asking the minister how he reconciles that with the economies which he has mentioned, the Treasurer has mentioned, and the Premier (Mr. Davis) has mentioned. The Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) talks about putting the lid on it and implies a 15 per cent decrease in total. Instead, we have a six per cent increase, which averages out at $75,000 gross. How can we take the government's statement seriously in the Throne Speech or anywhere else?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that in providing our constraints we must continue to provide services. I don't think the member or anybody else is going to suggest that we discontinue services to the public that are needed. The services are going to be there, and if they are needed they are going to be provided. At the same time, ceilings are being instituted and there'll be more constraints announced very shortly.

We must face the fact that there are more people. Our population is growing every year and services are being increased every year. This doesn't represent an increase in payments to doctors at all.

Mr. Lewis: Well, of course it is. Who receives it?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have a further question?

FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have a further question, Mr. Speaker, of the provincial Treasurer. Have I got the provincial Treasurer's vague attention?

Hon. Mr. White: Always.

Mr. Lewis: Okay, as long as it is there.

Does he know that his colleague, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, yesterday told me that the moneys which were to be apportioned for the Niagara Escarpment could be found in his estimates, that is the Treasurer's estimates? Can the Treasurer tell me where, since I have perused his estimates carefully and failed to find them.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think this should rightly be put to the Provincial Secretary. As I told the House a week ago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: He referred them to the Treasurer and he can't find them either.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Lewis: No, I am not going to be fobbed off so easily.

Hon. Mr. White: I have got the answer, if the member will be good enough to listen. Can he stand sitting still for one minute?

The estimates include amounts for the acquisition of roadways under the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and for the acquisition of parklands under the Ministry of Natural Resources, etc. The anticipated cost of the Niagara Escarpment Commission in the present year is incorporated in those operating ministry expenditures. We do not set up a separate item on every new endeavour.

Mr. Lewis: All right! By way of supplementary: Knowing that to be true, I asked the Minister of Transportation and Com-

munications (Mr. Carton) yesterday what amounts in his ministry were set aside for this matter, and he said none. So perhaps the Treasurer should talk to him.

Hon. Mr. White: Perhaps, in that event, there are no roads to be built this year in that area.

Mr. Lewis: Fine! By way of supplementary, since the Treasurer has such graphic knowledge of all the elements that go into this, the cornerpiece of the Throne Speech, land use control and the preservation of the Escarpment, which was the centrepiece of the Throne Speech, can the Treasurer tell us in round figures how much he will spend this year on rescuing the Escarpment areas, since a careful assessment of the Natural Resources estimates, the Treasurer's estimates, Resources Development estimates and Transportation and Communications estimates, show no significant increase over any previous fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. White: An exhaustive presentation to the members of the Legislature and councillors in the area affected will be made one day next month, at which time all of these answers will be known.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have further questions?

PETS IN OHC PROJECTS

Mr. Lewis: I have one last question of the Minister of Revenue, just as an incidental but one that strikes me as important. In view of the provincial Treasurer's public expression of affection for household pets as another cornerstone of his budget, is the minister going to change his policy and allow people who live in Ontario Housing Corp. projects to have domestic animals now that they don't have to pay tax on them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will go back into Hansard, when these discussions were held in the past on the subject of pets, he will find out there is no rule against pets per se in housing developments.

Mr. Lewis: They can't have them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, they can, and there are many who do have them. It depends on the circumstances. There was a change made about a year ago.

Mr. Roy: It depends on the kind of pet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It depends on whether the pet that the person wants to keep is or is not going to be a nuisance to others who are living in the same development.

Mr. Lewis: The minister makes those judgements?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well somebody has to make judgements. We have had no complaints in the last year—and that should give the hon. member some encouragement to go out and create some.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue has the answer to a question—

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary on that question? The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: With respect to the tenants having dogs as pets, Mr. Speaker, there is a specific situation in Windsor. A family on Lauzon Rd. has been threatened with eviction and the Catholic Service Bureau has stated quite emphatically that the removal of the nine-year-old family dog or the move of the family to a new address would adversely affect the mental and emotional health of that family, particularly the 14-year-old daughter.

Mr. Speaker: Your question is?

Mr. Bounsall: What steps is the minister taking to see that situations like this don't arise and keep arising?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, situations like that do arise and will continue to arise. We have to concern ourselves with all of the other tenants. We have about 200,000 people living in public housing projects and we have to concern ourselves with their rights and their comforts as well.

If the hon. member has a particular situation and he thinks it is worthy of a review I would be glad to look at it. I am sure if the corporation staff has made this decision it is probably based on very good grounds. If he thinks otherwise I would be glad to review it. If he will send me the information I will be glad to report back to him.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. Minister of Revenue now give the answer to the previous question please?

USE OF MARKET VALUE ASSESSMENTS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo North asked the other day if I would give him the figure of the total number of appeals against assessment in Bruce county.

I am pleased to advise the hon. member that out of the approximately 43,000 properties in Bruce county, 2,571 appeals were registered. Of that number, 187 were what is known as corrective appeals—that is, essentially clerical ones regarding ownership and land description, and so on; 83 of the appeals could be considered duplicates, being business properties with the realty under appeal. This leaves some 2,300 substantive appeals, or a rate of about five per cent, and I am advised by staff that this is a fairly reasonable figure for a reassessment.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Good: Yes. Does the minister have any indication how many of the 2,300 appeals that will be heard the first week in May are dealing with cottage or recreational properties, and how many are dealing with permanent residences?

Mr. Roy: Next week's statement!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I'm trying to satisfy the hon. member. If I have the information I'll give it to him. The figures I have are that seasonal lands comprise 465 appeals. I really can't tell the hon. member if these will be built on or what the developers intend to do. Appeals on seasonal property on which something has been built number 507. I'm not too sure that gives the hon. member the figures, or whether they're even correct insofar as the answer to this direct question is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer has answers to two questions. Does the hon. Treasurer wish to give those answers at this time?

Mr. Roy: I have a question.

MUNICIPAL GRANTS

Hon. Mr. White: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) asked on April 16 what proportion of the $180 million directed to municipalities will be to the credit of corporate, industrial and business taxpayers to provide 43 per cent of municipal revenues.

And the answer is, as members know, the 1973 budget provides some $182 million in new funds to local government. Of that total, $105 million will benefit residential and farm taxpayers, while some $77 million will be to the credit of commercial and industrial assessment. To the extent that property taxes are reduced for businesses, half of these savings will be recouped by increased corporation income taxes.

PROBLEMS OF FARMERS IN UXBRIDGE AREA

Hon. Mr. White: I have a question here, sir, from the hon. member for Waterloo North, which reads:

> Is the government contemplating action to eliminate the problems involving farmers in the Uxbridge township area who have no legal right to their land and are losing their mortgages?

The answer, I'm informed, is as follows: This situation relates directly to the stated case presented to the Ontario Court of Appeal in which questions concerning the validity of title were considered. A decision was made recently by the Ontario Court of Appeal and implications of this decision are presently under review by the law officers of the Crown. When this review is completed by the law officers of the Crown, we will be in a position to know what action, if any, is required.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

ONTARIO HYDRO FARM LAND PURCHASES

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. In view of the fact that last week the president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture stated that Ontario Hydro was guilty of intimidation and threats in order to get farmers' land for less than its actual value in the Arnprior area where the dam is being built, I wonder if the minister might advise whether he's familiar with the tactic; and if so, whether he would advise the officials of Hydro to cease and desist this type of action?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, we can accept an allegation of that type as being true.

Mr. Roy: Well, has the minister looked into it? Has he looked into it at all?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: No, but I'm familiar with the allegation itself. I've discussed the allegation with others, and at the moment I have no evidence there have been any high-handed tactics.

Mr. Good: Says it wasn't true, eh?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask one supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister not think it would be wise to advise the farmers of that area of the provision of the Ontario Expropriation Act and their rights under that Act?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it can be assumed these farmers don't know the protection they have.

Mr. Roy: Oh, I see.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

MUNICIPAL GRANTS

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer and the Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs: How does the minister justify a formula of grants to the municipalities that discriminates against certain municipalities in that, for example, it allows a per capita grant to the city of Sudbury of $5 and to the region of $7, while at the same time providing grants to municipalities in southern Ontario of, for example, $10.50 in Metro Toronto, $14 in Windsor, $13 in Stratford, and $23 for the city of London?

Now would the minister not agree this is not going to equalize or bring the northern municipalities up closer to the wealthier ones in the south, but will rather widen the gap that exists between those municipalities at the present time?

Hon. Mr. White: No. On the contrary, this will be of special benefit to northern Ontario municipalities; and the fact that the member has singled out a small handful from the many that exist proves nothing. The fact of the matter is this new property tax stabilization plan is linked directly to the property tax assessment deficiency. And so all over this province the less prosperous municipalities get more than the richer municipalities.

In addition to that, we have a northern Ontario additional grant which is intended to deal with the special costs in the north country and which is intended to shift additional burdens from the ratepayers.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Laughren: Is that special northern grant not included in the figures outlined in the highlights of the budget?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I expect it is.

Mr. Laughren: It certainly is.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I said we had had the last supplementary.

Mr. Martel: There was only one supplementary to the question.

Mr. Speaker: We'll allow one more from the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Is the minister not aware that the figures my colleague quoted are arrived at by dividing the total figure in the highlights by the per capita in the municipality? This clearly indicates the discrimination in favour of the southern Ontario municipalities.

Hon. Mr. White: Did he have the grace to add in the special grants for Sudbury?

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary if I might: Does the minister not realize that is a transitional grant and after this year will be phased out? He can't use that.

Hon. Mr. White: Did my hon. friend take a look at Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie and many other municipalities which benefit tremendously?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

Mr. Foulds: Thunder Bay has never received any transitional and special grants and the Treasurer knows it. It has been getting the short end for three years.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The member for Kent.

BUILDING ABOVE HIGH WATER LEVELS

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Is it correct that there is a recent provision that no building may take place at an elevation of less than 5 ft. above the high water level in areas subject to flooding? This would mean that the village of Erieau in my riding would have to be abandoned. Has the minister any word of action or any advice to this village, to avoid the threat of the disappearance of this village?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am unfamiliar with this. Is it a bylaw of the village?

Mr. Spence: It's in the building provisions.

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I am unfamiliar with it, Mr. Speaker, but I will acquaint myself with the matter because, of course, it could apply to many other municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

FEASIBILITY OF COPPER SMELTER IN TIMMINS

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Will the resources development policy field further review the feasibility of a viable copper smelter in northern Ontario in the light of the apparently greater and higher grade copper ores being found in the underground operations of the Texas Gulf operation in Timmins?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Ferrier: A supplementary: Has the minister had any discussions with Texas Gulf about this matter?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I have not been involved in any—I can't speak for the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier)—nor, to my recollection, has the policy field as such had this matter before it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Will the minister immediately carry out a survey of the condition of the properties acquired by the government in North Pickering and provide a report to this Legislature which will include the steps being taken by the government and the tenants to correct serious deterioration in those properties, and the neglect which is causing destruction of the communities?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to take the whole matter under advisement. I think I have reported to the Legislature and to the member in particular on one or two occasions relating to the contractual relationships between the government and the parties who rent the premises or who are staying on as free tenants. I'll take the question under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

CONTAMINATION OF FISH IN SUDBURY AREA

Mr. Martel: Yes, a question of the Minister of Health. Has the Minister of Health received any information from his colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), that the fish in the Sudbury area are now laden with as much as five times the normal weight of heavy metals?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No I haven't, Mr. Speaker, but I will go into it for the member.

Mr. Roy: It will give the minister a chance to print a new booklet.

Mr. Martel: In view of the preliminary studies, which indicate that such metals as lead, copper, zinc and so on are five times in excess of normal, what would the minister do with that information?

Mr. Laughren: The minnows weigh 12 lb!

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will check that out for the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. I think Dr. James Stopps will have that information.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

USE OF DRUGS IN SCHOOLS

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

In view of the reports of recurring incidents of use of drugs in the high schools, and even in the public schools, what is the minister doing now to correct this situation and what does he intend to do in the future about it? What plans does he have to cope with this problem?

Mr. Roy: He'll study it. He'll give the standard answer.

An hon. member: He'll appoint a task force.

Mrs. Campbell: He'll just do nothing.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's all the members opposite ever do.

Mr. Speaker, the health education programme has a component concerned with drug education and education on the use of alcohol which, I am sure my friend is aware, is really the major number one problem today—

Mr. Reid: In schools?

Hon. Mr. Wells: In schools and elsewhere.

Mr. Reid: I didn't think it was a major problem in schools.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If one reads the reports of the Addiction Research Foundation, the number one drug problem in this country today is alcoholism. I think that we have to be aware of that; and it certainly is part of the health education programmes used in most schools across this province.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Reid: A supplementary—

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: We will allow one supplementary. The time has nearly expired; I don't think we should spend too much time on any one question.

The member for Huron-Bruce can ask one question.

Mr. Gaunt: Since the use of drugs apparently has increased since the minister started this particular programme, does he have any other programmes in mind in order to cope with this situation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, it's that kind of irresponsible statement not based on fact, that inflames this situation.

Mr. Gaunt: It is based on fact! Let the minister tell me his facts.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If my hon. friend can somehow show that the use of drugs has increased in the past few years in schools, let him put it out on the table.

Mr. Gaunt: It has—and the minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But read the kind of reports that the Addiction Research Foundation is putting out. As I told him, the latest reports say that alcohol is the major problem—

Mr. Reid: That's a drug!

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think we have put a lot of attention toward that, and the schools are doing just that—

Mr. Roy: But drugs are increasing.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —but to make a statement that the use of drugs has increased in the last few years without documenting it is irresponsible.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, it has!

Mr. Reid: Where has the minister been?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Read the speeches I have made on this subject.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

HEALTH PROBLEMS OF INDUSTRIAL RADIOGRAPHERS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health regarding a Canadian Press news item of Feb. 21, in which the director of Alberta's industrial health services referred to an appalling rate of health problems among industrial radiographers. I have two questions: Approximately how many industrial radiographers are there in Ontario?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let's have that figure.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Burr: And, secondly, have they an appalling rate of health problems?

Mr. Speaker: Can the minister answer that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't tell him how many industrial radiographers there are, and I don't know of any appalling health problems. I do know that we now are considering licensing radiological laboratories in the province so that we will have some control over it. I will check and see if I can find out how many industrial radiographers there are in the province. There is just no

way I can give the hon. member that information now.

Mr. Speaker: One final question by the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Burr: Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: No supplementaries. We are just about out of time. We will allow the member for Windsor-Walkerville one short question.

STRIKE AGAINST WINDSOR UTILITIES COMMISSION

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour.

In view of the fact that Local 911 has been on strike now for eight weeks against the Windsor Utilities Commission, has the minister's office attempted to get in touch with both parties involved to get them together and resolve the issue?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville is very concerned about the situation. He has approached me several times, and I am just as eager as he is to see it resolved. Yes, I have in fact asked officials of my department to meet with both sides as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Hon. Mr. White: A question was asked a week ago and I now have an update, if I have the permission of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have the permission of the House to have this answered?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let's have it.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Is the Treasurer going to resign?

Hon. Mr. White: It relates to Brantford.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: At the request of the member for Brantford (Mr. Beckett), I have sent the following telegram to Brant county:

WITH REFERENCE TO YOUR LETTER OF—

I don't know what the date is.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The hon. member for Brantford looked surprised.

Hon. Mr. White: The telegram says:

IF IT BECOMES IMPOSSIBLE FOR MR. SMITH TO COMPLETE THE STUDY IN THE TIME SPECIFIED, ADDITIONAL TIME WILL BE GRANTED.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Potter presented the fourth report of the mercury task force.

Mr. Henderson from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient.

County of Hastings;

Service Hardware Ltd.;

City of Barrie

Township of Sarnia;

S. B. Young Ltd.;

Timrand Investments Ltd.;

City of Sault Ste. Marie.;

Town of Brampton.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the hon. provincial Treasurer with a gift to ensure he will sweat over the energy tax with which he wishes to burden the taxpayers of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Is that a report?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, to save the page coming over; I have made it a practice since being elected in 1959 not to accept presents, and I would be particularly unwise to accept this one.

Mr. Deacon: This is not a present under the table.

Mr. Speaker: Touché.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Treasurer is still driving around in that stripped-down Chev.

Mr. Taylor, from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the Board of Education for the Borough of Etobicoke.

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting New Augarita Porcupine Mines Ltd.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the Township of Gloucester.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TOWN OF BRAMPTON ACT

Mr. Kennedy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Brampton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Are they going to change its name?

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, to satisfy the curiosity opposite, this bill establishes a pedestrian mall for eight days.

Mr. Speaker: There is no explanation necessary.

Mr. Kennedy: Well, he was curious.

RETAIL SALES TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for first reading of the bill.

The House divided on the motion for first reading of the bill, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Bounsall
Apps	Bullbrook
Auld	Burr
Bales	Campbell
Beckett	Deacon
Belanger	Edighoffer
Bennett	Ferrier
Birch	Foulds
Brunelle	Gaunt
Carruthers	Germa
Clement	Givens
Downer	Good
Drea	Haggerty
Dymond	Laughren
Eaton	Lawlor
Evans	Lewis
Gilbertson	Martel
Grossman	Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)
Guindon	Nixon (Brant)
Havrot	Paterson
Henderson	Reid
Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)	Renwick
Hodgson (York-North)	Riddell
Jessiman	Roy
Johnston	Ruston
Kennedy	Smith (Hamilton Mountain)
Lane	Smith (Nipissing)
Leluk	Spence
MacBeth	Stokes
McIlveen	Worton—30.
McKeough	
McNeil	
McNie	
Meen	
Miller	
Morningstar	
Morrow	
Newman (Ontario South)	
Nixon (Dovercourt)	
Nuttall	
Potter	
Reilly	
Rhodes	
Rollins	
Root	
Scrivener	
Smith (Simcoe East)	
Snow	
Stewart	
Taylor	
Turner	
Villeneuve	
Walker	
Wardle	
Welch	
Wells	
White	
Winkler	
Wiseman	
Yaremko—60.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 60, the "nays" 30.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Could the provincial Treasurer give us his private phone number so those of opposite view could get in touch with him on this?

Mr. Speaker: Order please! May we just complete this order of business?

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Chatham-Kent): Ha, ha. Funny!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought it was pretty good.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is good to hear from the member for Chatham-Kent—the elder statesman.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in this bill fall into two categories—those which are budgetary and those which are of a housekeeping nature.

Mr. Lewis: Those which are odious and those which are disparaging.

Mr. Bullbrook: The word is house-cleaning.

Hon. Mr. White: The budgetary changes provide for the increase in the retail sales tax rate from five per cent—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. Mr. White: —to seven per cent. The new rate of tax, effective July 1, will apply to all forms of energy consumed in the province, except energy used directly in the manufacture of tangible personal property or in farming production. Electricity used in providing public transportation will not attract this tax.

The exemption for prepared meals is raised from $2.50 to $4, and new exemptions are proposed for plants and flowers and for household pets. Because of the impost payable on the purchase of supplies with resale special-occasion permits under the Liquor Licence Act, final purchasers of liquor, beer and wine purchased under such permits will be exempt from sales tax as well.

The housekeeping amendments are designed to clarify the meaning of certain provisions of the Act and will improve administration of the Act in general.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the Treasurer withdraw it now instead of suffering the humiliation later.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

CITY OF BARRIE ACT

Mr. Evans moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Barrie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF HASTINGS ACT

Mr. Allan, in the absence of Mr. Rollins, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the County of Hastings.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

S. B. YOUNG LTD. ACT.

Mr. MacBeth moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting S. B. Young Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE ACT

Mr. Rhodes moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF SARNIA ACT

Mr. Bullbrook moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Township of Sarnia.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TIMRAND INVESTMENTS LTD. ACT

Mr. Bullbrook, in the absence of Mr. Singer, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Timrand Investments Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SERVICE HARDWARE LTD. ACT

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Service Hardware Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL
(continued)

On vote 1502:

Mr. Chairman: Item 3.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): That's right, Mr. Chairman. I believe I was speaking on the item the other night concerning emergency measures.

I listened with interest last night to the debate between the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) and the minister concerning the high water levels in Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. I was concerned when the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Lawrence) said he thought that perhaps a new agency should be set up in the Province of Ontario to deal with the flooding conditions that exist along the Great Lakes system.

I was wondering, if the minister already has an agency known as the Emergency Measures Organization, why it hasn't been called into such areas as the Niagara Peninsula? I am sure that it was called into the Windsor area to assist in evacuation of people in the area whose homes were flooded out.

I was also interested in the matter concerning the Niagara Peninsula and the emergency measures set up there. Under the Niagara bill—I believe it was Bill 174—for some unknown reason they seem to have neglected the purpose of the Emergency Measures Organization in that bill.

I understand that for some 18 months now the chairman, Mr. Campbell, and members of the regional council have made representations to this government to include emergency measures in that bill.

I understand from the co-ordinator at the present time, Major Rhodes, that they are operating now in the Niagara Peninsula without any jurisdiction for dealing with the particular areas where the flooding occurs in certain municipalities.

I was wondering why the government has not acted to bring this organization in so that it can have some jurisdiction in case of any emergency or disaster that perhaps may occur again in the future—or it could happen next week.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that the hon. member understand the role of emergency measures as it has existed to date and as it is spelled out in the legislation in the programme. It is basically a planning mechanism. The supervision of planning takes place at the provincial level, but there are plans developed at the local level to take care of emergencies—and indeed, using local resources.

Actually the emergency measures' portion has been working very effectively, to my mind. The provincial people have been on top of the situation across the province; they have kept themselves fully informed in continuous contact with local emergency measures people. The significant thing, to my mind, is the fact that in all of the difficulty and the unusual conditions, no life has been lost. Plans have been carried out and were available on an hourly basis to take care of any emergency, in particular I think of the Pelee area.

I am reminded of an article which appeared in the Windsor Star of March 19. Of course, the Windsor area, the Essex county area, is where the basic trouble really began and has continued. There is an article here by Brian Vallee entitled "Putting it Together" and he sums it up very well, I thought. 'The job of EMO is to co-ordinate," he says. Then he goes on to say, "EMO is more of a process than something you can reach out and touch."

That has been the function and the role of EMO to date, but in the light of recent experience it may be that we will be taking a second look at this. I have been in discussion with the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development and indicated that if provincial hard services are to be made available there must be some co-ordinating mechanism to see that the hard resources of the Ministries of Transportation and Communication, Natural Resources and the others are available—if the policy of the government is such—through a co-ordinating instrument which is presently within the secretariat of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Once we have had this experience, a look should be taken with a view to the longer term.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the minister hasn't taken my point yet, which I am trying to convey to him.

I mentioned that in the regional municipality of Niagara, at the present time, the Emer-

gency Measures Organization is operating outside legislation, as I understand it. The responsibility for the health and welfare of the community lies with the head of that municipality and that is the mayor. In the case of a disaster now, particularly along the Great Lakes system and particularly in the Niagara region, that mayor has no jurisdiction to call in the Emergency Measures Organization to co-ordinate such a plan. That responsibility lies with your department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, just to assure the hon. member that we have been on top of the situation, we have been in communication with the local people and measures will be introduced under the auspices of the Treasury and Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs to bring about the necessary legislation so that item will be taken care of.

Mr. Haggerty: Surely it shouldn't take 18 months to get that legislation before this House, should it?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk on this item, too, concerning the operation of the Emergency Measures Organization in the Windsor-Essex county area. The director, Bob Norwood, did an extremely creditable job when it came to the flooding situation on Nov. 22 or 27 last year and again recently with the three different bouts they had with the weatherman.

One of the things that does disturb me about the whole situation is, is there no one in the department who checks on the equipment that the Emergency Measures Organization has? In this instance the truck or the bus that it had had bad brakes and the Emergency Measures Organization even hesitated to take it out on the highway.

You will say it is the responsibility of the EMO to keep the thing operative and in first-class shape. But when you provide it with a budget of $45,000, by the time it takes out the three salaries necessary for the operation of the organization, and provides $4,200 for renting accommodation, $670 for telephone costs, $100 for gas, grease and oil for vehicles, the organization has got only $250 for maintenance. That is definitely not enough to keep vehicles in full operative condition.

I think possibly the minister should have some official or officials who go around to the various Emergency Measures Organizations checking on equipment to see if it is in first-class shape, so that when the need arises there wouldn't be any hesitancy on the part of the director to use the vehicle or the equipment. Likewise, I could make mention of the communications system.

When a disaster hits, such as it hit the Windsor and Essex County area, I think that there should be supplemental funds available on a moment's notice to the director, so that he could, with the use of volunteers and additional funds, be able to get the situation in hand quicker and possibly in a better fashion than he can with limited funds.

I would like to ask of the minister: Does the department check on equipment to see if it is in first-class shape, in operative shape? Likewise, does the department provide sufficient budget for the organization to be able to operate under emergency conditions, such as did occur in the Windsor-Essex County area? Thirdly, does the department have emergency funds available to the Emergency Measures Organization so that it could operate effectively under such circumstances as it was confronted with recently, especially when you had a series of emergencies almost on a weekly basis just recently?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, as I say, the responsibility of EMO is to ensure that there are plans at the local level. Surely the hon. member isn't suggesting that somebody from headquarters at Queen's Park and the EMO should go down and supervise whether Mr. Norwood has a truck which has four wheels on it or something? I think if the hon. member will stop and think about what he is suggesting, he will realize that surely that would involve looking over everybody's shoulder across the province on every piece of equipment. That is purely a local responsibility. That is my point of view and the hon. member may not agree with it.

With respect to the financing, of course, the financing of EMO budgets is presently divided thus: 75 per cent of the provincial and municipal budget is paid by the government of Canada, because this is essentially a wartime emergency structure—a national disaster type of structure—15 per cent by the province, and 10 per cent by the municipal government. That's all that the municipal governments pay—10 per cent of the approved projects.

As it happens, the federal government froze the gross amount three years ago at approximately $1 million. So even though costs have escalated since then, it has been the province and the municipalities that have had to pick up the escalation in costs.

Mr. B. Newman: The minister makes mention that it is the responsibility of the Emergency Measures Organization director to—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order to call a quorum.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: I rise on a point of order to call a quorum. I do so with great regret, but there are only four Conservatives in the House at the present time.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Only five NDP.

Mr. Foulds: That is a third of our members. How many of yours?

Mr. Chairman ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Chairman: We now have a quorum. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to repeat to the minister a portion of what I had said earlier, that is, concerning the responsibilities of the emergency measures director. As the minister made mention, it was his responsibility to see that equipment was all first class and up to snuff, so to speak. Surely inventory of the equipment would be provided to the minister. Likewise, on that inventory it would be stated, I would assume, that everything is ship-shape and operative. Remember, if sufficient funds aren't provided to the director, then it is very difficult to expect him to be able to keep equipment in first-class shape.

However, be that as it may, I wanted to ask the minister if the Emergency Measures Organization here has developed or has acquired any special types of vehicles that could be used in the types of emergencies that we are being confronted with now, that is, the flooding and the erosion as a result of strong winds and high waters.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The funding at the provincial level does not relate to any great degree to the provision of a preference. There was a time when fire pumpers were being provided under this vote, but the federal government withdrew from that part of the programme, so that was discontinued. The bulk of the funds is made available for the planning process. The delivery of services—the hard core, the things that you can put your finger on—is the responsibility of the local municipality, at the local level.

Mr. B. Newman: May I suggest to the minister that he talk to his federal counterpart and suggest to him that either the funds be increased or that certain types of equipment are needed? We can foresee for the next several years the need for emergency pumps, plus other miscellaneous types of equipment—such as mobile communications equipment—for which the budget of the director, even though his responsibility is simply to set up an organization, may be insufficient for him to act as efficiently and with the dispatch that we would like to have him operate.

May I ask the minister if he will pursue this, then, with the federal authorities so that the whole operation is a little more efficient? I am not saying that it wasn't efficient, but that it could operate in a better fashion. Do I have a reply from the minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I assure the hon. member that this has already been done, but the federal government froze its participation three years ago. Its thinking with respect to emergency measures was that they were wartime measures.

Mr. Haggerty: No, peacetime.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, as we are transferring over to the kind of disasters that we are concerned with during peacetime, we would like them to be involved more and more, but the hon. member will have been aware of the difficulties in participation, not only to emergency measures but in the development of an overall policy as between the province and the federal government. One of the side effects of the present situation is that it has probably directed the federal attention more to the needs of the provinces and the local communities, when areas which are really under federal jurisdiction suffer a disaster.

Mr. B. Newman: Has the minister approached the federal authorities on the need for additional funds in relation to the disasters that are affecting various parts of the province?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Our officials have made contact.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I would like to know first of all, as the minister states this is a planning budget, what portion of the municipal projects budget goes to Metropolitan Toronto? The reason I am asking that is that, as you are aware, the provincial and federal governments cut out the funding for the planning officer there. I would like to know who is doing the planning now, that salary having been terminated some years ago. If it is a planning budget, who is doing the planning?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't have the specific details with me, Mr. Chairman—

Mrs. Campbell: Perhaps I could get that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I can get the details for you. There would be an approved budget and sharing in that budget.

Mrs. Campbell: Could I know, then, if there is an audit of this municipal projects portion, because it has always been totally impossible for anyone to get the proper budgeting for EMO because of its connection with ambulance services. Is this something that happens in all other cities or is it unique to Metro, that EMO and ambulance services are combined?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It doesn't happen in all communities. This is a local arrangement and there is an audit.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you. Then I can hope to get those figures.

One last question which is general in nature. I am assuming that this budget, indicated as being 1973 to 1974, is in fact a budget based on the present provincial fiscal year, and not, as the Treasurer suggests, any changeover terminating at the end of the year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member's assumption is correct.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I just have one question. Would the minister explain to me exactly what he or members of his department did, having regard to memorandum No. 1 addressed to the municipal clerks in the affected areas on April 10, 1973, from the assistant deputy minister, lands and waters, Ministry of Natural Resources? It outlines the procedures concerning financial and other assistance offered by the government of Ontario, having regard to the statement made by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development on March 21, 1973. In that circular, dated as late as it was, April 10, 1973, is this paragraph:

> The emergency measures branch of the Ministry of the Solicitor General has already been involved in providing assistance, through municipal EMOs, in co-ordinating the immediate emergency on-site requirements concerning rescue, transportation, communications, welfare, etc.

I repeat my question: What exactly did you, as Solicitor General, or members of your ministry, do to carry out what is forecast or referred to in this memorandum?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The director of the branch was in immediate touch with the local EMO co-ordinator to check with him that the plans, which were designed in advance, were in existence and were being put into effect. The one thing that didn't obtain the kind of publicity that buildings on the edge of banks have received was that in many communities, when homes had to be evacuated on a temporary basis in anticipation of more serious pressures, plans had already been made to move the people out of their homes, in some instances to schools. In any event they were taken care of.

The OPP was contacted immediately in western Ontario to ensure that there was no looting. That was another significant thing that emerged. Although many of the homes were completely exposed during the difficult period, there was not one situation or incident of any looting brought to our attention.

So that in retrospect, reviewing all of the matter, all aspects would appear to have been attended to completely in regard to the one area in relationship to the structural damage which related to homes. The Ministry of Transportation and Communications was got in touch with immediately so that roads could be repaired for communities which were cut off. I think there was at least one community in which Transportation and Communications moved in very quickly in the Sarnia area to ensure that the people didn't have to go across open fields.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That's not right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What do you mean?

Mr. Bullbrook: What you are saying.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That road was taken care of.

Mr. Bullbrook: That road was not taken care of.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, people are no longer going over fields, as they were in the first few hours of the damage, to my knowledge. I was under the impression, and accept the fact, that that road was repaired. I think it was the hon. member who may have directed somebody's attention to it, because I don't know whether it is in his riding or just outside?

Mr. Bullbrook: It was the hon. member who phoned the EMO man on the Saturday morning at 10 o'clock to try to find him. He was delivering his child to the Y at the time. He finally got back to me about 11 o'clock. It was the hon. member who went out to meet with the people. Just so we understand each other—and I am not unduly deprecating the individual; or collectively, your enterprise —we met with the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development two weeks ago here in connection with some 60 families who had no access to their homes. This is three weeks after the fact. This matter still isn't resolved at all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Is the road still out?

Mr. Bullbrook: Part of the road is still out. They still have no access.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Is the community cut off?

Mr. Bullbrook: About 60 homes have access now as a result of action on the part of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the municpality itself. But I just don't want the minister to be under the impression that it was the Emergency Measures Organization that was the instrument of activity in this respect; it really wasn't.

Mr. Chairman: Did the hon. member for Riverdale have a comment?

Mr. Renwick: I just want to fasten the responsibility on the minister. Was the minister himself actively engaged in this, and was he satisfied that the director of the emergency services branch was himself involved in making certain that the local organizations did in fact carry out their responsibilities?

The reason I ask is not so much to be critical, but because we were relatively fortunate that a more serious disaster did not occur, and it appears to me that there are some lessons to be learned in terms of the alertness of the service. Having existed for so long without any immediate need, it must be quite rusty in many of its operations, as the evidence would indicate. The system for alerting it, and the action to be taken when the alert is sounded, do not seem to me to have the kind of dispatch and communication and attention that they deserved in the circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to lead the hon. members to believe that every cog in the whole wheel of the EMO was completely in operation. I do know that during the most difficult time—I think it was the middle of March—the emergency measures people were working on a seven-day, hour-to-hour basis. The director was in touch downward with the local people and upward right to the deputy minister, who was in touch with me. I had the distinct impression that from the province's point of view the emergency measures were being carried out.

This is not to say, as the hon. member says, that others were not involved. I do recall that he was involved in bringing attention to the fact that people were crawling and climbing over fields. The hon. member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) took immediate action, which I commend; he paid out of his own pocket for about 500 sandbags on the spot. That was instant service.

I was getting daily reports on the overall flooding conditions, and these were passed on immediately to the Provincial Secretariat of Resources Development. That information, together with the assessment of personnel from the Ministry of Natural Resources and others, was the basis for the unit working together and the policy development, as outlined by the hon. member for Riverdale and as outlined by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development earlier today.

Mr. Bullbrook: If I might just add a word, I don't want to carry forward an attitude of disparagement toward the local EMO man or the organization itself, because when you are standing facing 60 mile-an-hour winds and waves of 15 ft and 20 ft in height, and hour by hour you see the banks falling into the lake, you realize the Emergency Measures Organization can't do anything. It's a situation of complete futility.

But the point I would like to make—and I suggest that the minister might like to look into this—is that the Emergency Measures Organization wasn't equipped, as a result of

its statutory ability, to assist in an immediate way.

We met on the Wednesday. The brunt of the storm was Saturday. On the Monday afternoon there was a public meeting held in the township of Sarnia hall that I attended. I phoned the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton), asking that he might have representatives there from Transportation and Communications in Chatham. The Emergency Measures man came. I think, if you look into it, you'll find that the basic problem was that the Emergency Measures man couldn't appropriate funds for the building of alternative access and egress immediately for those people. He just didn't have the ability to do it.

You might want to look into the situation as to some type of liaison between Transportation and Communications so that they can make those almost ad hoc decisions. The problem, really, with the township of Sarnia is they just didn't have the financial resources nor do they continue to have the financial resources. I'm sure things are being done now, but I want the minister to know that they weren't able to be done in a quick fashion. For his knowledge, I would think it was at least three weeks, and this is my guess, before anything was done in connection with access or egress.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, before I ask a question of the minister, I would like to publicly apologize to you for the certain remarks I made about your very kind disposition and character last night, if not about your general intelligence. You deserved everything you got, but I still feel that I should say a word or two about it.

Mr. Chairman: He builds you up to let you down, doesn't he?

Mr. Lawlor: Well, it's the irascibilities sometimes around this place.

I was interested in reading the other day about the Emergency Measures Organization, that after the war it had taken on a considerable number of people but they found themselves derelict and out at the elbow. In one jurisdiction of the province which had, I believe, 34 policemen on staff, it had 37 volunteer policemen working with the Ontario Provincial Police. They were people who, this article said, would normally belong to the Emergency Measures Organization, some of whom did previously belong but who now find that they have no role to play and take up this voluntary role with the Provincial Police. What is the structure of the police in this regard? Is there a place for people in that situation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, the transfer was a deliberate action. There is now under the OPP vote a separate heading, a separate item, which talks about the auxiliary police. You will see in vote 1504, item 7, Ontario Provincial Police Auxiliary. Those are gentlemen who were formerly funded out of the emergency measures funds—some of them. Now the total cost of the auxiliary police is taken care of by the OPP appropriation. At that time, we may get into a bit of a discussion as to their appointment and their role. Actually, it's a very interesting situation.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of things under this vote I want to get into, and I appreciate that they may come in under either 1503 or 1504.

I'm talking about the search and rescue units that we have. I'm sure they're scattered right throughout the province, but in particular they perform yeomen service in the north where people get hurt in a hunting accident or a fishing accident or they just simply get lost and the local detachments of the OPP find it necessary to enlist the services and the aid of many local people.

A good many organized communities in the north have found it wise and useful to organize search and rescue units. A good many of them are very well organized. They have a very good liaison with the law enforcement agencies and with the media who can disseminate information and provide effective communications to all concerned. I think that if it weren't for the existence of many of these search and rescue units co-operating with the Ontario Provincial Police that a lot of people who venture into wilderness areas in the north simply would never be found again; or a relatively minor accident would be of major consequence if it weren't for the assistance of the search and rescue units.

I had occasion to write to the provincial co-ordinator of EMO to see if there wasn't some kind of ongoing programme by which they could assist, at least with seed money, in getting one of these search and rescue units going in the community of Geraldton. There was some question about whether the

local search and rescue co-ordinator had the right to commandeer a plane of the former Department of Lands and Forests to conduct a search in a given area for a youngster who had become lost. They were told that they had no authority to commandeer anything, that it had to be all co-ordinated through the local Ontario Provincial Police.

It seems to me that when you do get small groups of dedicated people who are willing to provide this kind of rescue service and search and rescue operation in the north, it's reasonable, in the absence of a lot of law enforcement presence—where you might have a small detachment as opposed to built-up areas here where you could call on even greater numbers of law enforcement officers—you should provide a little bit of seed money at least in the initial years to get these people going with the kind of equipment they find necessary.

I understand that Sault Ste. Marie has an excellent search and rescue unit. It is used as a model in many areas where they seek assistance in organizing themselves in a useful and effective way, by looking to those who have done well in this field.

I'm wondering why you can't allocate certain funds to assist these people, at least, as I say, in the initial stages of getting organized. It seems to me and it's my information that once they do get organized it takes very little by way of operating expenses, but they do need a certain amount of capital to get going. I'm wondering—I suppose maybe, Mr. Chairman, it might more appropriately be brought up under—

Mr. Chairman: Under vote 503!

Mr. Stokes: Under fire safety services and I was going to talk about assistance—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Next vote!

Mr. Stokes: Yes, but—

Mr. Chairman: Next item!

Mr. Stokes: But emergency services or the Emergency Measures Organization may be the appropriate vehicle for assisting small communities when a fire breaks out and they don't have a volunteer fire brigade.

I wonder of there is any liaison between the Emergency Measures Organization and the Ministry of Natural Resources which has a good deal of firefighting equipment in any community of any consequence throughout the north. I can think of several areas, particularly in unorganized communities—I'm thinking of Upsala for instance—where the Ministry of Natural Resources has a forest ranger setup.

I'm thinking of Savant Lake where the ministry has provided a little assistance. I'm thinking of the community of Armstrong where the Ministry of Natural Resources has quite a significant installation. They do have firefighting equipment.

I appreciate that the fire marshal's office comes under the next vote but I'm thinking in terms of an emergency when these small volunteer fire brigades in unorganized communities could look to the Emergency Measures Organization. We do have one in Thunder Bay. Why couldn't the EMO get out and effect some kind of liaison between small volunteer fire brigades and the Ministry of Natural Resources which does have equipment and, I think, would be willing to make it available to responsible people in case of an emergency? I wonder if the minister has given any thought to that kind of liaison, that kind of co-ordination, to make use of existing facilities?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, for even one family, when their home is burning down, that is, for them, an emergency. But really the Emergency Measures Organization is set up to deal with disasters—situations on a much broader scale than that.

I assume that if a vast area of the north or several communities were involved, then of course emergency measures would have to play a very direct role. I think in northern Ontario the fire marshal has pretty well left it to the Ministry of the Natural Resources to deal with forest fires and threatened communities in this regard.

The hon. member's question really relates itself to the provision of ordinary services within unorganized territories, because I think the kind of equipment which is readily available in organized territories in southern Ontario would meet most of the emergencies that the hon. member is referring to.

Now, I am taking the matter up with the fire marshal. I've also been in communication with the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle) to see whether, with this particular situation, some provision can be made—there is a financial constraint. Then I've been in communication with the TEIGA, with the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. White), highlighting again for him the problem of providing services in unorganized territories.

I am very sympathetic to the problem and, having been in Armstrong, I know some of the exigencies which can exist in that community.

Mr. Stokes: Yes; well, fine; I appreciate what the minister has said and I understand the problem.

With regard to the search and rescue units though, does the minister have any liaison with search and rescue units throughout the province.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Could we have a quorum?

Mr. Chairman: Do we not have a quorum?

Mr. Chairman ordered the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Chairman: We now have a quorum. The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Just to complete my very few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the minister sees the emergency measures vote, which is $1.4 million, as the vehicle for assisting search and rescue units in areas where they do need some kind of assistance to get going? If not, where would you suggest we go?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I would think that communities would really develop their own resources in this regard. My understanding is that the resources of the Ontario Provincial Police are available in the northern areas to co-ordinate and participate in ground rescue—that's their job—and when it comes to air rescue that that has primarily been the function of the armed services, the air force. I don't think that we could think of setting up a permanent organization with all of the attendant costs that would be involved. I think that the mechanism has to be at the local level on an ad hoc basis with respect to a search to supplement these two basic pieces—the OPP and the armed forces.

Mr. Stokes: See, here's the problem. I can appreciate that the minister wouldn't realize the planning that must go into a search and rescue operation. We had three aircraft downed in the far north in recent months and that resulted in the loss of life and multiple deaths.

Of course, in a case such as that it gets good media coverage and there is a good deal of concern and interest about such a loss and such an unfortunate accident. Where a plane is lost it is given wide coverage, so you do get the armed forces involved, I suppose on the invitation of the local law enforcement officers. But there are a good many areas in the north where it isn't always possible, for any number of reasons, to have that OPP presence and this is why you have these search and rescue units who band together for just such an emergency.

What you have to do is—and it's crucial—if you have somebody down in a snowstorm or if you have somebody lost in a snowstorm, it is very crucial that you get somebody out there in a matter of minutes or hours, because if you don't get them then, they are lost. The thing is there is nobody, short of maybe an inspector with the OPP, who can alert somebody at Trenton or somebody who has the use of an aircraft for such purposes at the local level.

This is the problem, as I see it. These local search and rescue units are all responsible people, or they wouldn't involve themselves in that kind of activity, but there is nobody who can ring up the Ministry of Natural Resources and say: "We have somebody lost in a certain vicinity. Will you get an aircraft into the air as soon as possible? It is very vital that you do so immediately."

Nobody has that authority. There are a good many OPP detachments which won't take on that authority, so by the time you get through all the bureaucracy and the red tape, the poor guy is really lost and he may be found in a mound of ice when the snow melts.

It doesn't happen too often but there are occasions when it does happen and when you have responsible people like search and rescue units who are willing to accept that responsibility, I think somebody in this government has a responsibility to co-operate with them to the fullest extent. I am surprised that the minister isn't aware of the wonderful work that is done by many search and rescue units throughout the province. If you aren't aware I think you should make yourself aware, and if you do accept that they do a job I would like to see you provide them with a little bit of seed money and then some authority to take action when it counts the most.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried.

Item 4, fire safety services.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the fire safety vote, I would like to refer the minister to the 1971 report of the fire marshal. I assume this is the latest report which is available and that the 1972 report is not available.

I can't conceive why the 1972 report wouldn't be available at the middle of April,

1973, because this report, which is the 1971 report, is dated March 14, 1972, and I would assume that by this time in 1973 we should have had for consideration of this vote the 1972 report of the fire marshal

I want to ask the minister about the fire investigations which took place during the year, and whether or not there is any relationship between the criminal charges which were laid and any evidence of a syndicated or organized arson conspiracy in the Province of Ontario with respect to those fires.

I quote, Mr. Chairman, from page 12 of the report which states:

> The record of fire investigations which shows on an analysis of investigations by region, county and district, disclosed that there were 1,592 investigations conducted, including 168 fatal fires, in which 225 persons died, and 40 large fires and explosions. After investigation into 1,384 fires where there was suspicion of an offence having been committed, 743 were found to be of incendiary origin; 265 were accidental and 376 undetermined. As a result, 356 criminal charges were laid in 1971 and these, together with the 74 carried over from 1970, resulted in 214 convictions, 48 acquitals, 72 withdrawals and 96 cases awaiting trial at the end of the year.

The report then goes on, Mr. Chairman, to list the large fire losses where the loss was over $250,000 and there are several statistical charts setting out the various offences.

It is, of course, natural to note that the principal area in which the serious-offence charge of arson is laid is mainly the larger centres, but I want to know whether or not we have any indication, as a result of the work of the fire marshal, and as the result of the work of the police in the areas of syndicated and organized crime in the province, whether there is any evidence whatsoever that in any way organized crime or syndicated crime organizations are involved in the relatively large numbers of charges laid for arson.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the report is in process of being compiled and will arrive here shortly. I would have liked to have seen all the reports of the ministry involved. I do have the figures for 1972 in front of me—they are comparable to the figures that the hon. member has stated.

I won't go into the details. There were 1,823 total investigations of which 1,004 were found incendiary, 239 accidental and 357 were undetermined. There were 495 charges laid during 1972 and there was a carryover of 91. The disposition was 305 convictions, 42 acquittals, 100 withdrawals and 144 awaiting trial. So that the figures follow the—

Mr. Renwick: A very significant increase.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But they follow the same pattern.

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say that so far as I have been advised, there has been no pattern or link between the fires and what might be described, as the hon. member says, as organized crime or syndicated crime.

In fact, I have specifically asked and, I believe, asked a second and a third time, that the attention be directed to an examination of any particular group of fires to determine whether there is any common link at all. To date I have been advised that there is no such link.

That is not to say that that is an absolute, but not so far as we have determined. I am advised that the fire marshal has a member on the CISO, so that the intelligence will be available in both directions. The fire marshal and the relevant law enforcement agencies are aware of my concern to be assured either yes or no in this field.

Mr. Renwick: Of the convictions which were registered in this field, was there any evidence that fires were started by the owners or persons having other rights in connection with the property; or was there any evidence that the person who started the fire was in conspiracy with the owner or other person having property rights in the property?

And is there any evidence, or does the fire marshal have the information, or is it collated through the Superintendent of Insurance, with respect to any insurance companies which do not pay off as a result of fires having been started through arson, because of the complicity of the owner or other person having an interest in the building or premises destroyed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are individual cases where a criminal act has been committed. And it may be that either the proprietor directly or the proprietor in conspiracy with someone else, but I am not including that in what I assume is the hon. member's definition of organized crime or a syndicate. There may be some sort of a conspiracy with relationship to one incident, but there is no link between that incident and others. Of

course, it may be tied in—a fire might be tied in with extortion or something of that kind; but there is nothing to indicate that that is on such a scale as to indicate that there is organized or syndicated crime involved.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Solicitor General consider including in a future report the information available on the extent to which the fire losses are covered by insurance and that the insurance has in fact been paid? It's generally very significant, in tracing any connection between fire loss and crime, as to whether or not the insurance company feels itself obligated to make payment under the policy.

This would be particularly important in determining whether or not it was worth anyone's while to cause a fire in a particular building. Indeed, it's not usually worthwhile to burn down a building intentionally, unless one is a pyromaniac, unless there's an insurance recovery.

It would seem to me that an essential part of a complete fire marshal's report should indicate the extent to which the losses were recovered through insurance and that the insurance was in fact paid or liability was denied.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I was under the assumption that that report has those statistics in it. I have in my books here fire loss summaries for 1972 which give a lot of details with respect to fires, including a statistic on the number: 26,000-and-some-odd fires; with a total fire loss of $79 million, insured loss of $69 million and an uninsured loss roughly of $10 million. The total fire loss figure of $79 million is down from last year.

Mr. Renwick: I wasn't thinking of the gross figures so much, because that's not the significant factor. The significant factor, if I can make myself clear, seems to me to be the extent to which, because of convictions for crimes related to incendiary fires, the insurance companies have denied liability.

I think that in a future report it may be of significance to know the number of cases in which the fire marshal has found that they are incendiary fires; whether or not the insurance claim has in fact been paid; whether or not the cause of the fire was accidentally incendiary; or whether it was because of a crime that was committed; or whether a charge was laid for a crime, but an acquittal resulted. This is the lucrative part of an arson ring.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have the gross figures, of course, compiled from the individual situations and I will take it up with the fire marshal's office to see just what would be involved in making those figures available in a public form.

Mr. Renwick: If I may, just one last question. I assume that the relationship between the fire marshal's office and the security intelligence organization is, as was indicated, sufficiently close that the fire marshal works in very close co-operation with the police in discovering whether or not there would be any conspiracy or organization behind any of the fire losses which occur in the province, because they are going up every year.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The answer is yes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a result of the proliferation of shopping centres and the disregard for parking in shopping centres—people will park their cars on fire routes—does not the minister think that there should be some general legislation that would prohibit this?

This is on private property, I understand that, but the public seem to disregard this. The shopping centre owners are not going to come along and ask for legislation to ticket the vehicle, but we certainly can't, from a safety point of view, continue to allow this disregard for safety by the parking of vehicles in fire safety routes at shopping centres. I know the minister will say that that is a responsibility of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, but I thought if some recommendation came either from his ministry or from the fire marshal, then my own community would not have to ask for special legislation to control that type of parking.

I would have assumed that the way it affects my community is the way it affects every community in the Province of Ontario—general legislation would be needed to prevent parking in designated fire routes in shopping centres and shopping plazas. May I have the minister's comments on that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is enabling legislation which permits municipalities to do this. I understand that Windsor did receive from the fire marshal sample bylaws and that in effect they have implemented and passed the by-

laws and are satisfied with the nature of the bylaws. I don't know whether there is some specific situation here. Is the hon. member indicating that the bylaws which were passed by Windsor are not effective?

Mr. B. Newman: I have not been informed that Windsor has even passed a bylaw similar to what has been mentioned. But let's assume that the municipality does pass the bylaw. Don't you, Mr. Minister, think that this should be general legislation rather than be controlled by an individual municipality? This should be general throughout the Province of Ontario, especially with fire routes. It shouldn't be the responsibility of the municipality, it should be in general legislation.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The legislation is general. It's enabling legislation, I believe within the Municipal Act, which enables municipalities to deal with this in a local nature and then the municipalities would have to spell out the terms of the bylaw to fit the needs within their own communities. Quite a number of communities within Ontario have done so—Scarborough, Ottawa, East York—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What about those that don't? I think that is what he is trying to get at.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Then I think that the citizens should talk to the local municipalities and the city councils.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the fact that it hasn't been passed by all municipalities indicates that there is need for action on the part of the Minister of Transportation and Communications or your department to have this general throughout the province, so that when an individual goes to a shopping centre, regardless of the community, he knows that if he parks in the fire route area he will be ticketed. As it is now, there is no provision whatsoever. It is entirely up to the municipality itself to come along and introduce a bylaw respecting that. I don't think that's the right way to approach it, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, here again, does the hon. member expect me to run the fire routes in Windsor out of the fourth floor of the Hearst block? Certainly not. I am sure that the hon. member for St. George would be aghast, if I may use that term, at such a proposition. This is something which is definitely at the local level. Surely the citizens who are concerned about their own health and safety can bring this matter to the attention of the councillors and have the necessary bylaws passed?

Mr. B. Newman: Does the minister think that a municipality that does not pass such a bylaw should allow vehicles to be parking in a fire route? What are you going to do about the municipality that doesn't pass the bylaw? Where does the fire marshal come into the picture then? Where is the safety of the people who have gone into the shopping centre? Aren't you concerned with their safety at all? You are certainly not concerned if you refuse to act on the provincial level.

Mr. Bullbrook: Do we leave that lie dormant?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Bullbrook: Does that lie dormant without response; except the nod of the Solicitor General's head?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I believe the hon. member slipped into his chair after I said I do not propose, from the fourth floor of the Hearst block, to designate and control fire routes in shopping plazas within the communities. I think this is a responsibility at the local level.

The Municipal Act has hundreds of pages of enabling legislation by which councils are called upon to provide for the health, care and attention of their citizens. That is where the responsibility is and that is where the responsibility should be.

Mr. Bullbrook: As a matter of technical interest, if I might inquire, I am thinking of one shopping centre in my riding that abuts two public roads. The other periphery is a private road. Just as a matter of interest to me, the parking areas being private property, is there statutory power for emergency vehicles to go on there?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that there is such enabling legislation. As a matter of fact, it relates to something that the hon. member's colleague, the member for Downsview, was raising about police security guards enforcing bylaws on private property. I would think the two are definitely related. There is enabling legislation.

It is fairly recent, I think, but I am given to understand there is enabling legislation. There must be if Scarborough, East York, Ottawa and Windsor have passed bylaws to take care of these situations.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I have a topic under this vote and perhaps the minister can indicate if it comes within his jurisdiction.

Some time ago the insurance companies raised the rates or the cost of insurance in northern Ontario based on the fact that they felt the fire departments of those communities in northern Ontario, particularly those communities which had voluntary fire forces rather than permanent or regular forces, were a higher risk factor than those areas which had permanent forces. I wonder if the Ontario fire marshal had any input into that kind of decision and whether it is within your jurisdiction to make any recommendation or report on a situation such as that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question is no, and I believe it would come within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, which has, I believe, all matters relating to insurance. The Superintendent of Insurance is in that ministry.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I'd like to pursue that further. I think what my colleague has said really does come under this minister's department. If the minister has made any study, as I hope he has, of the quality of fire protection provided by volunteer brigades as compared with that of full-time brigades he would have evidence to show whether or not there is a difference in risk.

We happen to live in an area where there is a volunteer brigade. It is one of the finest brigades I have ever come across anywhere. We have had partially burned barns—and I don't think that is a very common occurrence when you get a fire department arriving at a farm 2½ miles or 3½ miles or more from its location, and getting there in time to actually save one of those highly inflammable buildings! If the minister is doing his job in this department he will have the figures concerning the degree of risk as between voluntary brigades and full-time brigades. I would like to know what he has in that form of information for the insurance companies and for the public.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have never had a request from insurance companies to do that kind of study. I agree with the hon. member that, from what I have heard, the activities of volunteer brigades throughout the province do achieve a very high standard. I would assume that those taking up the risks go on the experience within a community, in addition to the kind of facilities that are available.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to pursue this unduly, but surely the fire marshal is charged, among other things, with keeping statistics of this sort and reporting through you to the Legislature.

Mr. Deacon: And to the councils. They have the information.

Mr. Reid: And to the various councils involved. Would the minister not think that it is imperative that the fire marshal do keep such records, not in the interest of the insurance companies, but in the interest of the public at large and the people who are being affected by these insurance rates?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't know what the hon. member is driving at. What records is he referring to?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the minister says he has no records or statistics and was not asked to make a study of statistics in regard to the relative success in fighting fires or the relative statistics in fire losses, due to either a permanent, regular firefighting force as opposed to a voluntary force. I would think that this is material that you should have available for the public interest, not for the insurance companies' interest.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we have all kinds of statistics relating to fires right across the province. What I indicated was that we had never made a study in relation to this. Both the hon. members would know that the fire insurance premiums are based on the experience and the potential risks. I would imagine if you had a community that had no fires at all over a period of time that the insurance rates would be adjusted accordingly within the community.

Mr. Reid: Just let me finish, if I may.

Mr. Stokes: No. According to firefighting capability.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have to disagree with the minister, particularly when he says "potential." Surely we have to go on what has happened in the past, particularly in regard to these matters, and this is why I'm asking for the statistics. I feel that the smaller communities across the province, particularly in northern Ontario, are being discriminated against by the insurance companies. They are using this as an excuse. They say, "You have a voluntary force.

Therefore, you people in your community are going to pay more money."

Mr. Renwick: There's no doubt about that. There is discrimination, whether it's the minister's fault or not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, Mr. Chairman, that aspect has never been brought to my attention.

Mr. Reid: Will you look into it, now that it has?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Will the hon. member give me some facts that need to be checked into?

Mr. Reid: Yes, I will send you the correspondence.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Fine!

Mr. Stokes: Let me pursue that matter.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the reason I feel it is important, in addition to the homeowner and the insurance rates, is that the decision of councils can be affected by their knowledge of the benefit that will be given residents if they have a full-time brigade versus a part-time brigade. It is important that these statistics be made available. As I mentioned, we have in one part of Markham two volunteer brigades and we have a full-time brigade in another. I understand that because of the very favourable experience with volunteer brigades the city of Sudbury is going back to using volunteer brigades with a certain amount of a permanent force always at the station. In fact, these volunteers have been so well trained and they have developed such a spirit that they are highly efficient.

I well remember, a matter of 15 years or so ago, when a great deal of development was beginning to occur in our community, that we were trying to decide as a council whether or not we should provide for a full-time brigade in one of the more heavily developed parts of the municipality. I thought that it would be useful to come to the Ontario fire marshal to find out just what the experience is in fire protection needs. I was surprised that there was nothing in the way of assistance that could be provided me by the fire marshal.

I got my statistics in the end from the insurance people, and I was sorry to think that we have to depend on those agencies for statistics when we have a branch of government that is charged with that responsibility. I suggest, I recommend and I urge the minister to ensure that municipalities can get from this branch of his department the necessary information on which they can base a sound judgement for the protection of their people.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the statistics relating to all of the fires within municipalites is in the report of the fire marshal. Is the hon. member saying that he went to the fire marshal of the Province of Ontario, asked for certain statistics and these were not available to him? If so, what statistics?

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get comparative statistics as to the quality of protection that could be expected from adopting a full-time fire service versus a volunteer setup. In other words, what is the best thing to provide for? I also wanted to know what type of equipment we should provide for; how much we should be planning and budgeting for in the way of equipment for certain concentrations of population. Those statistics were not available, and I thought that sort of information could have been provided by a branch that was really doing a thorough job of researching the needs for protection of property.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have just checked and I don't know who the hon. member went to—

Mr. Deacon: The Ontario fire marshal.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Ontario fire marshal's office is prepared and equipped to give out information of the kind that the hon. member latterly indicated, as to the type of equipment, the range of equipment and the amount of equipment that would be suitable for a community. However, we have not made a study of comparative costs.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to get across to the minister is that it's fine for them to recommend something, but the elected councillors are charged with the responsibility of making a decision; and they should have statistics and information of a comparative nature, based on research that the fire marshal could provide, as to the alternatives. Is there a greater degree of risk by taking one route compared to another? Is there experience as to what type of equipment should be provided in certain types of developments? These are the things that we

should be able to get from the department but at that time, which is a long time ago, it wasn't available. I was asking what information the department has, other than how many fires there were and how much damage had occurred.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I will send the hon. member the handbook on fire protection for the Province of Ontario, which spells out all of those details—the fire loss, the costs, the number of firemen, the amount of equipment and so on.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay is first.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Less than a year ago there was a civic function in White River in the riding of Algoma, and the fire marshal happened to be there on a tour. We had a conversation, and I got the impression in speaking to him that he was just in the process of completing a report to the appropriate minister about the adequacy of firefighting forces and equipment in the north. It was my understanding that he was going to make some recommendations to government that would provide greater firefighting capacity in most areas in the north. I would hope that would include assistance for unorganized communities.

I don't want to hash over old ground and, in fairness to the dialogue that the minister and I have had about particular situations in the north of recent days, I have a commitment from him that he is going to attempt to get some assistance for firefighting forces in unorganized communities through the Ministry of Community and Social Services or whatever is the appropriate agency.

I appreciate what he is attempting to do, but this whole area bothers me a little. After this conversation with the fire marshal, he was preparing a report or a study and was going to make some recommendations to the appropriate ministry on how government might assist these unorganized communities. Was I wrong in that assumption? If I wasn't wrong, what has become of that report or what was the result of the tour that he was undertaking at that time?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This was a study that was done by the Ministry of Natural Resources with an input from the fire marshal. I believe that the letter is on my desk, going from me to the Treasurer (Mr. White) which is a further follow-up to the correspondence I have had with the hon. member that that study be updated to see what the current needs are, together with the expenditures which would be involved. It's fortunate that he is both the Treasurer and the Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Stokes: Well, is it the minister's impression that something meaningful will be done to assist volunteer firefighting forces in the north and particularly in unorganized communities?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I bring to the attention of the hon. member again the financial constraints which are upon the province and the fact that a whole list of priorities have to be made—and there have to be some very difficult decisions made upon the choices of meritorious projects.

Mr. Renwick: Why do they always have to be against the north!

Mr. Stokes: Surely—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No. Mr. Chairman. If that is on the record, that is not the instance.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): They are always made in discrimination toward the north. Look at the minister's budget. Look at his estimates.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are many communities throughout Ontario which have the same problems.

Mr. Stokes: But they are not communities that are 100 miles apart.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, all they have to be is 40 miles away from a firehall when the barn goes up. Now, the hon. member is left with a half-burned barn and he thinks he is lucky; but with most of the barns in southern Ontario, once they catch fire they go up. I think the hon. member for the Wellington county area knows when a barn starts on fire, up it goes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: One short question, Mr. Chairman. Is it true that there is no legislation in the Province of Ontario requiring a municipality to set up a fire department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member is correct.

Mr. Good: That makes me ask another question.

In the light of the minister's answer that there is no legislation, does he not feel some responsibility in this? Is there not some conflict in the fact that the fire marshal's hand, and rightly so, is in every building plan that is submitted—before any building permit is given in municipalities regarding public buildings or anything of that nature—and should there not be some type of control of the efficiency of fire departments across areas of the province, the same as there is in the matter of policing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The fire marshal examines plans with relationship only to public buildings, and also where the province contributes money. The hon. member is touching upon the whole framework of uniform building codes and uniform fire standards as part of those codes, and that is of course an ongoing current study.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, to the minister, with regard to the remarks he made a few moments ago about the constraints and the priorities that have to be considered in terms of fire protection and that kind of thing, is the minister implying that the Management Board of Cabinet does not consider fire protection one of the priority items in this province?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the hon. member that there are a whole host of priorities and that decisions have to be made as to the choice of them.

Mr. Foulds: Would the minister care to enlighten the House as to where he considers fire protection in that list of priorities?

Mr. Lewis: The minister has never enlightened the House. He has tried to respond.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): The minister better get himself a fiddle.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: All I have to do is smile and the place just glows.

Mr. Lewis: With your own special beneficence.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I point out to the hon. member that he can assume that what is in the estimates of the Ministry of the Solicitor General are the priorities as set out by this ministry, as approved by the Attorney General (Mr. Bales).

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That's what you assume, too, but you don't know, do you?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is much that could be done by our ministry and other ministries in many fields.

Mr. Foulds: Could we follow that up, Mr. Chairman? It's very interesting. The minister just said his estimates were approved by the Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Management Board.

Mr. Foulds: You said the Attorney General. Are you giving precedence to your colleague over yourself?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was a slip of the tongue, one of the mistakes I've made. This is the second one. I mentioned Toronto instead of Ottawa and Hamilton, now I've—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Two this year; that's not a bad record.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 4 carried. Carried? On item 5, coroners' investigations and inquests.

Mrs. Campbell: On item 5—

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask one or two questions of the minister—

Mr. Chairman: The member for St. George is first.

Mr. Cassidy: I apologize; I would certainly defer to the member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to put this question because I don't really know a great deal about the coroners' department. Is it a fact that this ministry has now changed its policy so that where we used to have a coroner's constable for coroners' investigations we now have the individual detective who is dealing with a possible homicide? I am advised that police forces are rather concerned about this. Could I know why this change was made if, in fact, you made it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, there has been no change. I am delighted to hear that municipalities want the system of coroners' constables continued.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you.

Mr. Lewis: All right, now to the serious stuff.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, a brief question of the minister first.

As I recall, the coroners have been for several years without a pay increase. I cannot remember whether or not such an increase has been announced or whether they are still being paid at the 1967 levels.

Mr. Stokes: It has been denied. It's not a priority item.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, such an increase has not been announced.

Mr. Cassidy: Could the minister elucidate for the House what is the rate of pay for coroners? When was it last raised and how does it compare with the $75,000 a year that is now paid to general practitioners by the province?

Mr. Lawlor: There's a ceiling on coroners.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the member's questions lead me to believe that he was not in the House when I made an answer to a question asked by the member for London North (Mr. Walker), in which I told him that the long overdue increase for coroners had top priority within the ministry.

I have to go back to 1957 when the present schedule of fees was set forth. I had hoped that an increase would have ben available this year. In fact, I may say if there are coroners within the province who believed there would be an increase. I was one of those who led them into that belief. Again, because of financial constraints, that has not been possible.

The coroners, I think, have made out a good case; they no longer have to persuade me of the merits. The mileage is 10 cents a mile and I don't think anybody will travel for 10 cents a mile now.

Mr. Stokes: All members of this legislature do.

Mr. Cassidy: That is right, we do, too. If they haven't had a raise since 1957, I find myself a bit uncomfortable defending medical doctors. Had the government been consistent and applied this freeze to other doctors it might be easier to defend. What on earth are you doing with an extra half a million dollars in the estimates for coroners if you cannot find priority to give any extra money to the coroners themselves, whose case you say is now indisputable? Certainly since 1957 the incomes in the profession have probably trebled in that period of time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The fees have not been raised; it's the workload which is greater. There are more investigations and more inquests with more autopsies with the attendant increase in costs even based on the present—I shouldn't say present—the 1957 structural fees.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. G. E. Smith) has the floor.

Mr. Good: No, the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, I thought he had finished. Go ahead.

Mr. Cassidy: I would like to continue. I would like to ask the minister whether any discussions have been held with Quebec and Manitoba, particularly with Quebec, about the problems of inquests, where both sides of the border are involved. We had a recent case in Ottawa where a patient was treated in an Ottawa hospital and died a couple of hours later in Quebec. The coroner on the Quebec side refused to handle it because the apparent cause of death, or the possible cause of death, had been in Ontario. The Ontario coroner refused to handle it because of the fact that the death had taken place outside of his province.

It is not possible, Mr. Chairman, to have some arrangement so that these inquests can be handled? That particular case was eventually settled through the intervention of the chief coroner of the province and a fair amount of political pressure. It should not have had to work that way. There should be a set of rules which doesn't allow deaths that have ramifications in two provinces to fall outside the net of inquests.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I recall that specific case. It was a very unusual situation where the treatment was in Ontario but the death occurred in Quebec, on the other side of the river, about one hour later. A postmortem was held in Ontario and an inquest was held in the ordinary course, not due to political pressure.

Mr. Cassidy: I beg to differ. I believe it was something like six weeks before the inquest was held. There was an autopsy, of course, but it took about six weeks before an inquest was held. It certainly was not in the ordinary course, Mr. Chairman.

Could the minister say what is the policy then, because along the Ottawa river this has happened a number of times? There has at times been informal co-operation between coroners on both sides of the river. Unfortunately, that did not happen in this particular case, where the Quebec coroner, I believe, was also involved as a medical attendant on the deceased, and that may have complicated the matter.

What is the policy where a death occurs one one side of the border that seems to have stemmed from incidents on the other side; for example, a car victim, an accident victim, who was injured in Ontario and taken to a Quebec hospital, or injured in Quebec and taken to an Ontario hospital? What is your policy? If it isn't working, will you change it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, the general policy is that the inquest is held where the death occurs. This is an example really of flexibility, at least on our part. I think the hon. member has a good point. I think when an opportunity presents itself I will discuss it with neighbouring jurisdictions, because with the mobility of people and the travel back and forth an incident such as this really would not be an unusual occurrence either in the one direction or in the other direction. It's one of the matters that I would be pleased to look into.

Mr. Cassidy: I would appreciate that. Pending successful discussions with Quebec, would the minister be willing to give a commitment that, in similar circumstances where a death took place outside the province, but related to events within the province, if need arose, an Ontario coroner would be empowered to hold the inquest?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, each incident will be looked at on its own merits and the situation.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Simcoe East.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the minister say that the remuneration to the coroners in the province is under review and the fact that the mileage is being reviewed. I agree; I think this is long overdue. I wonder if the minister could give some indication whether it will be reviewed or anything will be done about it this year or whether we will have to wait until next year's budget.

I am sure that I reflect the concern of the other members from Simcoe county, my colleagues, when I say that we have had representation from our coroners. I would hate to see some day some of the coroners saying, "We are not going to carry on our responsibilities any further unless something is done." I think many of them are only doing it now because of a sense of responsibility; they feel that somebody has to do it. If they don't, who will? I wonder if you could give some encouragement to the coroners?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the member that many of the coroners have acted out of a sense of public duty. I have acknowledged that in my letters to them and expressed the hope that they would continue because it would be my intent to move the matter forward from the ministry at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the same topic, the minister surely is aware that the juror and the witness are not there by choice, whereas the coroner selected the job to be the coroner? Does the minister not think that the juror or the witness to an inquest should be given far greater consideration than he is now? Would the minister tell me exactly what the juror or witness will receive, or receives, as the result of his being present at an inquest?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The juror at present receives $6 a day. Of course, the question of fees for jurors is not related just to this field; it goes right across the board into the administration of justice field, which involves criminal and civil law, and relates, of course, to witness fees. This is a determination which has to be attended to in the broad picture.

I am very sympathetic to the individual who is actually out of pocket. Many corporations pick up the tab and the man's wages or salary continues, but if the employer is a very small employer he is not in a position to do this.

The interesting thing I have found is that many jurors who do suffer financial loss by virtue of participation either in the coroner's inquest or in the civil and criminal field always have a sense that they were glad they had an opportunity to participate and found it most interesting and most rewarding.

That doesn't put butter on the bread but there is some consolation that they are participating in a civic duty and have the experience.

Again, we, within our own field, as I know the Attorney General is in his field, are very concerned about this aspect.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, being concerned doesn't put any bread on the table, let alone put butter on the bread. As the minister is aware, not all industries reimburse the individual who becomes a witness or a juror at an inquest. But surely, Mr. Minister, there is no need for waiting to increase the fee for the juror or the witness from $6 a day. Why, that's slave wages, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Good: That isn't a minimum wage for the Province of Ontario.

Mr. B. Newman: Surely you can't simply say, "We're going to give this top priority." I don't think the numbers involved are too great, so it isn't going to put that much of a dent into your budget. And we're living in 1973 not 1957. Surely the minister would consider raising the $6-a-day fee to jurors and witnesses today—now, not one year from today.

I don't want to read this editorial into the record, Mr. Minister, but on April 16, 1973, an editorial was extremely condemnatory, if that is the word, concerning the attitude of the government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Good word. That's what it was.

Mr. B. Newman: The head on the editorial was "Penny-pinching Ontario." That in itself speaks for the attitude that the press have concerning your stand when it comes to increasing fees, not only to the coroners, but also to the jurors.

And, Mr. Minister, many of these jurors are not well-to-do. Many of them do not necessarily work for an organization that will pick up the difference between the $6 and their daily rate of pay. You have to act now.

Can we get some assurance from the minister that we will see action before the House adjourns for the summer break? Do I have a reply from the minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give that assurance.

Mr. B. Newman: Then in other words you do not intend to act. You're simply promising some action in the future and that will probably take place when there is another Solicitor General.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, just a few observations. In the light of all the fiscal restraint the minister has been talking about, could he inform the House what the cost of setting up the new position of deputy supervising coroner was, with its attending secretaries, I suppose? And also, what will the duties of the new deputy supervising coroner be? And why was he needed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The cost is $30,000, plus the attendant secretarial needs. He is under the direct charge of the coroner. He attends to most of the needs of Metropolitan Toronto and is available on special assignment anywhere in the province to handle unusual or difficult inquests, where the local coroner, for some reason, would not be appropriate or suitable.

Mr. Good: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, one more thing. I would like—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He is a very busy man, I can assure the hon. member.

Mr. Good: Thank you. I just wondered what the new position was.

One thing, I think, should be made clear. I am convinced that the chief coroner's office is well aware of the need for revision of the fee schedule, not only of the coroners, but of those who provide services for the coroners. I am also convinced that the ministry is well aware of it. But unless the ministry gets through to Treasury Board or the Management Board of Cabinet and gets this matter resolved I have reason to believe, from the large number of letters which I have been getting in the last few months, that the coroner's system in the Province of Ontario could very well break down. And I'll tell you why.

There are those, as has been indicated, who are fulfilling their services because they feel a sense of responsibility, but the coroner is obliged to call on the services of other individuals. One year ago, Dr. McNally, who was the director of the emergency hospital services, indicated that no longer could ambulances be used for the transportation of the bodies of those who died in public places. This then meant that many areas were relying on other sources to move bodies. Removal services were set up in some municipalities

and the funeral directors were required to do this work, as they always have done in smaller municipalities.

Let me state now, and state it emphatically, that I have no conflict of interest in this matter, because the firm with which I am associated does not do this work for coroners and never has. So I can speak quite freely and frankly on behalf of those people who have had to do this work for coroners over the years according to a fee schedule that was set in 1957.

Removal services and funeral homes in small municipalities are expected to provide a vehicle and two men for $15 and travel up to 15 miles outside the municipality before they can claim 10c a mile. This is utterly ridiculous. They are doing it out of a sense of goodwill and public responsibility.

Now unless the minister can get through to the people on Management Board of Cabinet, he is going to find that coroners not only are going to have their own difficulties to resolve, they will also have the difficulty of finding people who are fed up with having to work for the government for nothing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The coroners will have to put it in the back seat of their own cars.

Mr. Good: Now I think it's very serious. It's a matter which Dr. Cotnam is well aware of; Mr. Hillis in his office has spoken about it, and so has the ministry. But nothing can happen until Management Board of Cabinet moves on it. If they don't move on it very shortly, there is going to be concerted effort across the province and, in the opinion of some individuals, the whole coroner system could very well break down because of the obstinance of this government in putting its priorities in what I would say is the wrong place.

Mr. Chairman: Item 5 agreed to. Item 6: the hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister would let me know the number of people who are covered by the $79,000 for salaries under the item of forensic pathology, new activity.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is a director, three technicians for the medical lab—they are called pathologists' assistants—and one secretary. That's a total of five personnel.

Mr. Renwick: What would be the proposed salary for the director?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't have that with me, Mr. Chairman; that is a contract arrangement approved by Management Board.

Mr. Renwick: A contract arrangement with an individual or with some service?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: With Dr. Hillsdon-Smith directly.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 agreed to. That completes vote 1502.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if I might, the hon. member for St. George asked me for the names of the members of the task force and I omitted the names of Mr. E. B. Hale of Waterloo and Mr. J. L. McIntyre of Sault Ste. Marie; and I would like the permission of the House to have that inserted in Hansard at the appropriate spot.

Vote 1502 agreed to.

Mr. Renwick: I think it's 6 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I'd like to say that the first item of business on Tuesday next will be the bill that was introduced today by the Treasurer (Mr. White).

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): They're ramming it through.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The second item will be item No. 2, and if we conclude these items we shall deal with Nos. 11 and 13 standing on the order paper today.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): But, Mr. Speaker, surely—since the bill that would increase the sales tax was just introduced today and hasn't been printed—we can have a day or two to have a look

at the final form of the bill before it is debated in second reading? What is the government trying to do, ram it through before people realize how bad it is? I think that's just ridiculous.

An hon. member: That stinks!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think the hon. member knows very well that I wouldn't do that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I know what the House leader is trying to do.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't think the hon. member does, or he wouldn't speak that way. I will take the matter under consideration and, in the meantime, if that change is made, then we would deal with the items after that as I enumerated.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 18, 1973

Great Lakes flood damage, statement by Mr. Lawrence 1133

Mercury contamination warning, statement by Mr. Potter 1134

Presenting reports, industry and tourism exploration teams, Mr. Bennett 1134

Ryerson financial problems, statement by Mr. McNie 1135

Great Lakes flood damage, statement by Mr. Lawrence 1137

Mercury contamination warning, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Reid, Mr. Stokes 1137

Sales tax on energy, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Roy 1139

Effect of energy tax on educational costs, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds 1143

OHIP cuts, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 1143

Funds for purchase of Niagara Escarpment, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 1144

Pets in OHC projects, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bounsall 1145

Use of market value assessments, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Good 1146

Municipal grants, question of Mr. White: Mr. Cassidy 1146

Problems of farmers in Uxbridge area, question of Mr. White: Mr. Good 1146

Ontario Hydro farm land purchases, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Roy 1146

Municipal grants, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Foulds 1147

Building above high water levels, question of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Spence 1147

Feasibility of copper smelter in Timmins, questions of Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Ferrier 1148

North Pickering development, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Deacon 1148

Contamination of fish in Sudbury area, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Martel 1148

Use of drugs in schools, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Gaunt 1148

Health problems of industrial radiographers, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Burr 1149

Strike against Windsor Utilities Commission, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. B. Newman 1150

Regional government, question of Mr. White: Mr. Beckett 1150

Presenting report, mercury task force, Mr. Potter 1150

Presenting report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Henderson 1150

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Taylor 1150

Town of Brampton Act, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading 1151

Retail Sales Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, first reading 1151

City of Barrie Act, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, first reading 1152

County of Hastings Act, bill respecting, Mr. Rollins, first reading 1152

S. B. Young Ltd. Act, bill respecting, Mr. MacBeth, first reading 1152

City of Sault Ste. Marie Act, bill respecting, Mr. Rhodes, first reading 1152

Township of Sarnia Act, bill respecting, Mr. Bullbrook, first reading 1152

Timrand Investments Ltd. Act, bill respecting, Mr. Singer, first reading 1152

Service Hardware Ltd. Act, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 1152

Estimates, Ministry of the Solicitor General, Mr. Yaremko, continued 1153

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1172

No. 27



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 24, 1973

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have this afternoon as our guests in the east gallery students from New Toronto Secondary School of New Toronto and senior citizens from the New Toronto Senior Citizens' Group of New Toronto. In the west gallery we have students from Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute of Scarborough and St. Mary's Separate School of Toronto. At 3 o'clock we will be joined in the east gallery by students from Glendale High School from Hamilton.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): We should have a crisis every day. They're all here.

ANSWER TO WRITTEN QUESTION

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Where is the Premier?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to question 5 on the order paper. (See Appendix, page 1228).

Mr. Lewis: What about 1, 2, 3 and 4?

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Come on, Treasurer.

PERSPECTIVES ON INCOME SECURITY

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, as recently as 12 days ago, when I presented minor adjustments with regard to welfare assistance rates and comfort allowances for residents in institutions, I informed the hon. members that these were temporary adjustments pending an overall review of income security at an upcoming federal-provincial conference of welfare ministers. This three-day conference convenes tomorrow in Ottawa.

When I spoke on the subject, I explained to hon. members that income security studies have been proceeding for some time in the various provinces, including our own. In these studies we have been examining positive approaches that should be taken in revamping our social security programmes, since what we have today is a conglomeration of programmes, both in social insurance and other forms of social assistance, and in the taxation field. Toward this end, Ontario has now produced basic principles on income security which it recommends in the report prepared by a group of senior public servants known as the task force on income security.

Today I am tabling in the House that report entitled, "Perspectives on Income Security."

For members' information, those who have collaborated in the preparation of this report, in addition to senior officials in the various branches of my Ministry of Community and Social Services, are, namely, the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, the secretariat for Social Development and the office of the Premier. In addition, we have also received valuable advice in the preparation of this report from consultation with the department of social services of Metropolitan Toronto.

At the outset, I should explain that Ontario contends that income security extends beyond the obvious combination of programmes, such as old age security, guaranteed income supplements, family allowances, Canada Pension Plan, unemployment insurance and the cost-shared programmes covered by the Canada Assistance Plan. We see income security as an integral part of the aggregate transfer system, including elements of taxation; employment-related services, such as placement, retraining, and job creation; and supplementary housing services, such as housing subsidies, rehabilitation services and also preventive programmes.

I am also tabling a document entitled, "Ontario Proposals for Amending the Canada Pension Plan," which outlines Ontario's plan for amending the Canada Pension Plan.

As we all know, the present income security system has evolved over the years with no set of consistent goals, but rather as isolated responses to specific problems of the day. At the present time, major programmes are initiated by two levels of government and often administered by three. While progress has been made, the outcome of this unco-ordinated approach has resulted in a system which can be characterized by gaps, overlaps, inequities and disincentives.

In order to rectify these obvious disparities, which have been growing in recent years, Ontario feels strongly that an improved structure must and can be developed, and that this task should be undertaken as quickly as possible. A major opportunity to initiate such an overhaul is presented by tomorrow's conference in Ottawa.

While we recognize the urgency for such an overhaul, we also realize it will not be an easy task. Ontario clearly recognizes the interlocking and complex nature of the present problems. These are compounded by the fact that they exist in such diverse areas as jurisdiction, finance, administration, social structure and human behaviour, which preclude the possibility of their immediate elimination.

But the government does feel strongly that an improved structure must be developed and that the task must be approached in a manner designed to minimize many of the existing problems and disparities. It cannot be done by a series of quick adjustments. This will merely add complications to an already confused system.

In order to make a rational beginning, we must start with a systematic approach. To this end, Mr. Speaker, you will find that Ontario has developed a six-point approach, the principles of which are spelled out in the report that I am tabling in the House today. However, we also recognize that there is an immediate need to proceed with amendments of the Canada Pension Plan. Our proposals provide a comprehensive plan both for immediate amendments and for future development of the plan within the context of overall income security reform.

We intend to submit this set of six basic principles before delegates attending the Ottawa conference, so that they might be considered by the other provinces and the federal government as the basis from which we might begin to develop a much more effective income security system—a system which will ensure equity of treatment to all.

Needless to say, agreement on common principles is essential in order to establish a common base from which to build a more effective and equitable system. Otherwise, there is nothing to ensure that one inadequate system is not replaced by another.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our position in Ottawa will be to propose to the federal authorities and the other provinces that the entire task of reform and overhaul of the existing system should be undertaken by a special working committee on which there is provincial representation. That is to say, the members of this working committee would comprise senior officials appointed by the federal government and by each of the provinces.

Together we have the expertise and the desire for a totally new scheme. Let's harness it today and put it to work in designing an equitable income security system based on commonly agreed upon principles and flexible enough to meet today's needs and tomorrow's concerns.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: At least they've got something to cheer about!

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: And so begins year two!

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski: (Renfrew South): He doesn't like it. The leader of the NDP has a long face.

Interjections by hon. members.

SALES TAX ON ENERGY

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, after that enthusiastic response from both sides of the House, perhaps this statement is unnecessary, but I would like to make a brief statement on a matter relating to government policy with respect to the provincial budget.

At the end of last week, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Treasurer (Mr. White) to review his proposal for a seven per cent retail sales tax on energy sources and to determine whether the principal objectives of his budget, of the fiscal objectives of the government, would be seriously affected if it were withdrawn.

I have discussed this matter with him further this morning and he has indicated that while there would be some problems associated with such a course of action, they would not be such as to be unmanageable.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I told the Premier that last Tuesday.

Mr. Cassidy: Now the Premier is going to bail him out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Therefore, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Cassidy: Why didn't the Premier say that before the budget?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the provision for a seven per cent retail sales tax on energy sources will be withdrawn from the legislation presently before the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Thank God for the caucus of this party, and the people of this province.

An hon. member: No thanks to you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Aren't the opposition in favour?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): They are unhappy. None of them applauded.

Hon. Mr. Davis: May I add, Mr. Speaker, that I continue to have the greatest confidence in the capacity, the ability and the integrity of the Treasurer of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Was that necessary?

Mr. Lewis: We share that. We think he should be Treasurer for ever.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I know that this confidence is shared both by his colleagues in the cabinet and by the caucus of our party.

Mr. Speaker, the budget which he presented to this House a week ago last Thursday—

Mr. Lewis: Was an exemplary budget.

Hon. Mr. Davis —reflected his concern for many of the pressing and difficult problems now facing this province; a concern, Mr. Speaker which is shared not only by the government but by private citizens right across this province.

Mr. Cassidy: As the Premier learned afterwards.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are confident that the measures it contains will benefit the people of this province and will help to bring about the solutions to these problems that we all wish to see.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): They won't forget it.

Mr. Lewis: One reversal after another. One reversal after another.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that the new plan announced in the Treasurer's budget to stabilize property taxes by giving $180 million more to municipalities in Ontario—

Mr. MacDonald: That is another illusion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —will go a long way to solve the increasingly difficult problems of municipal finance. It will permit them to reduce the burden of property taxes on Ontario homeowners and make the property tax as a whole more equitable. This will be especially true in the cities and towns of northern Ontario, which will receive an extra income of $6 million.

Mr. Cassidy: No. Those guys are too easily conned.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer's plan to increase tax credits—

Mr. Lewis: The Premier can't retrieve it with a second budget speech. The damage was done the first time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and to create a sales tax credit to provide $90 million to make the sales tax more progressive, and to create a pensioners' tax credit to provide $40 million to assist our pensioners, will both bring an added measure of fairness and equity to the tax system in this province and will lift some of the burden of taxation from those who can least afford it.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier said all that in the first budget.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that the elimination of property taxes on farm lands in Ontario and the new provisions for the forgiveness of succession duties on farm assets will help the farming industry to hold down rising food costs in this province and will help to preserve our family farms.

Mr. Cassidy: What about the equity of the increase in sales tax now? They had a real love-in.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): I saw that movie.

Mr. Lewis: This is a supplementary budget and it reads no better than the first one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that the partial elimination of succession duties and the new plan to permit business firms to pay this tax over a six-year period will help to preserve small Canadian businesses in this province.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we are confident that this budget will accomplish its objectives. It will benefit the homeowner—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Who is the new Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the tenant, the pensioner, the widow, the low-income family, the small businessman and many other people in this province. And just as we are confident in the budget, Mr. Speaker, we are confident in the Treasurer who introduced it.

Mr. Cassidy: Why does he say it twice? He is protesting too much.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Why doesn't the Premier get rid of his aircraft?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In my view, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: That is the second vote of confidence in the same budget.

Mr. Cassidy: Try it again.

Mr. Lewis: A vote of confidence on every page.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In my view, Mr. Speaker, what we have heard in the past week and one-half has been an expression in many parts of the province of a very genuine personal concern in connection with the proposed seven per cent tax on energy sources—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): And of confidence in this government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and the nature of the impact it has been suggested that this measure might have upon some people.

Mr. Cassidy: There is a concern about this government as well, and not just the tax. There are thousands of Conservatives who will never vote for this government again. They won't forget.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This concern, Mr. Speaker, while genuinely felt, has tended to overlook not only the many additional benefits that will accrue to such people, both directly and indirectly, but more importantly the particular care which was taken by the Treasurer in attempting to see that no real hardship would be inflicted on those least able to bear it.

Mr. Singer: They should both resign.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: He said it would be a brief statement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is.

Mr. Lewis: He should have kept it brief.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is brief.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: He should have withdrawn it and sat down because he can't retract it now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member is agreeing with everything that is being said. That is his problem.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is agreeing with everything that is being said—and he knows it.

Mr. Lewis: I agree with the first paragraph; that was fine. But the rest is just nonsense—it's a second budget.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The Treasurer has cost the government 30 seats.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Snow White is a little dirty.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, at the end of last week, when it became apparent that the introduction of this measure—

Mr. Lewis: Two budgets in less than two weeks.

Mr. Stokes: Remember what happened to Walter Gordon!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —had only served to produce a growing public concern with respect to the personal hardship and inequity that had been suggested might result, I asked the Treasurer to reconsider this tax—

Mr. Singer: He went out and got another sweater and took off.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why doesn't the hon. member pick up his foot and put it back in his mouth?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and to determine whether, in view of the manner in which it had been received and the widespread re-

action it had produced, it might be withdrawn.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is back on page 2. He has lost his place.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, Mr. Speaker, the decision to do so will not affect his decision to proceed with all of the other proposals contained in his budget—

Mr. Lewis: I should think not!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —nor the intention of the government to support him in that effort.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): For the time being.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: That is the third vote of confidence.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They'd better resign.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is talking it to death. It is too much. He said it all in his first paragraph.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You know why? The hon. member doesn't like to hear it. He doesn't like to hear it.

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean? I am glad to hear it, but all the rest of this is nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Then listen!

Mr. Cassidy: Even the Premier's own cabinet colleagues are embarrassed by now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to clear up a misapprehension which seems to have developed with respect to the kind of confidentiality that must surround the preparation of any budget.

Mr. Lewis: Yes—not to mention comment after the budget.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It has been a long-established principle of parliamentary democracy, adhered to at Westminster and the Parliament of Canada, and indeed in parliaments throughout the world, that the Treasurer may not reveal the contents of his budget to anyone not bound by the oath of secrecy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And to resign when he makes a major error.

Mr. Singer: This is the principle of responsible government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The observance of this principle has served to protect the public interest and to prevent any possibility of personal advantage or private gain that would be available to anyone possessed of such prior knowledge.

An hon. member: That is correct.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But while the contents of the budget may not be revealed in advance—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Doesn't the Premier trust his backbenchers?

Mr. Lewis: From 1315 AD treasurers have resigned in such cases.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —there is nothing in tradition or precedent to prevent any treasurer from withdrawing any budget proposal, should he subsequently determine that for some reason it is unacceptable.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: That is true.

Mr. Shulman: There was Walter Gordon.

Mr. Cassidy: Walter Gordon resigned. Now what about the member for London South?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is a fact; check the precedents.

Mr. Singer: That is the same as we have no right to know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This has occurred in the past, and no doubt it will occur again.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Look at those sullen anxious faces behind him. Oh yes, look at them. This is a day of mourning for them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, they are delighted.

Mr. Lewis: Look at them over there. Look at those rigid faces.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are delighted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a day of mourning for the hon. member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, while I do not expect that such a course would be without its consequences, I am determined that the government that I head and the party that I lead will continue to remain

responsive to the wishes and the will of the people of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If this means that we must change our minds or modify our policies, let it be known that we are prepared to do so.

Mr. Singer: Change treasurers. Try again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And while this may confound our opposition, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Election finances.

Mr. MacDonald: I think it is confounding the truth on that side.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I suspect that the people of Ontario would prefer responsiveness to rigidity in government, because that is what public participation in the democratic process is all about.

Mr. Lewis: What about regional government?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): This is the Treasurer's greatest moment.

PRINCIPLES OF BUDGET

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the Premier has indicated a responsive government which is responsible—

Mr. Renwick: What friends the government has.

Hon. Mr. White: —does not insist on passing into law measures which clearly offend a great majority of people. I have learned from members of the provincial Conservative caucus, and from taxpayers themselves, that one element of the budget was not acceptable.

Mr. MacDonald: I told the government that a week ago.

Mr. Cassidy: But it won't listen.

Hon. Mr. White: This has proven to be the case with that item in my budget statement of April 17, 1973, proposing a seven per cent value tax on all forms of energy presently untaxed in Ontario. Accordingly, on Thursday of this week I intend to amend the bill to delete that proposal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The government is a slow learner.

Mr. Cassidy: And it cost the government 200,000 votes.

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the government let the minister's successor continue?

Hon. Mr. White: Perhaps not everyone has fully understood the basic objectives of the budget and the benefits that flow from the tax changes it contains. I accept the basic opposition of the public to the proposed energy tax. I do wish to reiterate, however, some of the basic features of the budget—

Mr. Breithaupt: Oh, we've heard that twice.

Mr. Lewis: Now this is the third budget.

Hon. Mr. White: —in the hope that these will now be more fully comprehended and to comment on the consequences of withdrawing this one source of revenue.

Mr. Cassidy: Why doesn't the Treasurer give the Premier a vote of confidence?

Hon. Mr. White: First, let me review the basic principles of the budget.

Mr. MacDonald: They are already demolished.

Hon. Mr. White: By the refusal of the federal government to acknowledge the financial needs of the provinces and the municipalities—

Mr. Cassidy: If the minister couldn't explain it the first time, why try again?

Hon. Mr. White: May I say, Mr. Speaker, I have resigned myself to the rudeness of the opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We can't get used to the stupidity of the government.

Hon. Mr. White: By the refusal of the federal government to acknowledge the financial needs of the provinces and the municipalities, the federal treasury grows large while the other levels of government face an unhappy choice between curtailed essential services or higher taxation.

I would not have been obliged to consider increased taxes if the federal government had fulfilled its responsibility to participate—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —in the reconstruction of the financing of the Canadian federal system.

Mr. Singer: Sheer genius. Give us more!

Mr. MacDonald: What about capital gains?

Mr. Cassidy: What about resources?

Mr. MacDonald: What about succession duties?

Mr. Lewis: The government is losing its grip.

Hon. Mr. White: Almost 70 per cent of the Ontario budget consists of fiscal transfers to individuals and institutions.

Mr. Lewis: Why is the government doing this?

Hon. Mr. White: As I indicated, it was not necessary to raise taxes to meet the Ontario government's own expenses and it would certainly have been easier not to do so. It would have been an abdication of responsibility however to ignore the municipalities' plight and their dependence on the property tax, or to ignore the need for greater equity in our tax system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Which the government is getting by raising the sales tax. Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. White: I proposed to raise taxes by $333 million and to transfer more than $100 million to relieve property tax burdens in 1973-1974.

Although this tax increase will now be reduced by $65 million, we intend to proceed with our proposals to transfer the entire additional $400 million.

Mr. MacDonald: The government has got nest eggs all over the place to meet that.

Hon. Mr. White: Consequently, it is more important than ever that these transfers should reach the municipal taxpayer in the form of reduced property taxes. Of these transfers, some $130 million will be dedicated to enriched tax credits to make the sales tax more progressive.

As a result of the increased tax credits, plus the reductions made possible in property taxes, there will be a decrease in the total tax burden for families having income of $10,000 or less.

Mr. Renwick: It raises the price of everything across the province anyway!

Hon. Mr. White: The package of tax reforms for the farm sector—

Mr. Cassidy: The biggest in 10 years because of the government's tax.

Hon. Mr. White: —at once make our agricultural lands as well treated as any in the world, while helping to curtail the increase in food costs.

Second, let me comment on the consequences. I continue to believe that the energy problem is a serious matter for the people of this province and that we must find ways of conserving our energy reserves.

Mr. Lewis: Well, that's not the way to do it.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister should take the sweater off and roll up his sleeves and tackle the problem.

Hon. Mr. White: As a result of the decision not to proceed with the tax, our anticipated budgetary deficit will now be $467 million in 1973-1974 rather than $402 million. Our total cash requirements will also be increased by $65 million, thereby diminishing the improvement that I had hoped to achieve through the reduction of our public debt.

Mr. Cassidy: That was phoney accounting anyway.

Mr. Lewis: That was never real—never real.

Hon. Mr. White: As I indicated in the budget, provincial spending will increase by less than nine per cent this year, or 11.7 per cent including transfers, and this is the lowest rate of tax increase of all of the governments in Canada, with one possible exception. By contrast, the federal government will increase its spending by more than 16 per cent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: We are aware of the pressures our cost control programmes have imposed on hospitals, school boards and other institutions throughout the province.

Mr. Singer: When do we get to the part about the minister's heart-felt concern?

Hon. Mr. White: Therefore, it would be incorrect to expect that a revenue reduction of $65 million can be offset by a further reduction in expenditure.

Mr. Singer: The minister should resign.

Mr. Lewis: He can't resign. Who would the Premier appoint if he resigned?

Mr. Cassidy: The member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson).

Hon. Mr. White: I will ask our ministries to continue their campaign of expenditure constraint, however, and urge local governments—

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Revenue! Are you kidding?

Hon. Mr. White: —and other public institutions in the province to do likewise, in the hope that some further improvement will be achieved in our financial position.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the Treasurer of Ontario to propose ways of financing public services.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: There are no free public goods in our society today, not even fresh air and pure water. Taxation then becomes a question of who pays; that is the question of equity.

Mr. Cassidy: The Treasurer is using rhetoric to hide his fiscal duplicity.

Mr. Sargent: What a bunch of double-talk.

Hon. Mr. White: And how it's to be collected. That is the question of efficiency and convenience for the taxpayer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: I believe that this budget makes progress in both directions.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: Of course, the decision not to tax energy does reduce the tax burden. There remains that fundamental social equation between the demands of the public for services and the need to levy taxes in order to maintain fiscal integrity.

That is a question which demands the serious and objective consideration not only of members of this Legislature but also citizens of the province.

Mr. Sargent: He's a different guy today!

Hon. Mr. White: I will continue to seek and to welcome advice in an open manner—in discharging my responsibilities not only to the present but to future generations of taxpayers.

Mr. Cassidy: Is this the Treasurer's first lecture at Western he is repeating for us?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: The member knows better than that! No wonder he looks so set up.

Mr. Lewis: We have to know who the successor is to be first.

STRIKE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING STUDENTS

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, because of the interest in the dispute concerning the Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Board of Education and its French language advisory committee and students, I would like, as a statement, to read a letter which I received this morning indicating a resolution to the dispute which has gone on in that community for a short while.

The letter says:

DEAR MR. MINISTER:

I am happy to report to you that an agreement was reached by the Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Board of Education at its meeting on Thursday, April 19, upon the issues which have been under dispute there in recent weeks. I believe that the resolution of the dispute which has been agreed upon by the board represents a fair and reasonable settlement, and that it is one which should enable all citizens of goodwill to come together again to work for the best overall development of the educational system in the three united counties.

I am attaching a copy of the formal resolution of the board which I thought you might wish to have. As you will note, it provides, first, for the shift system to be continued for one more year by Saint Lawrence Secondary School and Ecole Secondaire Saint-Laurent, and, secondly, for the existing school building to be designated now as the French Language Secondary School for September, 1974, and for the new school building which is presently under construction to be designated now as the English Language Bilingual School for September, 1974.

The resolution provides, further, for appropriate supervision by the Director of Education of the registration of students

for the schools during the coming school year, and for a review of the arrangements for the two schools to be undertaken, by the minister during the first year of their operation, in 1974-75.

Mr. Singer: It has been 2½ months! The minister should resign.

Hon. Mr. Wells: To continue:

The resolution also provides for each of the secondary schools concerned, prior to registration, to be given equal space in the local daily newspapers at the expense of the board to describe the programmes of the schools and that this informational material should be prepared by the principal of each school subject to the approval of the director of education.

During my discussions with the board I made a number of other suggestions and I believe that these suggestions were also favourably received. They include the following:

That the board establish a working committee on public relations to review its relations with all segments of the community, and to prepare a long term plan to improve these relations;

That the board undertake in the near future a full review of its transportation and school boundary policies;

That consideration be given to facilitating wider use of the printing and refrigeration plants at Saint Lawrence Secondary School as valuable regional learning resources.

During our discussions several members of the board also expressed to me their hope that greater support could be made available in order to extend the opportunities open to English-speaking students to learn French. I believe that representations, which I would like to support, will be made to you upon this subject.

Finally, I would like to report to you that I received throughout my work as mediator the complete co-operation and assistance of the board and staff of the Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Board of Education and many other individuals in groups in the community.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) T. H. B. Symons.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say publicly in this House that I appreciate, and I know the members of the House do—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —the work of Prof. Symons in this regard. I am happy that he was able—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister created the problem; Symons had to solve it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —in a very conscientious and unheated atmosphere—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: It is that minister who created the problem in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —to restore the confidence of all the people in Cornwall in their educational system.

Mr. Foulds: Tom Symons would make a pretty good Minister of Education!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SALES TAX ON ENERGY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Since he was aware of the decision to impose the tax that the Treasurer has just announced would be withdrawn, and he was aware of that decision before the budgetary announcement, can he explain why he was the one who urged the Treasurer to reconsider the imposition just last week? Perhaps he should accept at least a modicum of the responsibility himself for this serious error in judgement on the part of the Treasurer.

Mr. Roy: Right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course, the Leader of the Opposition is giving to me, perhaps, greater powers of perception or awareness than may or may not be the case.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the Premier mean he did not know the effect of the tax?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I asked the Treasurer in the latter part of last week to review the question of the imposition of the energy tax because I had had representations made to me by many

delegations, many individuals, from all across this province expressing their concern.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the Premier had been in the House he would have heard some objections here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government is responsive; it listens. We have found a way to resolve it, I believe.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary of the Premier.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was the Premier or was he not aware of the imposition of the seven per cent tax on energy before it was announced in the budget?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, surely! It boggles the mind.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would think the answer to that question really is self-evident.

Mr. Singer: Yes or no?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary that follows from it: Why was not his advice to the Treasurer to withdraw it before it was ever announced? Surely the Premier must have recognized that this kind of a tax was completely unacceptable. Surely, he has been irresponsible and unfair in forcing the Treasurer into a position of accepting the full responsibility for this ridiculous error?

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): The tax was accepted in Saskatchewan, in Manitoba!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): What kind of a leader is he?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deacon: He should resign.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have never been one to shirk any of my part of the responsibility. This is a matter in which I share the concern of the Treasurer. I made very clear in my statement the procedure that was followed; and I made it very clear also that I have complete confidence in the ability, the capacity and the integrity of the Treasurer of this province. That was very evident in the statement I made.

Mr. Cassidy: That's the fourth time the Premier has given the Treasurer a vote of confidence.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: He had to repudiate it anyway. He had to repudiate it. Sure he did; of course he did—the economic plan of the budget.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, following the Premier's answer to the supplementary question, I would put another supplementary question to him.

Does he not realize that the adviser who gave him the advice that he accepted last week and rejected this week is also his Minister of Economics, his minister of municipal affairs, the chief provincial planner, the Treasurer of Ontario and his Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs? Is he convinced that he can continue to accept that sort of advice when the minister in whom he protests that he has such confidence has these overwhelming responsibilities?

Mr. Singer: It has been repudiated.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said before that I have complete confidence in the capacity of the Treasurer. I do not minimize the workload.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This was made very clear, if the Leader of the Opposition will recall, at the time of the hon. minister's appointment to this very onerous task. I am also very cognizant of the very great workload and the very large area of responsibility.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is a ridiculous workload.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the Premier not agree that the $65 million that the tax would have raised was, in fact, unnecessary in the first instance and that the opposition, which put forward that contention, was entirely correct in the fact that the tax was not necessary?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect to the mathematics of the Leader of the Opposition, it is not a question of necessity. It's a question of trying to find an equitable way to discharge properly the financial responsibilities in this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: Whoever said that was equitable?

Hon. Mr. Davis: While we have found a way—and a way that has to be understood—to meet the general objectives of the budget, to pay the benefits that are, I think, very evident in the budget, there is a price to be paid. And that price for this year is not to be able to reduce the amount of the public debt to the extent the Treasurer would like to do. You can't have it both ways. Surely that should be evident.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The government is budgeting for a deficit of $400 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the Premier is prepared to put it that way, will he stake his political career on the projected deficit that the Treasurer has put forward, because obviously it is inflated?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is not proper.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would only say this. If the Leader of the Opposition had staked his political career on the estimates he was making on the deficit some few weeks ago, obviously his decision as to whether he stays or not would have been made sooner.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: We won't ask for the Treasurer's resignation yet because we are afraid of whom the Premier might appoint in his place.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the Premier. Since the Premier obviously bears equal responsibility for what occurred, is he also satisfied that the increase in the debt makes sense? Wouldn't it be rather preferable to find money from resource taxation, succession duty taxation, or increased capital gains taxation to bring to the people of Ontario from equitable sources, rather than an increase in the sales tax, the amount of money we need?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the leader of the New Democratic Party is expressing in the question his own political philosophy—

Mr. MacDonald: Right, just the way the Premier expresses his philosophy in his answers.

Mr. Cassidy: He is on the side of the fat cats.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that political philosophy being that we should tax the resource industry, the corporations, in a way that would make us less competitive in the world markets.

The answer very simply, Mr. Speaker, is that at this precise moment, knowing the competitive position that Ontario must maintain within the world markets, the answer to that is "no."

Mr. Lewis: Then by way of supplementary, the Premier is still characterizing as equitable a budget which in this fiscal year extracts $280 million from individuals and families in Ontario, and only $15 million additional from corporations? He characterizes that as equitable?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I never characterize any budget or anything as being completely equitable. I am the first one to admit that we have not achieved complete equity or perfection, and as long as human beings are involved in the political process we won't. So I am not prepared to say that we have achieved complete equity. What we are attempting to do is come much closer to it in this budget.

DISTRIBUTION OF TAX TABLES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Revenue. What authority permitted him to send out new tax tables to those merchants in Ontario who collect the retail sales tax, establishing the new rate, before it was accepted by the Legislature or, in fact, even introduced into the Legislature by the first reading of the bill?

And secondly, wouldn't it concern him that perhaps there might be some further adjustment to that tax and that he would have to amend it once the Treasurer has reconsidered it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that the administration of such a tax requires some advance notice to those people who have to collect it. There is nothing in the sales tax bulletin which advises the vendors precisely what is going to be expected of them on a certain date or which makes it legal for them to collect it at this time, and indeed I am sure no one has done that.

Surely if the bill is passed here the day before it becomes law it would be utterly

impossible for the vendors to be prepared for it. It is merely a courtesy and an advance notice to them so they can prepare themselves for it.

I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition would be the first one to criticize the government, and quite properly so, if there wasn't sufficient time given to the vendors to prepare them for a new tax.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Surely the minister would agree that the government picks the effective date; sometimes it is the midnight following the publication of the budget. In this case it was May 1.

Why wouldn't the minister have recommended that a date be established so that he could inform the vendors of the province after the bill had become law, since it is obviously in such substantial contention even yet?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Counting their chickens before they are hatched.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what objection the hon. member has to keeping our citizens and our merchants informed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It looks like arrogance, sending out that information before it has been approved.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I quote from the bulletin:

> The following information is provided as a guideline only and covers the more significant changes to the provisions of the Retail Sales Tax Act presented—

Mr. Singer: The changes have not been made yet, not until they are passed by statute.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will again take his feet off the desk and put one in his mouth—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: That's good; that's even better than the Treasurer. What does the minister do for an encore?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I repeat, Mr. Speaker:

> —and covers the more significant changes to the provisions of the Retail Sales Tax Act presented to the Legislature by the Treasurer of Ontario, April 12, 1973. Enabling legislation is being presented for consideration by the Legislature. Regulations and rulings affected by these changes are being printed and will be distributed as soon as possible.

Surely that is informational and is what he would expect if he were a vendor?

Interjections by hon. members.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION COUNSEL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General.

In view of the budgetary problems that we are obviously experiencing in the province, why would he have recommended to the recently established royal commission on crime in certain labour unions that Mr. A. E. Shepherd, QC, be retained as the commission counsel, when our experience with Mr. Shepherd in the last royal commission was that he charged us $130,480 for two years' part-time work? Is it true that, in fact, we have agreed to pay him in excess of $300 every day?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I did not recommend either of the counsel to His Honour Judge Waisberg. Judge Waisberg came to see me and discussed the matter. He wanted some suggestions as to counsel. Then he came back and made his own recommendations, and those were the persons who were appointed. They were not my recommendations to him, nor the government's. They are very able counsel.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No doubt about that.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think that they will do a very fine job. It has been traditional, and I think a good tradition, that when a royal commissioner is appointed he—that person—should have the right to select his own counsel. That is what has been done in this case.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: I am sure the minister will agree there is no question about the competence of this man or the commission or anybody else, but what is in question is some governmental control of the costs of the royal commission. What is he being paid and what are going to be the public requirements in order to service that commission?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It will have to be dealt with by Management Board and approved by order in council. They will be paid substantially less, I am sure, than they would receive in private practice.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Is the figure of $300 a day an accurate figure?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, it isn't an accurate figure. It depends upon what is taking place. They will be paid on a basis of so much when they are preparing for the commission hearings and a different rate when they are actually presenting evidence or dealing with matters before the commission.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: They will both be per diems, I take it? What is the per diem likely to be? The minister knows that now.

Hon. Mr. Bales: That will be finalized before Management Board and approved by cabinet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One further supplementary: Is the minister aware that our recent experience with the services of Mr. Shepherd during the royal commission on Atlantic Acceptance, assuming that he worked 200 days a year, would indicate that he was paid on a flat rate of $325 a day? That was for a royal commission that ended two years ago.

Hon. Mr. Bales: That, I think, is a different situation from this. Quite frankly, we spoke to the commissioner about it, that we wanted the royal commission to proceed as quickly and as expeditiously as possible but, at the same time, not to impair the work that they were doing. I may say that there are other matters in reference to a royal commission that cause me concern and I spoke to the commissioner about them, because I am concerned as to the protection of the rights of individuals who appear before that commission. We must be very careful not to hinder in any way their probing or their questioning, but at the same time the reputations of innocent people must be protected. Judge Waisberg, I am sure, is very cognizant of those rights.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney General tell us whether or not the protection of the reputations of individuals is going to involve more than a discussion between the Attorney General and Judge Waisberg?

Are there going to be guidelines? Are there going to be systems set out? Are there going to be occasions on which hearings can be held in camera? Are these people mentioned going to have the right to counsel? What is the basis on which these rights are going to be protected?

Mr. Lewis: That is not supplementary; the question dealt with payment.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Those matters are being carefully considered at this time and will be developed with the commissioner before the hearings take place.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): By way of supplementary, are we to assume, from the inability of the Attorney General to tell us what the cost will be, that the question of costs never entered his mind in discussing this with the commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. This was dealt with specifically with the commissioner, but we respected the commissioner's right to name and seek his own counsel.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of final supplementary, since the answer is a positive one, that the question of cost was discussed with the commissioner—

Mr. Yakabuski: What would the member have done?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): What is the member's fee per day?

Mr. Bullbrook: Could the minister explain why he can't tell us today what the per diem cost would be?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It's not the case that I cannot tell. It has to be dealt with by management board and finalized by cabinet.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? I believe there have been sufficient supplementaries on that question.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier still in the chamber?

An hon. member: He disappeared!

Mr. Singer: He won't need to wear his sweater any more.

An hon. member: He went out to cancel his order for a sweater.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, very briefly: If the Premier, in fact,

is absent because of a press conference or other media commitments, I think he should be advised that it is more appropriate on a day of this kind to be in the House throughout the question period.

I'm a little weary of the way the House is treated by the Premier.

Interjections by hon. members.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the provincial Treasurer, in the new spirit of openness and responsiveness that is characteristic of this government—not to mention its successive reversals on matters of major policy—will he now make—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Well, do members deny it? Will he now make available—

An hon. member: Snakes and ladders!

Mr. Lewis: Will he now make available to the House the logbooks of government aircraft?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, this is not my responsibility. The question should rightly be put to the Chairman of Management Board.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Well, in the spirit of the Premier's—

Mr. Bullbrook: Response!

Mr. Lewis: —response today! Thank you. Will the Chairman of Management Board now agree to provide public access to the logbooks of government aircraft?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is a good thing to change your mind.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the minister should listen.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I will have to answer in the negative on that question; the reason being there are many occasions on which the Premier, and indeed many members of the cabinet, discuss matters of urgent public business when they're going from place to place—

Mr. Shulman: We aren't asking the minister what they talk about!

Mr. MacDonald: No.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And I think that the security of the individual, also, is important—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister means they flew for security reasons?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —in this regard, and consequently we do not intend to release that information.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The Speaker is convulsed by the minister's answer.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The minister's answer is from the past.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I want to ask the Chairman of Management Board: What do the conversations which took place on the aircraft and what do matters of security have to do with the public right of access to the logbooks to determine who flew where and when?

An hon. member: It's over a year ago.

An hon. member: It's history.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I might say, Mr. Speaker, it's just exactly that.

An hon. member: What?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I will tell you!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce. A supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary of the Chairman of the Management Board.

An hon. member: Now hear this.

Mr. Sargent: In view of this period of fiscal masturbation they are involved in now, would the minister advise the House of the new DH 125 jets he has on reserve at $600 an hour—

Mr. Lewis: That's not the phrase I would have chosen.

Mr. Sargent: Would he tell us if the logbooks of the jets he is using now are available to the House?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't believe that that is the case, but I will look into the matter.

Mr. Singer: This is a hard day for those fellows. A hard day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister deny that they have a $600-an-hour jet available?

Mr. Singer: Even his secretary knows that.

Mr. MacDonald: He needs protection. He needs protection.

Mr. Singer: He's had better days, too.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister deny that he has a $600-an-hour jet standing by and he has had it since last August? Does he deny that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll have to look at that, Mr. Speaker, but I don't believe that to be the fact.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I can tell him it is a fact. Is he going to give us the logbook to that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have a strange feeling the hon. member will be withdrawing that statement.

Mr. Sargent: I can give him a phone number to call if he wants to, directly after the House closes.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): I sure wouldn't want one of the member's phone numbers!

Mr. Singer: He's lost it.

Mr. Sargent: What did the Minister of Natural Resources tell the minister? What did he tell him?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the Chairman of the Management Board could make it clear whether or not his prohibition against this information is going to restrict the access of the committee on public accounts to the logbooks? Surely there will be no effort on the part of the government to restrict their access to this information?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have said before on other occasions that I don't interfere with the work of the committees.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, but does the minister interfere with the availability of government information?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I just don't interfere with the work of government committees, nor will I with the public accounts committee.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Are the logbooks on file? I think there have been enough supplementaries.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member had been attempting to get the floor. I was going to permit him a supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to my leader's question of the hon. minister, would he not be prepared to make a commitment now that this information will be available to the public accounts committee? Make a commitment now.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Is that me the member is asking?

Mr. Roy: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I have had no requests from the public accounts committee, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Natural Resources, are the logbooks of government aircraft on file with the air transport board, that is with the commission on transportation and communications at the federal level? Is that a requirement?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, this is not a requirement. The logbooks, as required by regulation, are with the particular aircraft.

STUDY OF PAYMENTS FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health: I presume he is aware of the memo which has gone out to, I think, all doctors in the province from the medical review committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, relating to a new method of payment of physicians of Ontario as of May 1, 1973, and can he make comments on that memo?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): I haven't got my copy of it yet, Mr. Speaker, but I have mentioned before in the Legislature that the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario was making recommendations concerning some constraints on the payment of fees to physicians, so I assume this is the one the member is referring to. Under this programme, they are suggesting that

they will also have a control on quality of care as well as the payments that would be made to physicians.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, can the minister explain to the House the quality-service payment formula? I mean, it is public money we are talking about, and they are now intervening in a very direct way with the arrangements in the legislation. Can the minister explain to the House what this major transformation will be on May 1, since we know nothing of it and it is all being handled within the profession?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I can't explain to the House in detail, Mr. Speaker, because I haven't had the details explained to me. I am sure that the college has probably explained them to the OHIP officials themselves. But I have heard nothing more than what the hon. member himself has said, that the college has recommended to the commission that they will make these recommendations to them as far as payments are concerned.

In other words, their suggestion is that there will be a certain number of units of time in a day that a physician can actually perform adequately. They are suggesting that, as payments come in, any physician who charges for more than this number of units, they would recommend to OHIP officials that they check into these more thoroughly and perhaps not pay as much over a certain number of units in a day.

They hope that in this way they will be able to cut back the number of physicians who are, in fact, charging for a large number of procedures, which they don't think that they can actually perform adequately in the amount of time available. It is rather a complicated procedure to try to stand up here and explain to everyone, but I would be delighted to meet with members to discuss it.

Mr. Lewis: One last supplementary: Isn't this the strangest of all possible ways to proceed with a constraint package in the cost of medical care insurance, that the College of Physicians and Surgeons arbitrarily sets out a new formula which it recommends to the commission? Isn't it more intelligent and intelligible for the Minister of Health, who is disbursing $600 million of public funds, to announce to the Legislature what the government deems to be the constraint package rather than to have peculiar alterations implemented in an ad hoc way? Why are they determining policy all the time, rather than the minister?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate today that I will be announcing to this Legislature, when I am ready, the government's constraint package. This memo has nothing to do with my constraint package. This is a package that the college itself has instituted for its own members. Our constraint package will be announced shortly.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): As soon as OMA approves what the minister is doing.

TASK FORCE ON INCOME SECURITY

Mr. Lewis: I have one last question of the Minister of Community and Social Services, which may be answered in what he tabled—I guess it isn't. Can he tell me how many members the task force on income security had and how many members of that task force were women?

Mr. Cassidy: Pretty important.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I indicated in my statement, Mr. Speaker, I outlined the various ministries that participated. I believe that somewhere around seven or eight were on the task force. This was just a temporary task force to prepare us for this conference, and there were no women on the committee.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, how does the minister expect a task force, dealing with something as central as single parent families and the entire areas of mothers' allowances, to do a job, fully appreciating the implications involved, when he doesn't have a single woman on his task force? When is he or the government going to begin to give demonstration to their stuff about women having an equal role to play in these fields? Doesn't the minister think it was a serious error in terms of this task force?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Colour blind and sex blind.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, well, that is just nonsensical prattle because the minister couldn't see what was wrong.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, on this subject of women's representation, I would say that this government and our ministry have one of the best records on the North American continent.

Mr. Lewis: The minister can't talk knowledgeably about single parent families, which

are central, and not have a woman on his task force.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have a lady who is the assistant deputy minister. We have four directors of our branches who are women. On the board of review, practically half of the representatives are women. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that we are very much aware of the importance and we are doing something about it.

Mr. Foulds: What is the minister doing about it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, if I may be corrected, Mrs. Etchen, who is the director of our research and planning branch, was on the task force.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I'm glad to know that. The minister needed a note to tell him that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

GREAT LAKES DISCHARGE OF REFUSE BY UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Can he report to the House what steps he plans to take with regard to the United States Coast Guard not using holding tanks but discharging its refuse in the Great Lakes? Does the minister plan to make approaches to the IJC in this regard?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I understand that in the United States there is still not complete agreement between the US Coast Guard, who are the enforcement people, and the environmental protection agency. Our action has been through the government of Canada, suggesting the government of Canada discuss further with the United States government a faster implementation of the recommendations, or in fact the requirements, of the agreement signed by Canada and the US a year ago April.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: Then what right has the minister to ask boatowners in Ontario to spend millions of dollars for holding tanks, when he can't enforce it on such a large operation as the US Coast Guard?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member is aware that we have no jurisdiction on the American side of the lake. I might say, sort of facetiously, we haven't much of a navy on the Great Lakes either.

Mr. Breithaupt: The government has its air force though.

Mr. Roy: They do have their air force.

Mr. Singer: And those magic logbooks to record all the conversation!

Hon. Mr. Auld: I suppose we could do some water-bombing.

Mr. Cassidy: Bomb them with cabinet ministers.

Hon. Mr. Auld: But we have no jurisdiction, in fact, over commercial shipping, which is regulated by the government of Canada, including Canadian shipping. We have had discussions, as recently as about 10 days ago I believe, with the federal people to speed up action on this side of the Great Lakes and provide facilities at the various ports and locks to serve these Canadian ships at least.

Mr. Sargent: So it doesn't hold water then!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

FLIGHT OVER ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Would the minister investigate the cancellations, last Thursday, by Millardair, of the Bruce Trail Association charter to fly over the Niagara Escarpment? What role did his ministry have in that cancellation?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am not completely aware of the matter to which the hon. member refers, but I will certainly investigate and report back to him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

GENERAL WELFARE RATES

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. In light of the announcement by the federal government on the increase in the family allowance benefits, does the minister plan any changes in his family and welfare assistance programme; or is he prepared to give a commitment to the House now that he will not make any reduction at the provincial level?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this whole question of the social security system will be discussed at the three-day conference beginning tomorrow in Ottawa. I think I have indicated we are very much in favour of the increase in the family allowances.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Passed on, though!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, I am sure that there certainly will be no reduction in the family benefits or in the general welfare assistance, as a result of the increases to the family allowances.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister inform the House on how many occasions he used government airplanes in 1972; how many times that was outside of the province; and how much fishing was involved?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I recall—the only thing I can answer is that there was no fishing.

Mr. Shulman: Will the minister answer my question? On how many occasions did he use government airplanes in 1972?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, as I say I have no record in front of me, and I think I—

Mr. Roy: Get us the logbooks and we'll find out for the minister.

Mr. Sargent: We'll help the minister.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would have to look it up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Will the minister supply that information to the House?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will look it up.

Mr. Shulman: Will the minister inform us?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for York Centre.

GASOLINE TAX REBATE FOR FARMERS

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the provincial Treasurer, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Since the new $16 million property tax credit for farmers is a most generous bonanza for those with big homes on small plots of 10 acres or so, and the new fuel tax is a particular burden on those with big producing farms—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): What new fuel tax?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a reduction.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has that been taken off?

Mr. Deacon: The new two cents per gallon on the fuel tax is a big burden on those with big producing farms, will the Treasurer remove that two cents per gallon? It is an extra burden on the real farmers of this province.

An hon. member: The producing farmer.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. MacDonald: Does that mean there is a possibility of a government reversal there, too?

PLANT CLOSING OF DOMINION AUTO ACCESSORIES LTD.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware that Dominion Auto Accessories Ltd. in Windsor announced its closing today, effective today, while the plant was on strike, thereby avoiding all termination notice and termination pay to its employees? When is the minister going to plug that particular type of loophole in his legislation?

Furthermore, when is he going to introduce legislation that would prevent the situation that appears to have arisen with another division of this same company, Daal Specialties Ltd. It was closed last month, also when on strike, but now appears to be producing the same product through a new company, Emrick Plastics. It uses Daal cartons to ship its material in, uses Daal dies, prints its employees' cheques on Daal cheques—and the management and supervisors are all former Daal employees.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, we are looking very closely at all these problems.

Mr. MacDonald: How long is the minister going to do that? He had a whole year to look into Acme Screw and Gear.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

ROUTE OF NEW TORONTO SUBWAY

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Since his ministry is going to be contributing 75 per cent of the cost of public transit, does the minister care to indicate what his opinion is where the new Toronto subway should go? As the previous Treasurer indicated to the Municipal Board what should be done with Metro Centre, would the minister care to indicate to us what the route should be? Everyone else and his brother has indicated a route.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the opportunity of voicing my opinion, but as I have already explained to the Legislature and to Metro, whatever is decided by Metro will be in accord with the provincial policy.

Mr. Singer: Metro made its decision.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister explain why the government's own plans for intermediate rapid transit are so delayed, and when a choice of system will be announced?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, they are not delayed. I have a bill on the order paper this afternoon, which will be debated; and the announcement will be made on May 1, which is just a few days away.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

ESSEX COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education: Is the minister prepared to compensate the Essex county board of education for all costs of settlement in the matter of dismissal of the director of education, since his department delayed the decision 1½ years?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no; and I would take issue with the hon. member in saying that our department delayed the decision for 1½ years. That certainly is not the case.

Mr. Ruston: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the county board of education passed a resolution 1½ years ago, and the minister's department never acted upon that resolution, then he is completely responsible, is he not?

Mr. Roy: Speak up.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is now aware the county board of education has rescinded that resolution suspending the director. They have accepted his resignation. I think a satisfactory solution to a very touchy problem has been found.

Mr. Ruston: The minister is not aware! It is all his fault.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If the hon. member knew as much about it as he pretends to know, he would perhaps have a little better sympathy and understanding about it.

Mr. Ruston: I know a little more about it than the minister!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Chairman of the Management Board. Can the minister recall on how many occasions he used government airplanes in 1972; and can he tell us on how many occasions he took his family along?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am not absolutely certain whether I used a plane in 1972 or not. If I did, it was extremely minimal, and I did not take my family with me. I'll check the records.

Mr. Stokes: The plane broke down in Sioux Lookout! Does the minister remember?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But I recognize what the hon. member for High Park is doing. He is asking individually to secure information that he feels he can't get collectively. I know that. But I'll endeavour to enlighten him further on that question.

Mr. Ruston: He is asking the minister a simple question.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is very bright today.

Mr. Lewis: That is why the minister is Chairman of the Management Board; he is a very sharp fellow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

Mr. Breithaupt: The member for Scarborough West is sharp too; but people still swallow it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The members opposite do a lot of swallowing; all of the members over there.

SCHOOL BUDGETS

Mr. Singer: In his letter addressed to Mr. Bone dated April 19, the minister points out that Metro Toronto school board had an awareness of the ceilings in 1971. Would the minister not agree that the ceilings by themselves were meaningless unless they were accompanied by weighting factors, and that the weighting factors were only given to the Metropolitan Toronto school board and its component boards just a few weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the ceilings are not the complete picture until the boards have the weighting factors, and the weighting factors for 1973 were given to the boards in December 1972. It was handled in this way in order that there could be input from the boards, and discussions were held with the North York and Metropolitan Toronto Boards. As a result of those discussions, weighting factors improved the conditions of the 1973 ceilings; so in fact things were better than they were when the ceilings were announced in 1971 so far as the Metropolitan Toronto school boards are concerned.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, would the minister not then agree that if the weighting factors are as important as he now admits, he was most unfair in the tone that he took in this four-page letter dated April 19?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I wouldn't agree, Mr. Speaker, because there are about 180 or 190 boards in this province that accepted the spirit of the ceilings announced in November 1971, and in fact did the things that would enable them to arrive at budgets and be within the ceilings this year. Alone, the Metropolitan Toronto board and others neglected to take any action to prepare themselves; and now they say that if they only had been given a little more time they could get within the ceilings. That was exactly why the ceilings were announced two years in advance.

Mr. Singer: By way of final supplementary, would the minister not agree that it was impossible to take definite or finite action in regard to the ceilings without knowing what the weighting factors would be? And even though there was a facility for smaller boards in Ontario to do this, would he not agree further that a board with more than 50 per cent of the students and 50 per cent of the expenditures in education in the Province of Ontario needed those weighting factors well in advance to properly come to any system of control as the minister suggests?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with that at all; I think that there has been evidence of an unwillingness to accept the whole principle. In fact, I can recall statements by some officials of the Metro board to the effect that they weren't even going to look at the 1973 ceilings. The argument they are putting forward now is that if only they had a little more time—until June 1974—they could get within the ceilings. That's precisely why we announced two years' ceilings at one time: so they would have that time—and these were neglected—

Mr. Singer: Without the weighting factors; without the weighting factors.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They still could have at least got to the position where they could have been better prepared than they were.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Solicitor General recall on how many occasions he used government airplanes in 1972, and on how many occasions did he take his family along?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, to the best of my recollection during the year—the calendar year of 1972?

Mr. Roy: He has a bad memory.

Mr. Singer: He will look it up, and he may tell the hon. member later.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Once, to fly to Aylmer to address the graduating class at the Ontario Police College; no member of my family travelled with me. I find the question insulting.

Mr. Shulman: I thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: How many suicides is the member responsible for?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Shulman: In 1972, is the minister inquiring about?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In the member's lifetime.

FRENCH SCHOOLING IN ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

Relative to his statement today that Dr. Thomas Symons has completed his work in Cornwall, is the minister prepared now to send him to the next point of conflict and problems, that is, Elliot Lake? Is he prepared to send him there?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the hon. member is aware that we already have a task force working in Elliot Lake as a result of the meetings that I and our council on French-language schools had last week. This group is now working up there, and I think this is satisfactory to the people there. Until we get their report, we will just wait and see.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, I just want to inform the hon. member for High Park that to the best of my recollection I may have flown to St. Catharines during the course of opening a wonderful home for the aged for the German-Canadian community there. There may have been other occasions on which I used planes for such commendable objects.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

LINGUISTIC RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

When can we expect legislation to be presented to the House following the statement in the Throne Speech about a linguistic rights commission?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It will be in before the House recesses for the summer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

SCHOOL BUDGETS

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker.

Can the minister tell us how many boards were unable to meet the ceilings in 1972? How many have approached him this year with difficulties in meeting the ceilings in 1973?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the last part first, the only boards which have approached us and indicated real difficulty this year are the Metropolitan Toronto school board and the London board of education. As far as I know, all the boards across this province have set their budgets and have lived within the ceilings during 1972. Only when we see the audited financial statements of the boards—as we did with boards just recently for 1971—will we know whether, in fact, they were within the ceilings. It's too early to say how the year 1972 worked out. That will be available.

Mr. Stokes: It seems that the Red Rock board contacted the minister about that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Excuse me, I'm sorry. The hon. member refreshes my memory that there are certain boards in the north. There is the Red Rock board and the Northshore board.

Mr. Stokes: I wrote to the minister on their behalf.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There are several boards up there which have problems and they are probably over the ceilings again. These are special situations which are going to have to be looked at in a special light.

Mr. Stokes: Given special treatment?

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, we have exceeded the time allowed for questions.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. On page 846 of Hansard, in the second column, about halfway down, the word "psychopath" is attributed to me in a certain speech that I made to this House on April 10. I did not use the word "psychopath." The word should have been "sycophant" and I would ask that Hansard record my intention and meaning at that time. If I caused any embarrassment to anyone by the apparent use of the word "psychopath," it was not the word I used. The word I meant was "sycophant."

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Carton presented the report of the Ontario Telephone Service Commission for the year 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Carton moves second reading of Bill 93, An Act to amend the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, on first perusal of this bill, it seems to be a very harmless enactment and an agreement that, knowing the minister, we can probably live with. On closer inspection, this particular bill, especially section 2 wherein there is a broad, sweeping and unrestricted right of the ministry to enter into agreements with various companies and municipalities, it's mainly the companies' agreement that give me great concern in view of the things that have gone on in this province in the past few months, such as the proposal by Mr. Moog, that was accepted by Ontario Hydro with no tenders called. Similarly, there are other instances which we could name.

This sets up a system of government entering into contracts which, I think, violates my principles as a Liberal and as a member of this Legislature. I think that the broad, sweeping power that is being asked for by the ministry in this particular section is something with which I can't live. I hope we can bring in an amendment to counteract this power the next time it comes before the House.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): I hope the minister isn't closing off the debate. He is just answering the question?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, I'm answering it because I think an explanation is due.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Did the hon. minister wish to make a statement pertaining to the bill itself—an explanatory statement?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, I did, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well, it should be understood that this has, on occasion, been done and I'm inclined to permit it at this time. It will not exclude the right of other members to participate in the debate.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreeable?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Certainly.

Mr. Speaker: It's agreeable; the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this particular bill is enabling legislation to allow the ministry, on behalf of the government, to enter into a contract with the successful applicant relating to the intermediate capacity transit system.

As everyone knows, there has been a competition. We are now coming into the final stages. As I replied to the member for Ottawa Centre in the question period, the announcement will be made on May 1. I find myself in the position where, in order to sign the contract I must have the capacity for signing the contract and that is the purpose of this particular bill.

Perhaps a brief word would be in order, Mr. Speaker, as to the way in which the ministry officials have gone about this particular exercise. First of all, this is a document which is public. Any of the members can have it; as a matter of fact, the member for Ottawa Centre already has a copy. These are the specifications – some 100 pages – which were set out by the ministry and the other officials involved.

On the basis of the specifications contained in this document there were eight submissions. Those eight submissions were narrowed

down to two submissions and we are now in the final evaluation stage.

Mr. Paterson: There is no guarantee that either of these will be accepted.

Hon. Mr. Carton: May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is only the enabling legislation; there will be my estimates during which the sums of money that will be required will be debated. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I have a further piece of enabling legislation which I will be bringing forward during this session.

Obviously, I am not at liberty to divulge any of the terms of the contracts because we are still negotiating with both parties and we are negotiating separately. In other words, the ministry officials are meeting with one of the parties one day and one evening; and then the next day and the next night. This has been going on for some three months. So I do say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not at liberty to go into the particular deal insofar as the contracts themselves are concerned.

But I would point out there is an item in my budget that would have to be debated and, of course, the estimates would have to be passed, so it would be in order for the members of the opposition at that time to question more fully what has gone on.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker—and I think this is the important aspect insofar as the demonstration project is concerned—the people who are involved in this, and who have the expertise, basically are as follows:

From the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, from the systems research branch, we have 18 staff members including electrical, control, mechanical and aeronautical engineers, computer specialists, and application and simulation specialists. We also have from the ministry, from the structural design office, five staff members in evaluating and costing foundation and guideway proposals.

We also have, from the Toronto Transit Commission, four technical staff working full-time at the ministry for the two-month evaluation period, with their ability to tap resources of the TTC as required.

In addition, we have consultants. We have Graham Crate and Associates from Ottawa, who are control specialists, to carry out analysis of magnetic suspension in the guidance system. We have the MITRE Corp. from Washington, D.C., to perform analyses, using their developed computers programmes, of the linear induction motors. We have De Havilland of Downsview, who are qualified in the dynamic analysis of Hawker Siddeley suspension and guidance.

We have James Kendall and Associates from Mississauga, who are control specialists, to assist in the evaluation of the command and control systems; H. K. Davis and Associates, Toronto, communications specialists, to assist in the evaluation of the data communications aspects of command and control; a consultant from Washington, D.C., who was a specialist in electromagnetic compatibility and interference with respect to data communications liability.

We have Powercomp from Saskatoon, who are experts in reliability analyses and development of a reliability model for ICTS, through their recognized reliability expert, Dr. Billington. And we have A,B,A,M, of Seattle (guideways civil engineering consultants), who have produced and implemented similar guideways in Seattle, Disneyland, and Dallas-Fort Worth Airport.

There are a large number of criteria here, Mr. Speaker. I would go through these if the members so wish—they are in great depth—but I think it is perhaps unnecessary. However, if they wish me to do this, I can do this at the conclusion.

Mr. Speaker: Would the remarks the hon. minister just made have altered the comments of the hon. member for Essex-Kent? I don't want to exclude him from his right to participate.

Mr. Paterson: The member for Essex South, Mr. Speaker!

My basic contention still stands, that this opens the door for this ministry to enter into contracts without bids, over and beyond the specific limits the minister has made in his opening statement; and I'll say no more at this point.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am worried about the way in which the government is proceeding with the whole intermediate-capacity rapid transit project. I think that—and the minister himself was saying this to me privately a minute ago—in a sense this is the first round of what I hope is a pretty profound and important debate on the question of the intermediate-capacity system.

It comes up at this point because the minister is seeking powers to enter into agreements. As the member for Essex South—is that right?—indicated, they are pretty broad

and wide-sweeping powers, and I am afraid that both the public is not being protected, the taxpayer is not being protected, and if you will the government is not protecting itself from a possible very serious act of folly in the course which it is now undertaking.

I think the minister ought to be aware from the lessons of this weekend that his government has a certain capacity to trip and a capacity to make mistakes. I think the minister's reassuring litany, or attempt at a reassuring litany, of experts who have been involved from his department, from the TTC technical people, from outside consultants who have been involved in the preparation for the intermediate-capacity project, is like a security blanket which the minister has erected around himself in order to assure him that it is going to be all right.

I am suggesting to the minister that just as the Turbo train has brought infinite grief and woe to Canadian National Railways, that he stands in great danger of having an equal amount of grief and woe, and of leaving as a paternity to the province a system which is excessively costly and which will fail and continue to fail to deliver economically on all the promises that the minister and the Premier (Mr. Davis) have made for the system.

Mr. Speaker, I think the faults within this bill are two, and I'll try and talk to the bill. The first fault is the broad powers that it gives to the minister; the second fault is that there is no mechanism of control for these powers in order to protect either the public or the taxpayer, or for that matter even to protect the government against itself.

I think, Mr. Speaker, these powers allow the minister to get into—and at any price—any kind of an experimental or demonstration project related to public transportation; and also allow the minister enter into an agreement with a firm or corporation to do almost anything in the field of public transportation so long as it's related to public transport and so long as it is labelled a demonstration project.

Mr. Speaker, as the minister well knows, the purpose of section 2(2) in this bill is directly related to intermediate-capacity rapid transit. I don't know whether the minister intends that the purpose of section 2(1) might also relate to demonstration projects, such as the dial-a-bus system that the ministry ran at Bay Ridges or such as possible similar systems in Ottawa or other parts of the province. I am not sure whether it is all related to that. I regret that the minister has rushed through with this bill without particularly adequate warning. It was introduced, I believe, last Wednesday, just before the holiday, and it is being debated immediately after the holiday, at a time when people were either on holiday or else, may I say, concerned with other matters.

I am going to speak, though, to the powers it gives the minister in the initial instalment on the billion and one quarter dollar proposal of the government and of his ministry for intermediate-capacity rapid transit systems in the cities of Toronto, Ottawa and Hamilton.

I have said there isn't enough public protection here. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, there are too many questions which all of this raises in the minds of people who have examined it for me, or I think any other member of this Legislature, to be genuinely happy with the precipitate course that the minister is taking.

I might ask him—and when he replies he might be able to give an answer to this—why on earth would a simple bill like this, which he knew he was going to need, not be introduced a month ago and give us some warning rather than being rushed in just under the wire, introduced 19 or so days after his original deadline for signing a contract with one of the two remaining contenders for the intermediate-capacity rapid transit; and introduced, as I said, over the holiday period? We could have had a much better look at it had the minister not been so preoccupied or worried about other things.

The second thing I want to talk about is the need for protecting the public. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the minister and his advisers may well have gone technologically crazy. That is they are so enamoured of a couple of systems which the minister allowed himself to be seen testing when he went off junketing around to Detroit, and off to England and off to Germany, in order to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): In full colour!

Mr. Cassidy: Probably in a government aeroplane as well!

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Going to Detroit is hardly any junket!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the minister went off, and as these things happen it's quite likely that he said: "Well look; I'll take that one and that one and that one; and three of those." Well one of them, Mr. Speaker,

actually had a top speed of only 12 miles an hour, and he eventually realized that wouldn't work.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Pretty fast for this government!

Mr. Cassidy: Pretty fast for this government; yes!

Mr. Speaker, across my desk this morning came an evaluation of various kinds of new rapid transit systems—I'm not sure if I can find it, I seem to have the wrong document here.

But I searched that document, which was prepared by the ministry task force about a year and a half ago. I scanned it very quickly, I admit, but I did not find any mention of one of the three systems in the minister's current short list, the magnetic levitation system being offered by Krauss-Maffei, a German firm.

Mr. Speaker, about a year and a half ago—if I can find my notes, which I assembled rather hastily—the chief planner for the province in this field, Mr. Malcolm Armstrong, told Metropolitan Toronto's transportation committee that a trackless system of intermediate capacity transit, with the kinds of capacities the Minister has talked about, could be built in Toronto for $5 million a mile and could operate, Mr. Speaker, at a charge—would you believe it—of five cents a ride. Not five cents a mile, but five cents a ride!

This was a quote from Mr. Armstrong of March 9, 1971, quoted in the Toronto Globe and Mail.

And that prediction by Mr. Armstrong—who has certainly been the guiding genius, the guru or the eminence grise behind the minister's ventures into new forms of rapid transit—that quote came after a task force which was appointed by the government, which worked for the ministry, had spent about a year in preparing a report on new modes of urban transport. They had inspected all European and US innovations. I mentioned that they did not, apparently—although I can't quote it directly, I don't have the source here—look at the Krauss-Maffei system; or maybe in fact Krauss-Maffei didn't have it to peddle at that time, it's come up since.

Well all the same, they were looking at a system that would cost $5 million a mile and a nickel a ride. Now when the Premier came up with his plans, he came up with a system which didn't cost $5 million a mile and a nickel a ride, he came up with a system which cost $13.8 million a mile in Toronto; and which cost between 16 million and 18 million dollars a mile in Hamilton and in Ottawa. This was sprung on an unsuspecting public, and for that matter was also sprung on unsuspecting municipal councils and planning people in the three areas.

So one reason for suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there is a need to protect the public against the minister and his planners and his government, is the fact that a $5 million proposal, offering cheap transport that could really solve some urban transportation problems has escalated into a very expensive kettle-of-fish indeed; $13 million dollars a mile right now, without allowing for any of the risk or inflation or technological kind of escalation of costs, which has happened again and again in similar kinds of innovations that have been carried out in Europe and in the United States and in other parts of the world.

In other words, that's the starting price; because as the minister himself will admit there is not, anywhere in the world, in operational use, a single version of either of the two systems which the government is now considering. In fact when the engineers for one of the proponents—I recognize we are not to talk about that—they were I will just simply say one of the proponents came to Toronto for a seminar recently and was asked about the cost of running their system. He said it would cost about five cents a passenger-kilometre to ride, Mr. Speaker; in other words, about eight cents a mile at European prices. Likely, with higher construction costs but lower electricity costs, the overall cost would be approximately the same here in Toronto or in other parts of the province.

So, instead of a nickel a ride we get eight cents a mile on a system designed to carry people for relatively lengthy distances, that is in the range of six to 10 miles for Toronto and in the range of three to five miles for Hamilton and Ottawa. We get costs, therefore, as high as 40 or 50 cents a ride, rather than the nickel a ride which Malcolm Armstrong talked about when he was unveiling the technological future and trying to persuade the Metro Toronto transportation committee what great ideas the ministry had.

I don't know if it is significant, Mr. Speaker, but some time in the period after the present minister had been conned into accepting this concept, and before final decisions were made on the short list, lo and behold, Mr. Armstrong departed. He went to Montreal to work for the Transportation Development Research Centre, I think it is,

and he went in the tradition of upwardly mobile civil servants and other people who one sees around this government and the federal government, who leave their disasters before they catch up with them, and therefore are seen to be moving from strength to strength and from success to success.

Mr. Speaker, in this particular case I think Mr. Armstrong has left a pretty abortive brainchild behind him. I am open to correction on this. I must say that I have sought in vain for the past five weeks to try to see the minister's experts up at Downsview. While certainly the minister has been co-operative, it has proved exceedingly difficult to see them.

So if you will, I will admit that this is a one-sided kind of point of view that I am putting to the minister. The essence of the problem that the minister has created, Mr. Speaker, is not the fact that the technology is necessarily wrong or that it necessarily won't work. It may. At what price it will work we don't know.

It may be that some of the technical people within the ministry have got sufficient prescience that they can predict how much it will cost to make it operate. It may be that when they begin to develop it they will be excessively lucky. It may be that systems now on the drawing board and never before tried will, in fact, work in the heavy ice and snow conditions, say, of the city of Ottawa. It may be that the city of Hamilton, which currently rejects completely the idea of an intermediate-capacity system because it does not see where its 25 per cent would come from, will come around and would be interested in listening to the minister.

It may be that the National Capital Commission, which was never consulted by the ministry in designing a rapid transit system for the city of Ottawa—and which I might say is extremely miffed and very upset, and quite rightly so, Mr. Speaker—and the ministry will put their heads together and will do what needs to be done in the Ottawa area, which is to devise an amalgamated and integrated rapid transit system, not just for Ottawa but for the entire Ottawa-Hull metropolitan region.

All of these things may happen, Mr. Speaker. It may also happen that the ministry begins to talk with the Metropolitan Toronto plan review, the technical body which works for the joint technical transportation planning committee, of which he is a member. It seems rather ironic that the minister, with one hand, has got TTC technical experts and other people working up at Downsview in order to devise a plan for intermediate-capacity rapid transit, while on the other hand the body that was set up after the cancellation of the Spadina Expressway, that is the Metro Toronto plan review, has not yet effectively been consulted about the choice of routes suggested by the province, about the technology suggested by the province or about any other aspect of these intermediate-capacity rapid transit plans.

In other words, right now the province's planning is a matter of lines drawn on a piece of paper by the ministry up at Downsview and projected with great panache at various press briefings by the minister and by the Premier. The province has not got down to the nitty-gritty of talking with the Toronto Transit Commission, which probably of all the transportation commissions on the continent is the best qualified and has got the best planning, as well as technical expertise. Yet the ministry hasn't even started to talk with them, either before the November announcement or in the four or five months that have come since.

Now it may be the ministry will eventually sit down with the TTC and the Metro Toronto transportation plan review and will begin to recognize that its kind of arbitrary, one-sided and unilateral planning won't work; that it is wrong and will be wrong for Toronto's development; that it will be harmful to transportation planning in the city, and for that matter, will be unduly expensive. That may happen as well, Mr. Speaker.

It may happen that the ministry eventually will accept the views of the TTC and the need for such things as a Queen St. subway, which is not now projected in the $1.25-billion spending plan of the ministry. Or it might accept the need for light rapid transit on certain routes and then agree to go ahead with one or two experimental lines within Toronto, which if they fail will not wreak untold and irreparable damage on the whole transportation fabric of the city.

All of these things, Mr. Speaker, in that rather extended stroke, may happen. And yet, right now the whole concept of the system that the minister and his aides and the Premier and other people have talked about won't work. In other words, he's trying to deliver the impossible. He's freaked out on a technological dream that won't work, and that is why we need public review rather than this kind of back-door and intensive kind of work underway right now, which is essentially directed to political purposes and

not really to the best transportation solutions for major Ontario cities.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the minister speaks of Mr. Kirk Foley, who's now the co-ordinator of this project, sleeping in his office and working every night until 3 a.m. in the process of negotiating with Hawker Siddeley and with Krauss-Maffei, the two companies which are still involved in bidding for this intermediate-capacity demonstration project down at the Exhibition. I might remind the minister that originally that project was going to have some use because it would have stretched through the Metro Centre site from Union Station to Ontario Place and the CNE grounds, but somehow it got wound up in a circle. If you want to travel in a circle down there, you'll be able to; but apart from two weeks of the year, that line will be of very little use.

What I was saying, though, is that the minister himself worked all weekend; and to give him his credit, I gathered from our little chat that he was working not on the energy tax but in fact on the transportation plan—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): North York's education problem too.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm not sure if he had his political priorities straight, but maybe he had his ministerial priorities straight at that particular point.

But I do ask, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a wise and sound judgement, about the spending of $1.25 billion—or more, with inflation—which very possibly will flow from the initial demonstration project which the minister wants and is hell-bent on signing by May 1. I ask whether that kind of decision by exhaustion is really the best way of preparing to spend either $20 million of the public's money or ultimately $1.25 billion of the public's money.

One recognizes, of course, that when the government announced its new policy for rapid transit and for support of public transportation back in November, there were some very good elements in there—particularly the commitment which we had never seen before from this government, the commitment to public transportation.

That's fine; but now the government seems to be carrying these things to extremes, because the minister has set himself a deadline which probably bears mostly on the timing of the next election. He knows that outside of Metro they're not going to like to see his plaything down at the CNE, but at least they had better see it running rather than see it half running off the rails, if you can call them rails, or otherwise unfunctional or disfunctional, whatever the word may be. In other words, by 1975 he's got to see something on the ground. The Premier told him, "Get it running or your head is on the chopper." So the minister is there with Kirk Foley and his other advisers—

Mr. Singer: The Premier never fires anybody—not even the Treasurer (Mr. White).

Mr. Cassidy: —and all of these people from DeLeuw Cather who are getting fat fees of $1,000 per team per day in order to advise the minister. It seems to me that they are telling him exactly and precisely what he wants to hear, Mr. Speaker, which is another reason for suggesting that we really do need some protection from the minister and his people, and from the government; and it should be included in the bill. What it should specifically be is the possibility of a brief but intensive public review of the systems and concepts—the concept particularly—that the government is trying to put over. So let me talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I prepared this speech in haste and I cannot cite chapter and verse of all the government's proposals. I am just trying to see whether these notes will yield the points exactly. But let me talk about the main features which I believe are laid out in those technical specifications that the minister had passed around, and which in fact I received just late last week. I am afraid that I haven't had a chance to have as good a look at them as I would like; in fact I haven't looked at them yet.

As I recall though, Mr. Speaker, from talking with ministerial planners and from reading the documents of the government, the government wanted a system which would meet a number of goals. It would, and this quote is specific, provide personal rapid transit service in off-peak hours. It would have a capacity in the intermediate ranges between the peak capacity of buses on existing arterials, and the maximum capacity of subways on their own rights-of-way.

Bus capacities run up to 6,000 or 8,000 people per hour; subways are at about 40,000 per hour. The minister wanted a system that would be designed to deliver up to 20,000 people per hour in a peak direction—in one direction. Mr. Speaker, the main contradiction in the government's plan arises because of the insistence on personal rapid transit in

a system which also has an intermediate range of capacities of around 20,000 people per hour. And I will explain why.

The first thing is that if you are going to have personal rapid transit, then you want small cars. The ministry, I believe, specified a capacity of around 18 to 20 passengers; maybe a dozen sitting and half a dozen standing. You want those cars to travel, at times, individually or in very small groups; so they must automatically couple and uncouple. Because they will bypass stations, you want what is called off-line loading. Because the trains are relatively small, you need at least one extra platform at each station for off-line loading. It may well be that you need two or three platforms at each station in each direction for off-line loading, in order to handle the peak demands of up to 20,000 people per hour.

The switching must be on the transit car in order to allow the vehicles, which are going around like busy ants, to jog off the track, to jog back on the track, to jog off and to jog back, and to do it very quickly. You can't do it that quickly with on-line switching—that means switching on the track or the guideway—and therefore the ministry specified that the switching needed to be on the cars themselves, in the same way as you have steering on an automobile, rather than attempting to switch automobiles through ruts in the road.

The standards of safety in rapid transit must, of necessity, be infinitely higher than the standards of safety on our highways. In fact, I don't know whether the TTC has had more than one or two deaths every decade from accidents, if that—apart from suicides, for which it is not responsible. Those standards of safety must be so high that each and every transit car must be monitored or guided.

The ministry has spoken of computer monitoring or computer control of the cars. That means that every foot of every line must be monitored so that the computer knows precisely where each car is at any time. It is not possible simply to use a sophisticated block signal system, which has 75 or 100 years of history behind it and is an awful lot easier to work with, because the cars, of necessity, are moving so closely together. In addition, with cars carrying only 18 or 20 passengers, it is clear that—

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bill to enable the minister to make agreements with municipalities or with private corporations. It has nothing to do with techniques of running public transit in any manner, shape or form. Would you kindly call the member to order, and have him confine himself to the subject matter of the bill?

Mr. Speaker: I think the point is well taken. I think the details in the agreement being worked out by the minister with the municipalities is not the principle of this bill. It could be referred to briefly but, really, to go into so much detail has nothing to do with the principle of this bill.

Mr. Cassidy: With respect, Mr. Speaker, the explanatory note to section 2 says:

> The amendment authorizes the minister to enter into agreements with respect to experimental or demonstration projects, the design of transit systems and rights related to transit systems.

Mr. Speaker: But the details of those agreements really would have nothing to do with the principle of the bill which is may the minister or may he not.

Mr. Cassidy: I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, and I am not talking about the details of the agreements.

Mr. Speaker: There seems to be too much detail to me; perhaps the member can keep more to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, as members well know and as the minister himself made clear, this bill is to give the minister authority to sign an agreement which will be worth $12 million, $15 million or $20 million—we don't know the amounts yet—for an intermediate-capacity rapid transit system.

The minister has tabled in the House copies of the specifications for the system. Section 2(2) of the bill again refers to agreements to provide all or part of an experimental or demonstration project. Implicit in the experimental or demonstration project referred to are the terms of reference to which the ministry is working and this, Mr. Speaker, is the only occasion, prior to signing the agreement, when it is possible to debate the terms of reference, the reasons or the way in which the ministry is going in.

I think the minister, Mr. Speaker, is aware that I have not yet referred specifically to the features of either of the systems being referred to. I think that the member for York-Forest Hill is quite legitimately in order in saying that were I to talk about Hawker

Siddeley's proposal or Krauss-Maffei's proposal then I would be out of order.

The member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) says that even then I wouldn't be out of order. But right now, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that this bill should provide for public review of the terms of reference under which the minister proposed the competition and following from which he intends to sign an agreement, because the terms of reference, in fact, were abortive and are creating or risking a real technological problem for the province.

We are going to be stuck with the minister's white elephant if he won't desist; if he won't hold back for a couple of months; if he won't consider the points I am making and that other transportation experts in this city and other parts of the province are beginning to make.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to draw public attention, frankly, to the kinds of defects in what the ministry has been doing because I am gravely concerned about it. I think that's a proper function for me in my role as a member of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: I think your recent remarks are in order but I think you were getting into too much detail earlier. It seemed to be quite technical to me anyway.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, I realize—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): So what if it is?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I realize one has to be technical. The minister has got a technological fantasy on his hands and he is trying to endow it on the rest of the province for $1.25 billion. At times we have to engage in a fairly highfalutin' kind of debate in this House. I don't ask you, Mr. Speaker, to understand it all. If you will, I am really speaking directly to the minister, who has had the courtesy to stick in here because—

Mr. Lewis: It's a courtesy? He has to.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, he has to—I don't know, the way the Premier and other people carry on. There have been some noticeable absences. I am really talking to the minister because I think these are very serious points, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I can continue.

I mentioned a number of items, Mr. Speaker, which it seemed to me created exceptionally high costs and operational difficulties in the system as a result of the requirements of the minister that it both carry up to 20,000 people an hour and engage in personal rapid transit service, that is skipping stations in offpeak hours. The ones I mentioned were switching on the—

Mr. Singer: The member is still out of order.

Mr. Cassidy: I am just recapping so that nobody forgets where I was. The ones I mentioned were computer controls; automated operation; switching on the car rather than switching on the line; the use of small cars; and the capacity of those cars to couple and uncouple automatically.

What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that firstly all of those features add enormously to the costs of the system. That is of concern to you, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this Legislature who is elected to office in order, among other things, to protect the taxpayer from the depredations of a government such as this one.

Mr. Speaker: I think you should hold your details to a minimum. You may refer to them in general terms, but on the principle of the bill, does the minister have the authority, or is the House going to give him the authority to enter into the agreement or not.

Mr. Singer: We need someone to protect us from your depredation!

Mr. Cassidy: With your tolerance, Mr. Speaker—and it is notable I might say by the way, that a few of the members of your party were concerned about the taxpayers' purse today—I am suggesting that you continue that revolution, that blinding flash of concern that you have had at least through to the end of this debate.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Speaker is neutral; at least it says so in the book.

Mr. Lewis: The devil he is!

Mr. Bullbrook: He has no party.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I don't believe it.

Mr. Cassidy: If I could engage the House and the minister in a bit of arithmetic right now.

The experts from one of the companies involved, and let's assume the other company would say much the same thing, stated at a seminar here in Toronto that with computer monitoring and all the other features that I mentioned, they can run their cars at 25 second intervals, or 25 second headways. Now since each of those cars will carry a maxi-

mum of about 18 passengers, that means the maximum capacity of a personalized system is 2,200 persons per hour, or a quarter of the capacity of the Bathurst St. busline, or a sixteenth of the capacity of the Yonge St. subway.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I don't mind the hon. member, in fact it is rather interesting to hear his remarks, but just on that one point, sir, there are 20 passengers per car, seven cars in a train, that's 140 times 60 which is 8,400. If we get 30-second headway that makes it 16,800, or even better.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I still think that is too much detail. These matters will be discussed more thoroughly in the estimates of the ministry.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the point is though, that the estimates will not come to the House before the minister signs this agreement. Do you want to protect the taxpayer from the mistakes that your colleague and the government may be making, or don't you?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Keep the House in order!

Mr. Speaker: I just urge the member to keep away from too many details, stick to the principle of the bill, which is whether the House is going to give the minister the authority to work out an agreement with the various municipalities or firms.

Mr. Cassidy: Fine! Well the minister says, if I can reply to him, since he introduced it, that there will be seven cars per train and they will therefore carry 140 people per train maximum, and by travelling at 30 second headways that means they will carry up to 16,000 people per hour. He has not explained how they will carry 20,000 people per hour. Nevertheless, they will carry 16,000 people per hour.

However, what the minister has failed to state is the statistical chances, if even 25 or 30 people get into one of these 140-passenger trains at Malvern; the statistical chances, even in offpeak hours, that all of them will want to go downtown without stopping at a number of stations on the way. The chances, statistically, of that train skipping more than two or three stations on a 12-mile journey to downtown are very slight.

It seems to me incredible that the ministry would contemplate spending the amounts of money that are entailed in the various extra features in this system, in order that offpeak, occasionally, maybe after midnight, a few people—who are probably, let's face it, captive transit riders—will be able to skip a few stations and save a few minutes of time on their way to or from downtown. That is all that the ministry is achieving!

The estimates I have of the additional cost, without accounting for the technological risks of the sophisticated features the minister wants to put into the system, the extra features from the estimates I have, would amount to at least 40 per cent of the capital cost of the system, and a substantial amount of the operating cost of the system. That would be over a system, Mr. Speaker, which ran without switches, which ran the trains at close headways, but without off-line loading and which used the present technology or used new technologies which did not have computer-controlled monitoring, and where the automatic controls were based on a block signal system rather than computer-controlled monitoring—which, incidentally, I understand, has not yet been successfully tried in transit usage.

For that matter, Mr. Speaker—and I think this is the final technical point I want to make—the minister wants us to believe that seven-car trains carrying 140 passengers can travel at 30-second headways. He admits, or at least says in the statement, that in peak hours they will stop at every station; that they will be coming in and out of stations every 30 seconds.

It takes the TTC, Mr. Speaker, about 15 seconds to load and unload its subways. Presumably it will take something like that for this system as well. I will have some more to say about this when I consult some technical people about the actual stopping distances and so on.

But what the minister is proposing to do is to run these trains so close together that it will be like driving at 60 miles an hour 20 feet behind somebody else on a freeway. And the system will not have the failsafe capability to prevent the risk of multiple collisions with incredible loss of life and injury and property damage and obstruction to the whole system from that kind of rear-end pile-up crash—what do you call them on the freeways when you get 80 cars that smash up together? That is the kind of thing that could very possibly happen when you have trains which are coming into stations only five or 10 seconds behind the one that travels before it.

The minister himself has already said the maximum capacity in ideal circumstances is 16,000 passengers per hour, rather than 20,000 passengers per hour.

I would point out that headways on the Yonge St. subway are about two minutes and that nowhere in the world are transit cars run closer than at one minute headways. So what I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, is why this emphasis on all this new technology, when in fact it really doesn't yield an awful lot?

If you permit me being a bit technical again, you can't make a subway or a transit train go any faster by using new technology. The reason for that is that the maximum speed is dictated by the distance between the stations and by the tolerable degree of acceleration and deceleration that passengers will accept. I think the minister has probably learned that by now. The only way you can speed up the trains is by having the stations further apart.

New technology can possibly reduce noise, but there are also other means of reducing noise which may be equally as effective. In terms of protecting the public against noise pollution, Mr. Speaker, the most effective means is to get as much rapid transit as quickly as possible in order that it will take automobiles and other forms of private transportation off the streets—because they create far more noise than even the TTC subways that exist right now, or other existing transit technologies.

Specifically, again Mr. Speaker the minister's chief adviser did suggest some time ago that a transit system could be built for $5 million a mile; he had in mind a suspended monorail system—which in fact has now been rejected.

Systems can be built for $5 million a mile or less, but they would be in the form of light rapid transit—which is a much more adaptable and flexible system than the ministry has adopted. In fact, it was never even examined by the ministry; barely or not at all—I haven't yet determined which. But the whole idea of articulated vehicles, or the extension of streetcar technology—in which the TTC is so experienced—was never even examined by the ministry in any depth.

They kept on saying to the TTC: "Look, wait till we've looked at our technological wizard's recommendations. We'll look at those and then we'll come to you and talk about streetcars and light rapid transit technology." This is despite the fact that that kind of technology has been tried and is being proven, or has proven itself in something like 20 or 25 cities of Europe and of North America.

That is just my own belief, Mr. Speaker, but it's an aspect of the province's desire for transit sex appeal over effective use of the public's tax dollars in providing the best and most extensive kind of transit system at the least cost.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that another reason the government has gone off the deep end on this is that Malcolm Armstrong and some of the other pipe dreamers within the ministry have the idea that some day they will go to the ultimate personal rapid transit vehicle, a vehicle which will hold about two or four passengers, which can be parked in one's driveway, driven down to the guideway or transit rail, linked on to transit, taken downtown and then driven to the place of work. Now, doesn't that sound very much like an expressway right now? Can the minister really say how, in the year 2000 or even 2050, the guideways that he intends to make with this demonstration project we're talking about here, can be adapted to—

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the member permit a question?

Mr. Cassidy: Of course.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the member permit a question?

Mr. Cassidy: From the member? Any time.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is he, or is he not in favour of the government entering into agreements with corporations or municipalities as envisaged in this bill?

Mr. Speaker: I presume the comments are leading to that conclusion.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, I am entitled to ask him a question. If he would prefer to let it—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): That is much too difficult.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the member for Sarnia may be very interested to know that I'm not exactly sure, as a matter of fact. I may find out at the end of this speech, and that's probably due to the fact that the—

Mr. Paterson: Is the member listening to himself?

Mr. Speaker: That would be on the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: On the principle of the bill, that's right.

I think in fact what we'll do, Mr. Speaker, if the member would like an answer and if the minister would like an answer, is, it's a Hobson's choice, there is a definite need for public review, and we will come in, I think, with an amendment to that effect during the committee stage of the bill. Frankly, we are torn between our support and endorsation for the principles of rapid transit and for the principle that we've got to take cars out of the city. We have to shift the balance far more than the government is doing right now, Mr. Speaker, from private expressway-oriented transportation in our cities, to public transit solutions for our urban transit problems.

Mr. Speaker, I drive in and out of Toronto frequently on my way to and from Ottawa, and on my way to other parts of the province, and I am appalled to see the amounts of money which are spent, sort of cached away in various governmental accounts for the widening, the doubling, the tripling, the quadrupling, of Highway 401 and the Queen Elizabeth Way and other highways—

Mr. Speaker: Speak to the principle of this bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, I'm simply answering the member's question.

Mr. Singer: Oh come on! This is not in the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Speak to the principle of the bill.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Can't you run this chair, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Cassidy: This is important, this is important!

Mr. Speaker, I have given a number of reasons why there ought to be public review and we will have a go at that. I would like to mention something else as well, though, and that is that the minister promised—and I don't know if I can find the quote here or not; no, I'm sorry, I can't find the minister's quote right here—but there has been a very definite promise of sort of maximum feasible consultation with municipalities which are involved about these experimental demonstration projects and about the ultimate choice of system.

One wishes that in public the minister would be clear about what really is the intent of the toy that he is going to build down at Exhibition Park. Is he coercing municipalities to accept the system, or is he giving them the freedom to use 75 per cent provincial subsidies in order to choose the kind of system that best suits their needs? I think the answer is the latter, but I think that we should have a clear reply from the minister about that rather than the kind of covert presure mixed in with a kind of overt bonhomie and statements to municipal leaders and other concerned citizens that: "Well, of course, we won't insist that you buy whatever we put down at Exhibition Park."

You know, Mr. Speaker—and again this indicates the need for protection of the public on this particular bill—I am told that before the province has even decided which system it will have, before it has any clue of whether that system or the other system will work, before it has any practical experience in the cost of the system, that it has already undertaken planning for a line from Malvern to Union Station with the new intermediate-capacity rapid transit system.

This is beyond belief. The problem with the minister and the government is that this minister won't be in that office by the time that line is complete. I think he hopes he might be a few chairs over to his left, but he won't be there either. In fact he will probably be on this side of the Legislature at that particular time, if he is here at all.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member is dreaming.

Mr. Cassidy: But he is leaving a legacy with which future governments are going to have to contend, and it may well be a half-baked legacy, Mr. Speaker, which the public will regret.

If the minister and his people had talked with transportation planners in the city of Toronto or Metro Toronto they would realize, among other things, that lots of people don't want to go to Union Station. A lot of people want to go rather to the north of there, and that's not where the centre of the provincially proposed system is going to be. The province wants it to be right down at Union Station.

Maybe the province wants it down at Union Station to help its friends at Metro Centre have a good profitable development so they'll contribute a few hundred thousand more bucks to the coffers of the Conservative Party for the next election. That's been known to happen in the past. I don't know what to say to the minister about that. I'd like to say that he's above that kind of thing. He's certainly involved in it as a member of

the government, whether or not he does it personally.

All the same, Metro Centre ain't where people all want to go. Lots of people want to go along Bloor St. They want to go along Eglinton Ave. They want to transfer, in a network which has some balance to it. If all the lines of the provincial system run down to Union Station, and if at the same time, the provincial priorities effectively suck dry the coffer of transit subsidies and therefore delay the Queen St. subway and the extension of the Bloor subway at either end, then there's a really severe distortion of transit priorities that will have taken place in this Metropolitan Toronto region as a result of the seduction of the minister to the technological sex appeal of new transit systems.

In other words, he's got to scrap a lot of that system. If he talks to TTC, who know their business, with great respect I would say to the minister an awful lot better than the minister does, and maybe who know the business an awful lot better than a lot of the minister's experts do too, because they've been in it for 50 years—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! This has very little, if anything, that I can see pertaining to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: I am arguing for the need of protection, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to raise some of the questions which need to be raised before the minister embarks on a decision which will then lead to a commitment by the government to justify the step the minister wants to take on May 1.

Whether it's Hawker Siddeley or Krauss-Maffei that the minister chooses, Mr. Speaker, he will feel committed to it. It's like somebody who gets married and after a year or two begins to realize that something is going wrong. At the same time, he doesn't want to admit that he's wrong and, therefore, he hangs in there and buys mink coats and diamonds and Cadillacs to keep the girl happy, if that's her particular bent.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cassidy: That's what the province may be doing, buying diamonds and mink coats in transit terms for a system which doesn't really meet, particularly well, the basic demand in moving people from one place quickly, economically and conveniently. That's all I'm arguing, Mr. Speaker, that once they buy one they'll feel they've got to buy another. They can't go to the other system which was rejected in the first technological assessment, because if the system they choose doesn't work—

Mr. Sargent: If you allow that speech, you'll allow anything, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: —then how much worse will be the one they rejected. So they'll be in a box, with planning already advanced on a number of lines. They'll feel maybe they can make it work when they get it on a real operational system, rather than on this toy fairground line down at the exhibition. The experience of Morgantown, West Virgina, Mr. Speaker, of which the minister is aware, is of a system that began costing about $3 million or $4 million and wound up costing, I've forgotten—was it $50 million? All it does is go three miles. If you press the right button you skip the intermediate station and you go from station 1 to station 3 with personal rapid transit. What a useless bowl of tripe that is, Mr. Speaker!

On May 1 the minister is going to sign—or he wants to unless he changes his mind or this House changes his mind—a commitment which will preordain 30 or 40 miles of intermediate-capacity rapid transit in the province, unless the system at the exhibition is such a total disaster that even the minister finally gets it through his head that he made a mistake.

I don't think the government would want to admit or would be in a position or able to admit at that point that it made a mistake, no matter how badly things were going. It will carve up the figures; it will try to argue that if the costs escalate there it's because it was new. The government will say it can save some money from mass production of the various cars and components. It will do all sorts of things like that and it will be a kind of fiscal duplicity worthy of the Treasurer when he was in the House today.

The government has already started that, Mr. Speaker. The Premier says it is $15 million a mile versus $30 million a mile or more for a rapid transit system. But the Premier was comparing an underground rapid transit system with the costs of a system that the minister and the Premier want to build, most of which will run above ground on elevated lines. The cost, Mr. Speaker, of an elevated subway isn't that much different from the cost of the system the Minister of Transportation and Communications wants to bestow on the province. It is also around $15 million a mile. We don't save that much.

The only real difference is that the minister's system will carry far fewer people. It may cost more per passenger and may possibly be more silent because it's elevated or runs on rubber wheels. One has to ask whether that benefit is worth it.

We are being committed, Mr. Speaker, to $1.25 billion or so—

Mr. Sargent: The member should be committed.

Mr. Cassidy: —on the system the minister chooses in the next 11 or 12 days. That's what the issue is in this bill and the minister will not back down. He's got that kind of stubbornness and pertinacity. If he finds out that the system is going to escalate to $2 billion or $2.5 billion dollars, he won't give up. Do members know what he will do first?

Mr. Bullbrook: They accused me of that.

Mr. Cassidy: He'll cut out the Finch line—certainly it is in one of the hon. member's ridings—which is decoration on the cake.

He promised 56 miles of line in Metro Toronto for, I think it was $800 million or $13 million a mile. About 20 miles of that 56 miles, Mr. Speaker, was a line that went along Finch Ave. at the very northernmost fringe of Metro and on the edge of zone 2 of the Toronto-centred region. In other words half of the catchment area for that line was the cows and the horses and the pigs and the stockbrokers who happen to live north of Finch Ave., just in stockbroker country there. I think the minister's political colleague, Steve Roman, is one of the people who live up in that area.

That line, Mr. Speaker, is expendable and we will still spend, I would predict, $756 million—or whatever the figure is—not for 56 miles but for, maybe, about 36 miles of line at a cost which would then be up to $20 million or $22 million a mile. In other words, as much as or more than the present cost of building subways on the ground or up in the air.

I'm not arguing for subways. I know that alternatives are needed and I have suggested one or two, and will suggest them further in debating and discussing this with the minister.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, the issue is not the spending; not the passing of a one-page bill. It is not even the spending of $15 million; it is the commitment to spend $1.25 billion on a system which I suggest is going to serve the province badly. That is why at the committee stage we will draft and will move an amendment which will call for a public review of these proposals and the terms of reference set out by the minister—that's where the contradictions arise, Mr. Speaker, on those terms of reference—in order that we can ensure that the ministry is not led down the garden path by departed experts, by rather vainglorious ministers and by premiers who are still inflated by the electoral results of the Spadina Expressway decision and somehow want to rediscover the magic they got from that particular decision.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Chairman, I hope the minister got a point out of the previous speaker's speech that unlike the Bart system of San Francisco, he had better make sure that every train has an automatic self-stopping device so that it can stop before it goes off the rails.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The member should get one that gets him on the rails first.

Mr. Givens: I will try to confine myself to the subject matter in the principle of the bill without getting into technical matters.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, it's much more interesting if a member gets into technical matters, though.

Mr. Gisborn: More intelligent.

Mr. Givens: Not at this stage of the game. The member for Ottawa Centre just became intoxicated with the exuberance of his verbosity; he wasn't talking about the principle of the bill at all.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Very good.

Mr. Cassidy: If that's the case, it is a lesson I learned from the member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: We hear a lot of claptrap around here but nobody is listening anyway.

Mr. Ruston: Very good point!

Mr. Gisborn: Come on, jealousy will get the member nowhere.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, I have very grave misgivings about this bill. It seems to me that what happened on this bill was that

the minister was sitting around with the boys, his advisers in his department, and he wanted to have the jurisdiction to sign agreements. They said: "Well, what kind of jurisdiction do you want?" He said: "Well, let's have it wide open.'

They went ahead and they drew up a one-page bill that will have everything in it but the kitchen sink. The reason I have great forebodings about this bill is because it is so wide open, and it has room for a tractor-trailer or a truck or a team of wild horses to run through it.

If this is to be a bill which will confine the jurisdiction of the minister to sign agreements with a municipality or a number of municipalities with respect to the intermediate-capacity system, I may be prepared to go along with it. But this bill does not confine him to the intermediate-capacity system. It will permit anything under the sun, and I think that is wrong. I am not prepared to buy that all at once in one little one-page bill.

There is a wonderful thing about promoting and conducting experiments. As any high-school boy can tell you, you can conduct any experiment you want under the sun. It can be a controlled experiment; you can run choo-choo trains all over the face of your living room. It is when you get into operations, when you get the darned thing out on the street, and when you get it out on the rails and you operate it under proper conditions, that the rub comes. This is where you are able to determine whether the thing will work or not.

It has never been clear to me how the government is going to run this experiment down at the Canadian National Exhibition and simulate, for instance, conditions of snow and storm and sleet and so on; how the system will be interlined at the Canadian National Exhibition with the subway system on the Bloor-Danforth line, or the University line, or the Yonge St. line; or how an intermediate-capacity system can interline with the Yonge St. system when it is crying out now.

Talk about making an agreement with the municipality! The minister should have authority to make an agreement with the federal government. He went up there hat in hand like a mendicant and beggar to ask the federal Minister of Transport to give him a dual system so that he can twin Yonge St. Yonge St. has reached the peak of its capacity now and within another year or two it is going to be absolutely paralyzed.

I am concerned about this bill because I think it gives the minister too much for what he requires. It isn't confined to the intermediate-capacity system and it opens up a whole can of worms which we are going to regret very much in the future.

Under section 87c(1), it talks about how the minister and a municipality may enter into an agreement. Does this mean an agreement with each other? Does this mean that you can have an agreement between one municipality and another municipality? This doesn't make it clear to me at all.

As far as having the right and the legal authority to make an agreement, this government, of all governments, has made it only too clear that the agreements aren't worth the paper they are written on. No agreement was more strongly worded, more hidebound and signed by more ministers, such as Mr. Goodfellow and Mr. MacNaughton, than the agreement having to do with the Spadina Expressway and rapid transit system. It was torn up the way Hitler tore up the Versailles treaty—just like a scrap of paper, without any consultation.

Mr. Singer: Charlie couldn't stand it and he left and gave up his seat.

Mr. Givens: The Premier didn't call the mayor of Toronto; he didn't call the chairman of Metro.

Mr. Singer: That's why Charlie left.

Mr. Givens: He didn't consult with anybody. He came in here as is his wont at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. He had told them at a bunfeed down at the Royal York that he was coming up to make an announcement. At 2 o'clock, an agreement that had been in the making for about 15 years was torn up like a scrap of paper.

So whom is the minister kidding, that he wants to have the right to make an agreement with a company? If the Prime Minister of this province can tear up an agreement with a metropolitan corporation of over two million people, what can he do with an agreement with a company or a corporation? He probably would be afraid to tear up an agreement with a company or a corporation, which is probably more to the point.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, he needs their finances for his election campaign.

Mr. Givens: But he openly defied and he flouted the agreement which took 15 years to bring to fruition, because under the Constitution of Canada he has the right to do this

under section 92 of the British North America Act.

Mr. Singer: Shame!

Mr. Givens: So, what great moment is this, The minister asks here for authority for himself to make an agreement with a municipality. What about cities like Toronto or Ottawa —I don't know what other cities have public transportation systems like Toronto's. This bill completely overlooks an authority like the Toronto Transit Commission. What is the position of the Toronto Transit Commission under these circumstances, which is under a provincial charter and is charged with the responsibility of running the public transit system of Toronto? Why should that not be included here? Did the minister intentionally intend to overlook the TTC in Toronto or any other public transit authority in any other city?

Another weakness in this bill is that the tender system is completely overlooked, and they are going to put themselves in the same box as they are doing with the Hydro building and other buildings that have been talked about in this Legislature. I think the tender system should be inviolate; it should not be departed from under any circumstances, unless there is an absolutely compelling and overwhelming reason why the tender system should be done away with.

Mr. Singer: I don't think we can vote for this. Have they got the bells working again?

Mr. Givens: We have a situation where only two companies are competing, and both are foreign firms. If we get ourselves locked into an agreement with one of the firms, how are we ever going to change it? How are we exer going to amend the situation that we got ourselves into?

I say that under these circumstances, where billions of dollars will be involved and the province is committing itself to 75 per cent of the cost or is going to be a three-quarters partner, the tender system must be written into this agreement if we are going to give this minister the right to make any agreement at all. Otherwise, it is left open to all kinds of chicanery and horsing around, and I think we have had enough of that. Justice not only has to be done but has got to be seen to be done, and the only way we are going to do it is by putting the tender system into this bill.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right!

Mr. Givens: Another thing I want to bring up about this bill is the right of the minister to make an agreement with a municipality and a firm or corporation. What's become of the desire expressed in this Legislature about Canadian content and Canadian technology? The other day a couple of us were watching television, and the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea)—there he is over there, with a nice cherubic smile—was saying what a wonderful thing the provincial government was going to do; that it guaranteed, in the public transit system that it was going to put into effect in the cities of Ontario, that Canadian technology and Canadian content would be supreme; everything was going to be done to see that Canadian content and Canadian technology would be carried out to the letter of the agreement.

Mr. Singer: What could be more Canadian than Krauss-Maffei?

Mr. Givens: Where is Canadian content and where is Canadian technology in this bill? Why isn't there a subsection here saying that when an agreement is made by the minister and a municipality, or by the minister and a firm or corporation, particularly a foreign firm or corporation, that Canadian content shall be observed to an extent of 80 per cent, 90 per cent or 100 per cent—take any arbitrary content level you want, but I think it should be written in here; otherwise the minister is committed to nothing. I think a bill like this, which commits him to nothing and which is so wide open that one can drive a tractor-trailer through it isn't sufficient as far as I'm concerned and as far as this party is concerned.

Mr. Singer: Right!

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): It's okay. I'll watch him.

Mr. Singer: The member agrees, does he? He'll watch him. Come on, the day of the car is over.

Mr. Givens: Now section 87c(2) says that the minister may enter into an agreement with a firm or corporation "to acquire, hold, exercise, develop, license, sell, lease or otherwise dispose of . . ." Over the heads of a municipality or the Toronto Transit Commission? Nothing is said in here reserving the rights of properly constituted authorities that are in existence today to have any form of review or to do anything once this agreement is signed. The province can do anything it wants.

One of the most perilous things that I envisage in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that by virtue of this simple, common, ordinary, everyday, garden variety bill—which looks like a caretaking bill, merely giving the minister the right to sign agreements—the minister is creating a parallel transportation force, which I think is going to be viewed with alarm in the not too distant future.

All of a sudden the province is propelling itself into the public transportation business where it has no right to be and where it shouldn't be, because it is not going to solve the transportation problems of all the cities, be they big or small, in the Province of Ontario with this intermediate-capacity system. You have to have a balanced system of public transit.

Anyone who can get on TV and say the day of the motor car is over, when we have just got through selling over a million motor cars in the Province of Ontario—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who would say something as irresponsible as that?

Mr. Givens: —and we have a registration of about one car for every three people in Toronto—you still have to have a balanced system between the motor vehicle, the truck, the dial-a-bus, the reversible lanes. There are 50 kinds of combinations and permutations and variations with respect to the public transit system.

Is the government suggesting that the province is going to get into the integrated business of public transit completely? It can't get into part of it, Mr. Speaker. It cannot get into part of it without getting into the whole and unless it is prepared to take over the whole ball of wax—for example from the TTC, in Metropolitan Toronto—then it has no business getting into this business of experimentation under Bill 93.

There are people who get up and talk about how wonderful the metropolitan city of Toronto has developed. It has developed because no one stuck his nose into the developing transportation system of Metropolitan Toronto until two years ago. The TTC was the ultimate authority and it is the only authority in this province that knows what it is doing public transit-wise. It is the only one that has had any experience. The guys in the minister's department haven't had any, and anything that they have learned they have learned from the TTC because there was no one else to learn from.

They went to Hawker-Siddeley. They went to Krauss-Maffei. And even those cities where these companies are haven't adopted the technology of those particular companies. They are not running their systems there.

I say that by virtue of this bill—this little innocent bill—where the government is permitting the Minister of Transportation and Communications to sign agreements with municipalities and with private firms and corporations, the government is constituting a parallel authority in public transportation and I say it is going to rue the day. It is going to be in it up to its ears.

The government is prepared to pay 75 per cent, but then it is going to hear the squawks from the areas of this province outside the big metropolitan centres, from the farmers and the miners. They will wake up to what has happened with the Spadina thing, where the government has undertaken to pay 75 per cent of the cost, and realize that they now are going to be paying 75 per cent of every nut and every bolt and every screw that it puts into the city of Toronto. I won't take that analogy any further than that, but the minister knows what I mean.

They are going to wake up to what it is to pay 75 per cent of the public transportation systems in the big cities and they are not going to like it. The government is getting into something right over its ears, but as the previous speaker has said, by that time the minister will have gone from the scene and he will be either Attorney General or more likely the Treasurer and the Minister of Economics.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A backbencher again.

Mr. Singer: Maybe he will be back in law practice. Spadina will beat them at the next election. The Toronto votes won't save them.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, I say Bill 93 is very serious and very dangerous. The minister can label anything an experiment or a demonstration project — he can build a whole line. When the intermediate-capacity system goes in you can build a whole line down the Nordheimer ravine and the Cedarvale ravine, and call it an experiment, because the first line will be an experiment, notwithstanding what goes down at the midway of the Canadian National Exhibition.

Is the minister suggesting that he should have the power to sign an agreement where he can "acquire, hold, exercise, develop, license, sale or lease or otherwise dispose of rights" related to that whole line, costing tens of millions of dollars, just on his say-so,

or on the say-so of whoever his successor may be?

Mr. Singer: The member has convinced me.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, I think that this is very dangerous. It has not been properly thought out. We haven't had an opportunity to think about it and I don't think the minister has had an opportunity to think about it. All he wants now is the right to grab hold of everything, because he has been told by his leader that before the 1975 election comes around they have to do something spectacular, even if it is only on paper, and they want to have the right to carry on this experimentation.

Mr. Singer: And Cam McNab is getting a few qualms too. He wants a job. That's what happened.

Mr. Givens: I tell the hon. members this is very, very serious. The more I think about it, Mr. Speaker, the more I believe that the minister shouldn't be given this authority, unless he at least puts in a section having to do with the matter of tenders—that any acquisition, holding, exercising, developing, licensing, selling or leasing or otherwise disposing of, has to be on the basis of the tender system — and that Canadian content and Canadian technology has to be supreme. Unless those two amendments are put in my party and I will certainly not vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill, obviously.

Mr. Singer: Why obviously?

Mr. Cassidy: The member supported something else, obviously, when it first came up! This is a bad bill.

Mr. Drea: Obviously I would have to support it if the only opposition to it came from the antediluvian forces in the rather affluent northern or northwestern part of this community.

Mr. Singer: Ho, ho, ho!

Mr. Drea: Ho, ho, ho to you too!

Mr. Singer: Try that once more.

Mr. Drea: Obviously I would have to support the bill when most of the opposition appears to come from the antediluvian forces from the wealthier areas of the north and northwestern part of this community.

Mr. Cassidy: Does he mean they oppose public transit?

Mr. Drea: What was that? I didn't hear that.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the member mean they oppose public transit?

Mr. Drea: That's right; of course they oppose public transit.

The reason they oppose public transit is that unfortunately, and much to their chagrin, probably the worst form of public transit that was ever devised by man—the Spadina Expressway—was killed. Had the Spadina Expressway not been stopped it would have meant the rather orderly destruction of the downtown core of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Singer: Oh dear; oh dear! I can't stand it.

Mr. Drea: Well, I have the unique honour of finally having driven the member out.

Mr. Sargent: When does the member's book come out?

Mr. Singer: Tell us about the day of the automobile having gone.

Mr. Drea: The day of the automobile, as a form of rapid transit or transportation to or from work is over and every thinking person knows that.

Mr. Singer: Yup! General Motors knows it; Chrysler knows it; Ford knows it.

An hon. member: And the member for Downsview knows it. Tell that to all the workers.

Mr. Drea: The workers. Quite frankly, there is still a very great market for private automobiles. And the market will be increased and enhanced by the fact that people no longer have to wear out their vehicles and themselves for two hours a day going to and from work in a rather unsafe and unsettled condition on highways.

But to come back to the bill.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Less pollution too!

Mr. Drea: To come back to the bill, I am obviously in full-hearted agreement with this and I can say to the House quite frankly

that it is from a position of vested interest, because after the demonstration project proves successful—and I have every confidence in the ability of Canadian brains and Canadian technology to make the demonstration project successful—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: —the first priority goes to the borough of Scarborough.

One of the interesting things is, and again the antediluvian forces used to heckle me a little bit on this, as I used to say that all that Hydro right-of-way in Scarborough was not being used to its fullest potential and that it was a great source of community wealth.

As I say, I speak from vested interest, because the first priority goes to building this intermediate-capacity transit from the borough of Scarborough right to downtown. I congratulate the minister, because this is the first time the eastern part of Metropolitan Toronto has ever received a first. So as I say, I speak from vested interest, but above all I also speak—

Mr. Cassidy: It may not work!

Mr. Drea: —as somebody who is rather enamoured of the fact that Canadians really can overcome many of the so-called insurmountable difficulties in urban life; and not the least of these right now is transportation. The inability of government to cope with rapid transit has led, in many jurisdictions, to the utter demise of the core of the city. That is one of the fundamental reasons why the downtown areas in the United States are fully and almost completely deserted once working hours are over. Their whole system has been laid out for rapid egress, by automobile, to the suburbs. Of course this, consequently, leads to urban sprawl; and it is already leading to suburban slums in the first ring built after the last war.

So what we have here is the determination that we will enter into agreements which will allow us to go forward in a rather practical way to take the prototypes from England and from Germany. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I wish there was a prototype from Oshawa or from Oakville or from Windsor or from American Motors in Brampton. But the fact of the matter is that up until this time there hasn't been any research done on this particular problem in Canada.

The research is being done in more crowded countries. It is being done in England, it is being done in Germany and, to a lesser degree, in the United States.

If you look back at the original Toronto subway—the original form of rapid transit in this city—all of the technology came from England. Even as late as the second stage, the University subway, a great deal of the technology came from England.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the very talents that produced the tunnels on both the Yonge St. and the University Ave. subway—even the workers, by and large—had to be imported from England, where they had been working on the tube system there. We didn't even have the basic labour technology.

But, as we have expanded the Yonge St. subway and the Bloor-Danforth line, there has been more and more Canadian participation in the actual physical construction. There is certainly more Canadian innovation in the subway design, because the cars are not only bigger now, they are lighter, and therefore they consume much less energy. So that we have progressed from the original system. Far from being dangerous, this bill seems to me the only practical way of doing business.

I really wish that the member for York-Forest Hill had stayed around. If memory serves me correctly, the member for York-Forest Hill was rather active in municipal politics when the first Yonge St. subway was built. One of the difficulties the Toronto Transit Commission got into on that occasion, Mr. Minister, was the law said the TTC virtually had to pay for the subway itself out of current revenues. This put it behind the eight-ball. That's why there has been such a slow evolvement of subways in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

It is only when the province got into the game—and all of us here are old enough to remember when there was a subsidy for highways, but nothing for rapid transit. And then all of a sudden we started getting subsidies and grants for rapid transit. This, I suggest to you, is when rapid transit took off in Toronto.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That was only last year.

Mr. Cassidy: Even the member for Scarborough Center is old enough to remember that.

Mr. Drea: Yes I am.

Now we are into another situation. Perhaps the conventional form of subway is too

expensive for a municipality like Metropolitan Toronto, or a province like Ontario.

One of the benefits of the intermediate capacity is that it costs less. Because it's a smaller system, it doesn't have the great waste that unfortunately there is in off-peak hours on the conventional type of subway. It is much more geared toward a 24-hour or even a 16-hour-day operation than are the big Yonge St. or the Bloor-Danforth subways, which have a peak of approximately two hours in the morning and in the evening —unless there happens to be some kind of particular event.

Now then we come to those who say that this is dangerous; it is going to erode the powers of the Toronto Transit Commission; it is going to erode the powers of the municipalities; it is going to set up the minister as some kind of tsar over every type of transportation in Ontario.

What is the alternative? Do we go to the poor Toronto Transit Commission and say: "Get into the intermediate field, boys, spend your money?" It has a difficult enough time now doing things on its existing surface and underground routes and keeping its money—

Mr. Cassidy: It has been making proposals for years and years—on deaf ears.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Dry up!

Mr. Drea: —and trying to come to the point where it doesn't have to increase fares and deter people; without being told: "Now go and find yourself $10 million, $20 million or $30 million some place and experiment." If we did that, the TTC would laugh us out.

Mr. Singer: Would it?

Mr. Drea: Far from being dangerous, it is much more practical to build a test line where the system can function under Canadian conditions.

May I throw it back to the members across the floor—it was their friends in Ottawa who made the fatal error with the Turbo train. It may have been great in the United States and somewhere else, but it couldn't stand the Canadian winter—and this set it back three, four, even five years. It is a perfectly acceptable form of transportation, provided the bugs are worked out—and that's precisely what this bill empowers the minister to do.

The responsibility for transportation in this province now belongs to the province. Not one of the members over there says that the province should get out of the highway business. Far from it—they want the province into the transportation business. How many letters from southwestern Ontario are sent here because the railways do not operate there any more and they say why doesn't the province take over? They don't suggest that little Palmerston take over the CNR line or the CPR line that's been abandoned. No, sir. They say to the province and the minister, "Why don't you take it over because they need transportation?"

To suggest that all of this money is going directly to benefit the people of Metropolitan Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa is sheer and utter nonsense. By being able to build an intermediate capacity line, after proving and getting the bugs out of the prototypes, it will cost us about one half the amount of conventional subways and that means there will be far more funds available for the type of transportation that is needed in rural Ontario or in small-town Ontario, because they want highways, they need bypasses, they need certain improvements on the roads.

If we were to put the money at the 75 per cent level into building more conventional subways in Toronto there wouldn't be enough money left over for rural Ontario. So once again, far from doing all the terrible things that he is supposed to do, all this bill is is an orderly attempt to bring in—

Mr. Sargent: Get to the point.

Mr. Drea: —what the people want, a new type of rapid transit system that they can afford, that will not be a further heavy drain on existing land, because after all we are going to use land that is already being used as a form of a transportation corridor because it is carrying energy. So, having listened to all of the arguments, I still cannot understand the type of mental activity that goes into saying that the minister is part of some kind of a conspiracy to finally erode the power of the municipality to provide its own transportation needs.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): His whole party is a conspiracy.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, as I have said before that the day of the automobile in transit to and from employment is over, I will give them another one and they can talk about this one for a while. The day of the municipality by itself, even a regional municipality by itself, being able to deal with the transportation problems of the future, is not

only over it has been over for about 10 years, and unfortunately far too few of us have recognized that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roy: What has the government been doing then? What took it so long?

Mr. Sargent: The member for Scarborough Centre should be in the front row.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, Bill 93, An Act to amend the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act, is designed specifically to alleviate some of the traffic problems in Metropolitan Toronto. If we give carte blanche authority to the minister—

Hon. Mr. Carton: "Carton" blanche?

Mr. Stokes: —"Carton" blanche—to enter into an agreement with a transit authority, it would mean that between $2 million and $3 million could be expended on an agreement with a municipality "to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of all or any part of the experimental or demonstration project related to public transportation."

"Otherwise dispose of" is the thing that bothers me in this bill because, coming from an area of the province that is sparsely populated, we don't have the problem of transporting huge numbers of people in a relatively short period of the day and the inherent congestion and the dislocation of people that there is in Metropolitan Toronto.

We are aware that there are a significant number of dollars going into a project such as this when we feel that perhaps the transportation priorities of this province and this government should be elsewhere.

It seems to me that you are going to have to have some kind of regional development plan to restrict the kind of development that is to take place in Metropolitan Toronto in order to cope with the mass transportation of a large number of people for relatively short periods throughout the day. We would have hoped that there would have been more emphasis placed on spreading out the industrial activity and the need for a high density of people—such as Metropolitan Toronto — to other areas of the province where we don't have this problem of congestion and the problem of transporting a large number of people.

I am particularly apprehensive about this bill, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it is conceivable that this minister, once he gets finished with his experimental project, will turn it over to some other authority such as the Canadian National Exhibition. It will be a showpiece that will add greatly, I suppose, to the attractiveness of the Canadian National Exhibition. There is no doubt that it will bring even more people into Metropolitan Toronto, thus adding greatly to the transportation problems that there are in this city.

I think it could even compound the problems that there are at the present time rather than alleviating them, notwithstanding the fact that it could create some employment if the government went for the English system whereby Hawker-Siddeley might get the contract. It could very well mean providing badly needed jobs in the Hawker-Siddeley plant in the city of Thunder Bay. Of course, we welcome any intimation from the minister that that will, indeed, be the case—that it will provide greater job opportunities in the north as has been the case with the construction of subway cars for the TTC. I believe some of the GO Transit cars were constructed up there.

I am a little bit apprehensive about the authority that will be vested in the minister to dispose of it otherwise. If he is going to realize a profit or break even, fine and dandy, this is the wise use of funds. But as an outright grant to one particular segment of the province—I wouldn't be so harsh as to say it is discriminatory against the north—it seems to me it is the kind of thing that doesn't take into account the transportation needs of many other areas of the province. Those areas could never aspire to this kind of treatment or the treatment as announced in the recent budget statement whereby 75 per cent of the cost of urban transportation will be underwritten by the province and the taxpayers of this province.

I think the minister is well aware of the needs of Highway 17 in the north. In many areas there is a need for construction of passing lanes and upgrading existing facilities. There is a need for upgrading Highway 11 between Beardmore and Geraldton. There is a need for a connecting link between Highway 17 and Highway 11 between Ignace and Atikokan, a mining town that is going to be in deep trouble in the next few years if some alternatives aren't provided for development.

In the recent study of transportation needs in the Kenora-Rainy River districts of north-

western Ontario, I think it was brought home quite clearly to this ministry that there is a need for greater transportation facilities to open up greater utilization of resources which those areas have in such abundance. I am thinking particularly of mining, forestry and the tourist attractions they have in such abundance. They are now inaccessible because of an inadequate network of roads.

I am thinking, too, of the Gull Bay-Armstrong road which a civil servant of this province has been travelling on a regular basis. He has a car that is less than a year old and it is just ready for the junk heap because of the driving conditions on the roads between Gull Bay and Armstrong and Highway 599 between Savant Lake and Pickle Lake. There are so many needs in the north with regard to transportation.

I'm just a little apprehensive, if the minister is going to put the greater percentage of his transportation expenditures in a relatively small part of the Province of Ontario—and I'm speaking geographically—that he is just going to compound the problems that are already in existence in Metropolitan Toronto and a lot of the urban centres.

I would have hoped that instead of spending more dollars to move an ever-increasing number of people in Metropolitan Toronto, this government could be coming up with programmes that would disperse people throughout the province on a more even basis. It would alleviate a lot of the problems that we have here at the present time—the high cost of land assembly, pollution concentrated in relatively small pockets of the province.

A lot of these problems wouldn't manifest themselves if the government had a realistic Design for Development programme. There is nothing in the Design for Development programme for the Metropolitan Toronto region that would indicate that this is the direction in which the government is going, and this bill seems to be ample evidence that it is just compounding the problem, rather than trying to come to grips with it.

Those are things I wanted to say about this bill, Mr. Speaker. I hope that before this bill gets final reading and approval from this Legislature that the minister will look at the overall transportation needs for the people in the Province of Ontario. Perhaps if he does that he will amend this bill and come to the conclusion that the dollars that he's speaking of in this bill could be much more wisely spent by dispersing them throughout other areas of the province where the priorities are just as great as, if not greater than, they are in Metropolitan Toronto.

It says: "to design, develop, construct, test and operate all or any part of a transit system related to public transportation"—any place in Ontario. And: "to acquire, hold, exercise, develop, license, sell, lease or otherwise dispose of rights related to all or any part of a transit system related to public transportation."

What could be wider? What could be more dangerous than to say: "Give," not just to this minister but anyone who would follow, "these powers"? And the minister is compounding; he doesn't do it with just one area, he does it with all the areas of the province.

We've watched this "Godfather" complex enter into every area of government and I don't think that there is a better example of a splendid public servant in this House than the minister I am talking to. I can't believe that he would want this type of legislation and these kinds of powers. I would say that if he were to have the implementation, the control and the security of this, I would be glad to give it to him personally, but he won't be here very long.

I am saying it is dangerous to put a law on the books, because it is so hard to remove them. How many times in this House have we removed laws? We just keep adding them on and on.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, everything has been said very ably by the member for York-Forest Hill, but I'd like to put a few points in here to the minister.

We know now, Mr. Speaker, after 10 years in this House, the way that the government—not the minister, the government—uses government contracts for political purposes and I would suggest to you that this is a very, very dangerous piece of legislation. It has unlimited powers.

I don't believe for a moment that this insidious bill is the minister's idea. I would suggest to the minister that this is possibly the senior civil servants in full flight. It smacks, I believe, of the beneficent dictatorship that we have been watching along here so long.

It gives the minister the power to enter into an agreement with a firm or corporation —it is that wide—to provide all or any part of an experimental or demonstration project related to public transportation — and that covers a whole gamut of projects and mil-

lions of dollars of contracts in net supplies—without tender, on the proposal system that we have heard so much about and that the government is so proud of.

Mr. Ruston: We removed a tax today.

An hon. member: That didn't get in.

Mr. Sargent: That's democracy in action. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is another Canada Square type of deal, that this is a much bigger ball game than $180 million for Mr. Moog, the friend of the Premier. I suggest that this is another form of the proposal system the minister is asking us to support. My basic training in government is that we worked on the low tender system. It's the bible of all municipalities across this province, and this senior body is telling municipalities, in effect, that the low tender system isn't important any more. Whatever happened to the low tender system? When did we start disposing of it? It was only in the last few years when the government wanted to enlarge its election fund coffers. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this opens up unlimited possibilities to allow corruption. The member for Scarborough West—

Mr. Drea: Centre!

Mr. Sargent: Scarborough Centre, I'm sorry! In a very able manner he put his case. The complete stupidity of this government can be seen by flying over this area in a small aircraft, not fast, but slowly, to see the two big arteries along the north and south going east and west, to see the Don Valley over here and Highway 27 over here, and to see the Spadina starting down the centre —and boom, she stops. It's complete stupidity. This is part of the powers that these people have. He talked about the wisdom of the Spadina. Ask any taxi driver who does much driving in Toronto, "What do you think of the Spadina?" and he will say "You have all got rocks in your head."

I think if the minister is looking at transportation—I say that in capital letters—across this province, if he looks at it objectively he should be ashamed. He should be ashamed of the setup we have in western Ontario. We have no rail system, no GO train, no dayliner in or out of Owen Sound to serve all the beach areas, Walkerton, Paisley, and the whole area on the west side of the peninsula up there. That's blocked off. All we have is a highway. We have no airline system; we have nothing. These are the things I suggest to the minister.

A study in the States after many, many thousands of dollars came up with this answer in the area of transportation. What we need in America, and we are part of the American scene, what we need today, are short-term solutions, not long-term Buck Rogers types of things, like the minister was overseas on.

All of a sudden one day, Mr. Speaker, they decided they had to get off their butts and do something about transportation. So what happens? The minister and his cohorts, in a few days' notice find themselves over in Europe looking at these things. They take their movie cameras along with them to watch all this, to publicize all this hocus-pocus and to let the people think they are doing something about transportation. The minister is not kidding us. We know that that's a long, long way off. What we need in this province—and the minister should be ashamed about what's happening here in Toronto on this transportation—are short-term solutions.

Nothing is happening up in our area at all. It takes you a day and a half to go from Port Elgin or Southampton to Toronto. One must change bus after bus to get down here and back, and that's ridiculous. I sincerely hope that the minister won't talk Toronto all the time; that's all we hear down here — Toronto.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Perhaps the members want to hear so much about it.

Mr. Sargent: They spent $20 million on the University subway here, and what do they do but close it down at 5 o'clock every day because it doesn't take in enough money to pay the ticket takers.

Mr. Drea: No, no. Nine o'clock.

Mr. Sargent: They close it at 9 o'clock now?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, they must have been worried about the members sitting, or something. But that subway doesn't take in enough money to pay the ticket takers, and it cost us $20 million.

An hon. member: That's why they're building the Spadina. They're looking for customers.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Dial-a-subway.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest to the minister —

Mr. Good: That's what we need: a dial-a-subway system.

Mr. Sargent: If the minister presses the button and puts this legislation through, it will be the most dangerous thing to happen in the area of corruption in government, because no minister should have the right to make these unending deals with unlimited powers. It's very dangerous legislation.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little puzzled as to why we've got this bill here at all. I would have thought, at first glance, that under the Highway Improvement Act, or perhaps under the general powers of the ministry, that the minister would have this power. However, my colleague from Sarnia and I entered into a great, long and legal discussion and he suggested to me that perhaps there was a legal opinion that indicated the Highway Improvement Act didn't go quite that far.

Mr. Bullbrook: I gave credit where it was due.

Mr. Singer: All right, perhaps that's the reasoning behind this bill. Well, if that be so, Mr. Speaker, then I wonder where the department got the power and the authority to spend the money for the studies it has done to date, for the trips to Europe, for the movies, for the engaging of experts and so forth. It would seem to me that if they haven't got the power to do what they're asking here, then they didn't have the power to do what they've already done. I don't know how many millions of dollars they've already spent, but I would suggest that it is a substantial number of millions of dollars, because the kind of presentation they have put on, the expensive kits, the making of movies and so forth wouldn't come too cheaply.

I don't think it would follow that if they need new legislation to give them the power that they're asking for here, that they could have done what they did before legally. I don't think they can have it both ways. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the government either has acted illegally before or if this bill is before us with good reason, then I think McCarthy and McCarthy, who I believe gave the opinion, if they have properly earned their retainer, probably are just gilding the lily a bit. And perhaps, Cam McNab, having had his fingers burned once or twice, would like to see it in black and white that he's got authority to go out and do this.

I've been very puzzled, Mr. Speaker, as to what goes on in that department. I guess we know that Charlie MacNaughton left in disgust when he was repudiated—the Treasurer should have gone this afternoon when he was repudiated—but I'm puzzled as to how people of the very substantial ability of the senior advisers in that department can sit through the planning and commitments they made and suddenly do this bold about-face. And for what purpose I don't really know. The legalities of this interest me, Mr. Speaker, and I'm dubious: Either we don't need it now or we needed it long before they got into this brand new experiment.

I share completely the views of my colleague from York-Forest Hill when he expresses grave doubts about the kiddy-car rides that will be provided down at Sunnyside. That's really all we're doing. We're going to embark upon an experiment, the work of which has never been proved anywhere in the world, let alone in the place where it apparently originated. This Krauss-Maffei firm are building and experimenting; and they've sold someone here a bill of goods which they haven't been able to sell in their own native country or in their own native city, where millions of dollars are being spent on forms of public transit that we have recognized here. They have come up with a variation, and the department has suggested a variation on a variation, and now we are going to pay them to experiment further here at the Exhibition on a basis that no one is quite sure about.

If it was so good, or if it had any real merit, surely countries like Germany, and/or Japan, and/or some of the other expanding and industrial countries in the world would have gone ahead with this. But no, to make a new image for the Davis government and to create the Premier himself as a man of decision—it really doesn't matter—we just open the Treasury vaults and spew out the millions of dollars and there we are: We are being brave; we are being bold.

Mr. Speaker, I'm puzzled too about the time sequences. It gets very peculiar because a member gets more, really, out of

reading newspaper accounts than he does out of what the minister tells us in the House. As I understood it, if this contract is going to be entered into, one could expect that maybe by the end of 1974 we would have something running on a track around the Exhibition grounds. If it wasn't running by the end of 1974, it might not run until the summer of 1975.

That would take us successfully into the next election period, and then I'm sure all the good people from the western part of Metro—because by this time we are going to have such chaos in moving traffic at all west of Yonge St.—all the people in the western part of Metro probably could dial their buses and go down to the Exhibition grounds and see something roaming around on a track in the summertime at the Exhibition—if it was ready in the summer of 1975.

If it is ever proven, when it might in fact work on the ground or in the air—Is it a man, or is it a beast, or is it an airplane? I don't know. It's Carton, I guess, that's coming—

Mrs. Campbell: Superbus!

Mr. Singer: When anyone is going to be able to use it as a method of getting backwards and forwards from somewhere, I don't know. Really, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is a ludicrous sham. One really has to wonder how a group of apparently intelligent men who have a great responsibility—they are spending $7.3 billion — and who make the odd serious mistake like putting a seven per cent tax on energy which is withdrawn to mighty hurrahs and great applause, can get involved even in their wildest inanities in this kind of kiddy-car nonsense and pretend that it is a transportation solution.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I can't see this bill at all, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister should withdraw it. I think he has already assumed he has the power to do what the bill asks him to do. Either he has assumed that and spent money properly, or else he has spent a lot of millions of dollars illegally and the opinion of McCarthy came a bit too late. Charlie should have asked for McCarthy and McCarthy before he left.

Mrs. Campbell: Who, Charlie McCarthy?

Mr. Singer: So Charlie McCarthy should have asked—yes, that's the joke.

I can't see this bill; I think it's a mistake. I think the minister should do like the Treasurer—not resign, because the Treasurer has no intention of resigning—

Mr. Givens: Just withdraw it.

Mr. Singer: Just withdraw the bill and let's get down to more serious and important business.

Mr. Givens: Come in with a proper bill.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): An Act to provide the Minister with a Blank Cheque for a White Elephant.

An hon. member: Very well put.

Mr. Deacon: But I think after hearing my colleague from Downsview I think that should be a blank cheque for a kiddy-car line.

The need for public transit has been well discussed everywhere. But one of the major problems has been the failure of the ministry to ensure co-ordination of transportation for people to provide a similar service as a car provides to people—that is, a door-to-door service with integration of rail, subway, bus, streetcar and dial-a-bus, so all these things are co-ordinated.

We have the CNR, CPR, TTC, Gray Coach, Voyageur, Travelways — all sorts of organizations in the transportation business —but not one of them is co-ordinated with the others. Here we are providing yet another separate authority. The province has its own transportation—the Ontario Northland is subsidized, as is the GO Transit operation that the CNR runs for us—but at no time has this province taken seriously its responsibility and its opportunity to co-ordinate a door-to-door public transportation service. The Metro-centred fiasco reflected, in the planning there, the failure of this government to ensure that every project we undertake today provides us with an improved co-ordination of door-to-door public transportation.

The way this should be done in Ontario, I feel, is to ensure that the province has, by means of its grant system and by its agreements with other levels of government, the power to co-ordinate such a service.

For example, in air service we have the opportunity to take Air Canada or Transair or some other service from one point to another when we travel by air from one part of the province to another or from one part of the country or from other countries. We don't have that in rail, not really, because

basically we don't have common facilities that others can use to provide competitive services.

For example, the Ministry of Transport provides the Malton facilities, controls traffic and ensures the co-ordination of traffic under its own direction and that of its traffic controllers. It ensures a standard of service is provided, and that there is safety in the type of aircraft. That is all done under the federal Ministry of Transport.

The same thing applies in operation of our water transportation system. But it doesn't do that for rail, so that we have this multi-discipline, this multi-level of government control which has caused the continuing lack of integration and resulted in the continuing failure of public transportation to compete with the private automobile.

I suggest the bill is going in the wrong direction. It's not providing a facility which will enable this minister to ensure there is competition in this new, this added mode of transportation. It's not providing us a means whereby this province can co-ordinate this service with the existing services that we now have.

I also am fearful that in providing and drafting the specifications for this scheme, the government has told the experts what it wants. It wants a little line that it can test and play with, not one that is going to really serve a purpose.

Surely the government recognizes the danger of that; what it builds here should be enhancing Ontario Place and the CNE grounds for the very great number of events that can take place there. Therefore, it should be a line that goes right into Union Station terminal and the subway station terminal, in some way connecting with existing facilities. Certainly Union Station would be the place for that to take place.

It should be a line of a design that provides for other than the particular contractors favoured here building and providing equipment. It should be of the type that we are sure will be able to be co-ordinated with other transportation facilities that we now have.

I am very concerned about the type of structure that is being projected. An experimental model, as my colleague from York-Forest Hill mentioned, can be a most dangerous way to move in this matter, because we all know how often the experiment doesn't really prove out when it comes to the operation itself. Just last year one of our major mining industries, Falconbridge, had to write off $50 million because its experimental model in the production of iron ore didn't work out, and it actually built the plant. It poured millions after millions of dollars trying to make the thing work and it just didn't work.

One cannot base the future intermediate type transportation mode we are now hoping to develop over the next few years on a kiddy-car line, as my colleague from Downsview described it, around the CNE. It must be something that is working and providing a functional role in our total transportation network.

Again I support the views that have been expressed by each of the members of this party—that in the way this bill is drafted there is no provision for tenders. There is not going to be an open opportunity for any organization which wants to provide this facility to compete fairly and to be sure there are no favoured cousins which get the special deals.

We don't want to have any further scandals in this province and this minister is one, I am sure, who is as anxious as anyone to avoid such a charge. But when he asks us to pass legislation such as that in this bill today, he is opening the way for the public to suspect him of the same things that they have been suspecting—and had good reason to suspect —of his colleagues. I therefore support my colleagues and urge all others to oppose this bill strongly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, as far as this particular bill is concerned, I would like to make a couple of observations, some of which may have been made before.

We have first the provision that this government may enter into agreement with a municipality. An agreement by itself normally indicates that one has two people who thoroughly understand that about which they are in agreement. I would ask the minister if he would tell us at some point what knowledge the municipality has had to date about the proposals or about the specifications which this government has placed before certain interests? I think they should at least be aware of what, if any, dangers are inherent or may be deemed to be inherent in this form of transportation which is suggested in this bill.

I wonder if they understand the decisions which appear to have been made already, Mr. Speaker, about the type of switching system

that could be involved in an agreement under this bill; and whether they know what safeguards ought to be available to protect their public as well as the public of the province.

The municipality, it is quite true, has not had the funds to be able to proceed with an overall transportation plan such as it ought to have in any large metropolitan area. I don't dispute the necessity for the provincial government to enter this field, but I do have very serious concerns when the government is inclined to enter into something and to force agreement, if you like, without full disclosure to the municipalities as to the ramifications of such agreement. This, of course, is my primary concern.

I am also naturally concerned about the type of agreement that is contemplated by this government in entering into agreements with firms or corporations. Would the municipality, for example, be a party to any of these agreements and to what extent? That isn't spelled out.

As to the disposition which is inherent in this bill, what would the effects of this be if this experiment shouldn't work, and what happens if there is in fact a tragedy as a result of this experimental operation because we had predetermined the specifications for it?

I would like answers to those sorts of questions, because I don't think any responsible person can approve this kind of legislation as proposed without having those very real questions answered and answered unequivocally. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to repeat the various arguments that have been made against the bill. I think that the minister should now be aware that the bill, for practical purposes, is so flawed that he should withdraw it.

I can well assume that if the House were to grant authority to any particular minister it would be quite prepared to grant and extend that confidence to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, but when he brings before the House for a limited purpose a general bill which is going to be embedded in the statutes for all time and asks us to vote for it, in an area where costs are unknown, where it is avowedly an experimentally designed system to relieve a transportation problem in Metropolitan Toronto, it doesn't seem to us that we should grant the minister that authority.

If the bill had been limited for the purpose which has been outlined by the minister to provide that kind of intermediary capacity experimental prototype that has been spoken of in the assembly, then I think we could go along with the granting of that authority. I think we would have linked the authority to have been exercisable by the minister subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but we are not prepared to grant this kind of continuing ongoing authority by permitting this section to be incorporated in the governing Act of the ministry.

It seems to us that the minister himself is ill advised to request this kind of extensive authority. If there is one area in which we are all concerned about government these days it is in the question of costs, and we know very well that if the minister has this ongoing authority to enter into agreements in the future we can be faced with being required to vote sums of money in the estimates of his department year after year because of agreements which the minister has entered into on his own authority and his own responsibility. We are just not prepared to do that.

The other reasons which have been given, of course, we adopt. The question of the requirement of a tender and the other points which have been made all appeal to us, but the principal point is that there is a limited purpose and the minister has introduced a general provision in a general Act of the Legislature to cover that limited purpose, and we think it is much too broad and gives the minister far too great authority. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we will oppose the bill on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to this bill before the minister?

The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I shall try to cover the points that have been made by the various members.

First, I would point out that this particular search for a new mode of transportation of intermediate capacity has been going on now for some three to four years. It didn't happen just within the past year or two. There was research made of all the various components and there are hundreds of components that would be available. These were examined. And, of course, what one must do is not only get the particular components but put these into a system, and

that is what is being done through this demonstration project. The various components themselves have in fact been tested, and successfully tested, in other parts of the world.

I happen to be a very cautious person. One has to question one's own ministry officials, which I did. One had to listen to their particular persuasive arguments, but even that did not satisfy me and I engaged two firms of outside consultants in the transportation field — the leading transportation consultants in Canada. I had them do an independent study and they came up with the same suggestions and recommendations as my ministry officials.

Mr. Cassidy: But which the public has not seen.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Apart from that, when I was on my trip relative to visiting the three successful contestants — and mind you, the evaluation from the eight down to the three had been going on for some time—when I visited the three the respect and the admiration that the particular people that I questioned had for the ministry officials was just first rate. I had one of the senior officials—in fact, the senior official — of one of the largest companies in England tell me that the British government themselves were on a hunt for an intermediate capacity system, and he had advised them to go to the ministry officials for the Province of Ontario to find out how to go about this particular search.

I think one just has to look at the red book that is in the possession of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre, which I tabled today, and look at some 100 pages of specifications to realize the expertise that has gone into this particular search. And then to have the hon. member for Ottawa Centre stand up and tell me that he can criticize the technology — I'm not blaming him for criticizing what we may be doing, but to criticize the technology is beyond my comprehension.

You know, when the members get into these technical aspects—for example, let me give them one indication. Telecommunications is a field that I also have very little knowledge about, although it is part of my ministry. So often, so many times, I kept hearing technical phrases and technical words. Because of this I took it upon myself to try to memorize what telecommunications really meant. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that of all the experts in the field, I doubt there are very few who can come up with the definition of telecommunications?

Telecommunications, very basically, is the transmission, emission, reception of signs, signals, writing, images or sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, visual or audio-visual system. Which simply means people talking to people.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I can assure the hon. members of this House is that I have approached this with a very conservative—not necessarily Progressive Conservative—but a very conservative and very cautious approach.

The hon. member for Ottawa Centre mentioned by name, Malcolm Armstrong, who was head of our research department. He neglected to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he was promoted as chairman for the federal government of their agency dealing with transportation. He is now the chairman of the transportation development agency—the top position for the federal government in research. They took him from us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: Maurice Strong pulled that trick with the federal government, leaving disaster after disaster behind him.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I would also mention that the region of Ottawa-Carleton is very interested in this new mode and, in fact, has asked for an appointment with the minister and the ministry officials with a view to getting on with it. So, I would point out to the hon. member for Ottawa Centre that his own particular people are interested in this for the city of Ottawa.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Tell 'em they can't have it as long as the member for Ottawa Centre is there.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the reason that we have been dealing with technical people thus far is simply because it has been a technical search. To answer the hon. member for St. George, we have had, as I mentioned earlier, the four technical people from the Toronto Transit Commission, the acknowledged experts in the technical aspect. Incidentally, Mr. Patterson, who is without doubt one of the leading authorities on urban transportation on the whole of the continent, is an avid fan of this particular ICTS.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, as I did earlier, that this particular legislation is enabling legislation. It is enabling the minister to enter into a contract. The funds will be voted during my estimates. The members of the House will be able to question me at

that time; they will be able to question my officials if it's in committee.

I would point out that I think there is one misconception among the members about this bill that perhaps is through lack of an explanation on my part. It would be impossible for us to sign a demonstration contract per se with either of the two companies without at the same time tying down the technology, because it's the technology that is important.

If we signed a contract relating only to the demonstration at the Canadian National Exhibition, then where would we stand when we came to have these particular systems put in our municipalities? We could be held up, Mr. Speaker.

So very simply, very basically, this province is garnering in the rights, the patents, the know-how, the technology, in order that this will be part of our whole system. We are purchasing those rights and patents and all that goes with it. We, in turn, will have parts of the world to which we can export this particular technology on perfection. So, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons that we are having this bill brought in at this time.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, will the minister yield for a question?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Givens: Is the minister willing to let this bill be confined and limited to the intermediate capacity transportation system? Is that what the minister is saying in his most recent remarks?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, there are other matters involved, and I will deal with that later.

I would also point out that we do not intend coercing municipalities so far as a system is concerned. We will make this system available to the municipalities. The 75 per cent subsidy, which was part of the formula that was brought in by the Premier last November, relates to urban transit. And as the hon. members know, particularly those from the city of Hamilton and the city of Ottawa, the municipalities have already taken advantage of this, much to their great surprise at that time.

For example, I believe the city of Ottawa had purchased or leased buses and was wondering whether in fact it would be eligible for the 75 per cent subsidy. It was pointed out that it would, and this is in fact what has taken place in the city of Ottawa.

The city of Hamilton, likewise, was able to take advantage of it, even though the time limit had suggested it might not have been able to do so.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the members keep talking about a kiddy-car system. I mentioned at the outset the numbers of individuals and the expertise of the individuals who have been involved in the search for an intermediate capacity transit system. Without doubt, these are the experts in the urban transportation field on the continent and, in fact, throughout the world. These are not people who are looking for Mickey Mouse rides, as has been so often mentioned about the system at the Canadian National Exhibition.

Mr. Cassidy: But there were acknowledged experts who designed the Spadina Expressway, too, and they were wrong.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Well, I am glad the member for Ottawa Centre mentioned that. As a matter of fact, on the Spadina there is one thing that I have always wondered about. Incidentally, I keep hearing about the Spadina day in and day out; rarely does a day go by that I do not hear it.

There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that I have always meant to ask those who perhaps knew more about it at the time that it was done—and the hon. member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) has just left the room; and I think that she would know a great deal about it.

The thing that has perhaps made me wonder about the Spadina Expressway since it was stopped, is why in fact was it stopped by Metro council in 1969 for a review by some of the very people who are criticizing the fact that the Premier stopped it on an appeal to the cabinet. It was stopped by Metro in 1969 because they had doubts about it. They must have had doubts about it. or they wouldn't have stopped it.

Mr. Givens: Not the subway system. The minister keeps on mixing the two deliberately.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Givens: What about the subway system? Why did the government go ahead with that?

Mr. Roy: The government spent $150 million before it stopped it.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the opposition in so far as the tendering system is concerned, but I would point out that in fact this has been done on a tendering system. We had eight companies with technological know-how who were given these particular specifications and asked to make a proposal. Surely that is a tender? Surely that is not going out to your friends and saying, "Put in a bid."

How many companies throughout the world would be able to put in a tender on a proposal like this? I suggest to members that any of the companies in the world which wanted to could have tendered on the particular specifications in this booklet, that we have here.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that in fact we do have in the contracts clauses to the effect that the Canadian content will be between 70 and 85 per cent. This is, in fact, written into the contracts. I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, one of the—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —hon. members pointed out that the minister and a municipality may enter into an agreement to provide or otherwise dispose of. It was the member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid); he was concerned about it.

Mr. Cassidy: It was the member for Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Cassidy: We wouldn't get anything that substantial from the member for Rainy River.

Mr. Roy: Words of wisdom.

Hon. Mr. Carton: What this does, Mr. Speaker, is, if there are parts of this demonstration project that cannot be utilized, it enables the ministry to otherwise dispose of them. I think that makes abundant good sense. If there are parts that we are not able to utilize after the demonstration, I think it makes abundant good sense to be able to dispose of them.

While I am talking to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, I would remind him that in the ministry at this time we are spending about $1.2 million on Highway 599. We are looking at the Fort Frances to Dryden road. We are going to start that, as the members know. Insofar as the air service in northwestern Ontario is concerned, we are reaching conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, the minister is well aware of what is happening in Thunder Bay. He is very interested in what is happening up in Thunder Bay and the whole of northwestern Ontario for that matter—and the whole of northern Ontario.

Mr. Drea: The minister gives them too much.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am sorry that the member for Grey-Bruce has gone out, Mr. Speaker, because he mentioned that really we never did anything in particular for his riding. I might tell you, sir, that after I came to this ministry I had a delegation from his area relating to the Tobermory ferry, which had been discussed for some seven years. I said I would resolve it and I resolved it within six weeks. We are spending some $13 million in the riding of the member for Grey-Bruce.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): He wouldn't say thanks for anything! Members have to get the minister in the right circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the member for St. George, the TTC could not be involved in this kind of demonstration project because there are no fares being collected and therefore no revenue. They would not and in fact have not the funds in order that they—

Mr. Cassidy: No fares?

Hon. Mr. Carton: At the Exhibition.

Mr. Cassidy: This is a revolutionary concept. The minister might try it where people like to travel.

Hon. Mr. Carton: To the member for Downsview, who has since departed, I would point out that we do, in fact, have the power to spend research funds, which is what we have been doing. That is why we need this bill to carry on now that we have done our research. We need the bill to get into the contract signing stage. To the member for Downsview, the timetabling is, has and will be—

Mr. R. B. Beckett (Brantford): He is not here.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I realize that. The timetabling will be that the demonstration project at the Exhibition will be operational in 1974, operate through the 1974-1975 winter and be operational at the 1975 Exhibition. People will be well able to ride and have a demonstration on this particular project long

before a certain event which has been imputed to me.

Mr. Givens: Nobody goes down there in the winter. Nobody is there. One could shoot a cannon through there and not hit a soul. It's a Toonerville Trolley.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I think, Mr. Speaker, I have covered most of the points in the time. As I mentioned, I do want to have this bill passed in order that I might be able to sign the contracts and make the announcement by May 1. On one hand, we are being criticized for not proceeding—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is going too fast and he is not satisfying this side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre with all due respect in the question period says: "Why aren't we getting on with the timetabling?" and "You were going to announce it." Then I come up and say, "We are announcing it on May 1." Now we are being criticized for going too fast.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What more do they expect?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I simply conclude, Mr. Speaker, by asking all hon. members to vote in favour of this bill and put Ontario where we are in the other fields, in the vanguard of all jurisdictions insofar as transportation is concerned.

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 93, which was approved on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 48, the "nays" are 25.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Just a minute! Is it committee of the whole?

Hon. Mr. Carton: If they want it, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Well it was not unanimous for third reading, so it is up to you to direct where it goes. Committee of the whole House!

Mr. Riddell: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I notice in the Votes and Proceedings, No. 22, that my name is spelled "Riddle"; I wonder if this time, with the recorded vote having been taken, my name could be spelled "Riddell". The pronunciation is correct, "riddle".

Mr. Speaker: We will make sure it is.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

(See page 1177)

An answer to a question was tabled as follows:

5. *Mr. Cassidy*: Inquiry of the ministry: Is it government policy to exclude books relative to the law from the libraries at Don Jail, Carleton Regional Detention Centre and other Ontario correctional institutions? If so, why are prisoners denied the right to learn about the law under which they were jailed; and when does the government intend to reverse this policy?

Answer by the Minister of Correctional Services:

It is not the ministry's policy to exclude books relative to the law from libraries in correctional institutions. All superintendents of regional detention centres, jails and correctional centres have been issued copies of the Criminal Code and have been directed to make the Criminal Code available to inmates who request to examine it.

It should be noted that regional detention centres and jails function primarily as short-term institutions. The main need of inmates in these institutions would appear to be for professional legal advice relative to their individual cases. This is available through the inmate's own lawyer or through legal aid. The ministry's view is that a person should be encouraged to make use of available professional legal advice rather than to try and prepare his own case. If an inmate does not have his own lawyer, he may apply for legal aid.

Posters explaining how to obtain legal aid are posted in inmate corridors.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 24, 1973

Perspectives on income security, statement by Mr. Brunelle ... 1177

Sales tax on energy, statement by Mr. Davis ... 1178

Principles of budget, statement by Mr. White ... 1182

Strike of French-speaking students, statement by Mr. Wells ... 1184

Sales tax on energy, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis ... 1185

Distribution of tax tables, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon ... 1187

Appointment of commission counsel, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Bullbrook ... 1188

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. White, Mr. Winkler and Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sargent, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy ... 1190

Study of payments for medical services, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis ... 1191

Task force on income security, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis ... 1192

Great Lakes discharge of refuse by United States Coast Guard, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Sargent ... 1193

Flight over Escarpment, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lawlor ... 1193

General welfare rates, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Roy ... 1193

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Shulman ... 1194

Gasoline tax rebate for farmers, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Deacon ... 1194

Plant closing of Dominion Auto Accessories Ltd., questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Bounsall ... 1194

Route of new Toronto subway, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Givens, Mr. Cassidy ... 1195

Essex county director of education, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Ruston ... 1195

Use of government aircraft, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Shulman ... 1195

School budgets, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Singer ... 1196

Use of government aircraft, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman ... 1196

French schooling in Elliot Lake, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Roy ... 1197

Linguistic rights commission, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Roy ... 1197

School budgets, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Foulds, Mr. Stokes ... 1197

Presenting report, telephone service commission, Mr. Carton ... 1198

Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Carton, on second reading ... 1198

Recess, 6 o'clock ... 1227

Appendix, answer to question 5, order paper 6, Mr. Winkler ... 1228

No. 28



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 24, 1973

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1973

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

House in committee on Bill 93, An Act to amend the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. Chairman: Bill 93, An Act to amend the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act. Are there any questions, amendments or—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: May I finish, please? To section 1 of the bill?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I hate to flog this but I fail to see how we can prevent—

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Chairman, excuse me, section 1 is just repealing another section.

Mr. Sargent: I'm sorry.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I think probably you will go along with section 1 and your point will be on section 2.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill then?

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Section 2, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Carton: On section 2, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to subsection (2)(b).

Mr. Chairman: Subsection (2)(b). Is there anything before subsection (2)(b)?

Mr. Paterson: Yes, under section 2, the introductory remarks, I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding after the word "section," the following clause numbered "(1) After public notice of a call for tenders" and that the item marked (1) be now numbered (2).

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Sounds very sensible to me.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, if I could speak to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Just a moment. Mr. Paterson moves that section 2 of Bill 93 be amended by adding after the word "section"—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): After what?

Mr. Chairman: After the word "section" the following: "(1) After public notice of a call for tenders," and then the present No. (1) be renumbered No. (2).

Mr. Sargent: Speaking to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, if I may—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may on a point of order, could you tell me exactly where in the amendment is the insertion of the words?

Mr. Chairman: As I see it, it says that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding after the word "section"—you will find the word "section" in the second section, the second line—it is a new subsection (1) really, which reads as follows: "After public notice of a call for tenders." And that the present No. (1) be renumbered No. (2). Any comments on this? The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: The member for Essex South should speak first.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I think most of the debate was carried this afternoon but we in our party feel that contracts of this nature, wherever possible—and we feel that in this instance these types of contracts and contracts in the future—should be called by public tender rather than by invitation.

An hon. member: It makes good sense.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in support of my colleague from Essex South I cannot underline too much the importance of the fact that hereafter all contracts between municipalities and this ministry will have this stamp of approval—that no tender is necessary. It opens a door so wide that what can happen scares me. The minister, as we mentioned this afternoon, will not always be in charge of this ministry and so from here on it's a wide-open door. I cannot understand the minister allowing this thing to happen, knowing his record in public service. It's an insidious thing; it's so powerful and dangerous. It's going to undermine our whole municipal control across the province insofar as tendering on contracts is concerned.

If you allow this bill to go through, in effect you're saying to municipalities that tendering is no good any more. The proposal system, as the Tories in Queen's Park want it, is the ongoing thing now, the yardstick. I think it's so serious I implore the minister to put the safeguard on it, to please consider the fact that we put the safeguards on for the future, because you know and I know, that we never, never come in to repeal these laws. It's on there for a lifetime. I think you'll open the door wide to corruption that we've never seen before.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, would you explain to me where that amendment will appear in the original bill?

Mr. Chairman: I really think, if the mover would allow me, that these words are meant to be inserted in the present subsection (1) before the words, "The minister." In other words, that subsection (1) starts out with: "After public notice of call for tenders, the minister and a municipality may—"

Mr. Gisborn: Will it be part of 87c? That's what we want to know.

Mr. Chairman: Is that right?

Mr. Paterson: That will be acceptable.

Mr. Chairman: This isn't self-contained in itself.

Mr. Gisborn: It doesn't make sense, though.

Mr. Chairman: It may make more sense in there.

Mr. Singer: The minister is a very reasonable fellow.

Mr. Chairman: Is that clear?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, it's clear.

Mr. Chairman: So really, subsection (1) would read: "After public notice of a call for tenders, the minister and a municipality may enter into an agreement to provide—" No, that doesn't make sense either.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, that still doesn't make sense, but I think we all get the point, which is that without any public call for tenders the minister is being authorized to select and enter into agreements. Without being too refined about the wording of it—

Mr. Singer: Rough and ready politics.

Mr. Renwick: —I think there's some merit.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The principle stands.

Mr. Renwick: I know what the minister's answer is. I'd like to move on to another point in connection with that clause. Why is it that the minister, dealing with a specific proposal related to the Metropolitan Toronto area and an experiment in that area, wants to have an ongoing, continuing authority in the bill? This is one of the major points that bothers us about the bill. Can the minister give us his answer as to why he wants a wide-open authority when he is always talking about a limited proposal?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I pointed out that I have an amendment to subsection (2) which I think will answer the member's question. We're dealing now with subsection (1).

Mr. Renwick: I want to deal with subsection (1). This is a wide-open authority from now on for the minister to enter into an agreement with any municipality across the Province of Ontario. My understanding is that what you're talking about when you're speaking about an experimental or demonstration project related to public transportation is the one which has been the topic of the discussion and the proposal. Why does the minister want an ongoing authority to enter into an identical agreement, or a different agreement, about this kind of a project with any municipality across the province?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that presently we have in legislation exactly what you're saying I should perhaps not have in future. We do have that now in legislation. It has gone through the Legislature in the following words: "The

minister and a municipality may enter into an agreement to provide an experimental or demonstration project related to public transportation."

That has been the law for the past number of years. That is, in fact, the law as it stands to date. That was the law that enabled us to have the dial-a-bus demonstration in Bay Ridges, the demonstration project in Sudbury, and the dial-a-bus experimentation that will take place in the northern part of Toronto. It is under this legislation which is presently in the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act.

We repealed subsection (5) which read as follows: "The minister and a municipality may enter into an agreement to provide an experimental or demonstration project related to public transportation." It was wide open. The only words that were added were: "or to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of all, or any part of." As I explained this afternoon, the reason we wanted those words added was, in fact, that parts of the demonstration project at the CNE may not be able to be kept or utilized, and we want to be able to dispose of them. So, basically, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member is taking exception to, is what I know has been the law and is the law as it stands today, until that section is repealed.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): I wonder if the minister might answer why he would not accede to what appears to be a very sensible amendment to this legislation. I heard you before, on the debate earlier in the day, and you mentioned the fact that there was really no problem because you and your red book—unfortunately I never saw the book, but in fact you have had a number of companies which have tendered on this project and slowly you are working down until what you are left with is one, two or three companies left in the whole process.

Mr. Singer: He started with three, he's down to two and he's going to accept one.

Mr. Roy: Yes, well you mentioned I think eight or so companies, and I appreciate that in that field you are somewhat limited in the number of companies which can participate, but the point I want to emphasize is that this piece of legislation does not limit you to having this track around the CNE. You can have all sorts of other experimental projects going on which you have not had tenders for, where you might want to experiment with some other companies. That is the point that concerns us.

We appreciate what you are saying about the fact that in this project you've got possibly two companies in mind, but this legislation does not limit you to what is going to go on for 1975 or whatever year it's going to happen—apparently 1975—in relation to that project and that's what we take exception to. We've seen abuses in the past. It's not as though we are trying to raise a red herring here. We've seen abuses in this field in the past, not necessarily in your department but in other departments, and we're saying that the taxpayers of this province are entitled to the best deal possible and this is why we suggest the question of public tenders.

I think the member for Grey-Bruce makes a good point as well, because you are in fact the minister and this government has been trying to encourage municipalities to be competitive, to have tenders, to get things going to try to save the taxpayers money, and here you're prepared to enter into or accept a piece of legislation which does not call for that.

If the minister was able to assure us here today that this piece of legislation limits him to one project at the CNE I don't think we would have much objection. But this is a blank cheque, so to speak, to enter into all sorts of agreements. Surely the minister must realize that the amendment my colleague brought in is a very sensible amendment.

I don't see any objection. I can't see why the minister would not accept this really, very frankly, and I think the member for Grey-Bruce has made a good point. We might be able to trust you but maybe you won't be around that long. You know, 1975 is coming on and the way things are going you might not be around after, so I suggest to you that if we are passing legislation in this House we should try to pass the best possible legislation.

We are trying to co-operate. We are all in this together, so why not accept our amendment?

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments or questions on this amendment? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I can only—and I think it makes as much good sense as the proposed amendment does—reiterate that there were literally hundreds of components that were examined, that any

company could have made a submission, that in fact eight companies did make submissions, that in fact—

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, I will accept the question.

Mr. Chairman: All right. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I still don't see why we should put all-embracing legislation on the books of Ontario forever to suit this one plan. We are in favour of what you are trying to do but don't give us blanket legislation.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): You voted against the legislation.

Mr. Roy: Don't talk. You don't even understand it.

Mr. W. Newman: You voted against it this afternoon. Don't you forget it.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Sargent: We are in complete agreement with what you are trying to do but don't tie us down forever to a blank-cheque deal. I think you will appreciate what we are trying to say.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): You fellows will remember that for a long time.

Mr. Roy: That's history.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I can only say again that there is no way this could now be put out to tender. I think that anyone with any common sense—and I think you all have that common sense—would agree that there is no possible way this could now be put out to tender. This has not been done secretly. From the time that we instituted this particular demonstration project, from the time that we got into this, the world has known that we are trying to find a new intermediate-capacity system.

Mr. Singer: The world didn't know it until you made the presentation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Do you not agree with me that this legislation does not limit you to entering any agreement on that red book of yours?

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Roy: You are not limited to that, that's the problem.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, again I come back to the fact that there is legislation presently on the books of this province—

Mr. W. Newman: Two wrongs don't make a right.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —and this was passed by this Legislature, that says the minister and a municipality may enter into an agreement to provide an experimental or demonstration project related to public transportation carte blanche. And that is the law.

Mr. Roy: We don't want any more of that!

Hon. Mr. Carton: That is the law.

Mr. Sargent: It is wrong; it is wrong legislation.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Order please.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, that has not been abused; and it has been on the books for five or six years. We have brought in the demonstration of the dial-a-bus project, which is a tremendous success. We have brought in the GO Transit system, which is a great success. Let's have a few pluses for this particular ministry.

Mr. Sargent: But this is for all over Ontario, though.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

All those in favour of Mr. Paterson's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: You stand alone.

Mr. Sargent: You've left the door wide open. You can do anything you want to do now.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order please. The member has had his opportunity.

Mr. Sargent: The minister can just keep on doing what he's doing. Great stuff.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Any other comments, questions or amendments before section 87c(2)?

Mr. Paterson: Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, to move another amendment to that section?

Mr. Chairman: No, you didn't amend any section. You were attempting to add to it and it didn't carry; so there is no section changed or carried.

Mr. Paterson: So that can't be added to?

Mr. Roy: Yes, but he wanted to make an addition.

Mr. Chairman: No, I didn't say that. If you want to talk about subsection (1), you are in order.

Mr. Paterson: Right, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to add after the word "transportation," which is the last word in subsection (1), the words "in the intermediate-capacity transportation system."

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Okay. Confine it to that.

Mr. Singer: Very good.

Mr. Roy: This is going to come back to haunt the minister.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Paterson moves that subsection (1) of section 2 of Bill 93 be amended by adding after the words "transportation" the words "in the intermediate-capacity transportation system."

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to confine this legislation to the specific proposal at hand, which has been spoken about this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I come back to the point that under this particular legislation, which is presently on the books, we can now have demonstration projects relating to dial-a-bus, GO bus or whatever we may want, and we have not abused that. To take away that right and limit it only to the intermediate-capacity system would mean we wouldn't be able to have any more dial-a-bus projects.

Mr. Paterson: We don't trust your successor.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Ottawa, for instance, wants a dial-a-bus demonstration project. The member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) isn't in his seat right now, but were he here I think he would want us to be able to enter into a dial-a-bus demonstration project with the city of Ottawa. We need this to be able to do other things besides the intermediate-capacity system.

Mr. Sargent: Why can't you tender for it?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Ready for the question?

Those in favour of Mr. Paterson's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it. I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Sargent: Like a bunch of sheep.

Mr. Givens: You weren't even listening.

Mr. Chairman: Now, any comments, questions or amendments to subsection (2)(a)?

Mr. Paterson: Yes, I'd like to move an amendment to subsection (2)(a) after the word "corporation" in the first line, which now reads, "The minister may enter into an agreement with a firm or corporation . . ." I would add to that, "and that Canadian content and Canadian technology shall have prime consideration in any such agreement."

Mr. Sargent: That's like motherhood. What does the minister think about that?

Mr. Givens: Vote against that.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Paterson moves that subsection (2) of section 2 be amended by adding after the word "corporation" the following words, "and that Canadian content and Canadian technology shall have prime consideration in any such agreement."

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, we certainly accept the hon. minister's explanation of this afternoon that it was his intent in this particular instance to have approximately 70 per cent Canadian content in these enterprises, but it says nothing about any future development, such as in the case of Ottawa or other areas that the Ministry of Transportation and Communications may enter into. We'd like to have this assurance enshrined in this particular bill.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, that is always the prime consideration, so I accept the amendment.

Some hon. members: Hurrah!

Mr. Chairman: We had better put it to the House then. Shall this motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Chairman, that motion has been carried? Okay. That's great.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): Go on, stand up and talk against it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the flexibility of this government should go down on the record for today, April 24. I think this is incredible.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I have some amendments as well. I apologize to the minister for coming in a minute or two late.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. On which section?

Mr. Cassidy: On section 2, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: To (a), (b), or (c)?

Mr. Cassidy: Pardon?

Mr. Chairman: To (a), (b), or (c)?

Mr. Cassidy: As a matter of fact, mine all came in under new numbering—(3), (4), (5) and (6).

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute now. We aren't quite that far yet. We are still dealing with section 2.

Mr. Cassidy: That is fine. I just wanted to put my claim in, Mr. Chairman, that's all.

Mr. Chairman: We have carried up as far as subsection (b) and I believe the minister has an amendment to subsection (b).

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought the member for York-Forest Hill made a good point this afternoon. I might point out there was never any intention for us to get into a transit system competition with anyone else, and the way that subsection reads I think that could be the interpretation. I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding in subsection (2)(b) the word "demonstration" after the words "part of a," so that the section will now read: "to design, develop, construct, test, and operate all or any part of a demonstration transit system related to public transportation."

Mr. Chairman: Shall this motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything on subsection (c)? Then the member for Ottawa Centre has new sections to add.

Mr. Cassidy: I know that you will accept these amendments as being in order as far as the House is concerned. I am just getting them copied right now and the page will be in in a minute with them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Oh well, we'll wait for you. How long are you going to be? Ten minutes?

Mr. Cassidy: The first one, Mr. Chairman, is that section 2 of Bill 93 be amended by adding a new section, subsection (3)—

Mr. Chairman: Isn't that (d)?

Mr. Cassidy: Pardon?

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute now. Section 2—all right, go ahead.

Mr. Cassidy: It is a bit confusing with the numbering Mr. Chairman—by adding a new section, 87c(3) "All such agreements shall be subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council." This is a requirement that the cabinet approves and the minister cannot go in on his own hook. We have great confidence in the present minister, but given the pending vacancy near the top of the cabinet, this man might not be the minister for very long. We don't know who might take his place—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He might be the next Treasurer.

Mr. Cassidy: —and if it was the Solicitor General, for example, we would insist that it be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Stick to the argument.

Mr. Lawlor: That applies equally to you.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member has a weak argument, he gets down to personalities.

Interjections by hon. members:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, while my colleague is waiting for the amendment to come—

Mr. Singer: Renwick to the rescue.

Mr. Renwick: —perhaps I could ask the minister, is there any significance in the amendment which he introduced in not using the words "experimental" or "demonstration" in the amendment which he proposed to item (b), subsection (2) of section 87c, and also why are those words not equally applicable in item (c)? Would the minister explain why they don't apply to item (c)?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Experimental, Mr. Chairman, would mean something that we are experimenting on; a demonstration is in fact showing. We would operate a demonstration project but probably not operate an experimental project.

Mr. Renwick: And why, Mr. Chairman, do they not apply to item (c)?

Mr. Singer: Out, out damned spot! Yes. Out, out damned White.

Mr. Cassidy: Is it a blue study as opposed to a brown study?

Mr. Singer: Have we got the copies yet? Oh, good.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, they are interchangeable. I would have no objection to adding that "experimental" in section (c).

Mr. Renwick: And the word demonstration in item (c) as well?

Mr. Cassidy: He is adding the word; he is accepting your amendment.

Mr. Renwick: I don't know that he is. I am just curious as to the reason.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The reason, Mr. Chairman, would be that by the time the demonstration project is over and after it has been proved, it then becomes, when it is constructed, a transit system. It is no longer an experimental or demonstration project.

I might mention the purpose of that, Mr. Chairman, is in order that the government may have all the patents, rights, accumulated knowledge, experience, data, knowhow, secret processes, formulae, technology, techniques, procedures, studies, test results, programmes, technical and other information. That is the reason that we want that section in; so that we can have it all-embracing under the umbrella of the government of this province.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Cassidy has moved that Bill 93 be amended by adding the following to section 2, under 87c, a new section, subsection (c) as follows—

Mr. Cassidy: Subsection (3).

Mr. Chairman: Subsection (3), I mean, not (c): "All such agreements shall be subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, if I could just say a word to that now that we do have copies. I hope the opposition have got a copy. The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) indicates that she has a copy which she can make available and the minister has a copy, too.

This is very simple. The point was raised a number of times in the debate and I don't think that the minister really will object to this particular one. It is simply an assurance that the cabinet does approve the expenditures—this is a principle of responsible government. When there are expenditures there should be approval by a board such as cabinet. It is a protection for this Legislature and for the people of Ontario, particularly in view of the fact that the projects which may be approved under the legislation as it stands right now are unlimited in amount, except insofar as there is a limit to what you can define as experimental.

I believe that the costing for the two-mile track down at the CNE grounds is of the order of $15 million or $20 million. That in itself is a very substantial kind of expenditure. It is a quarter of the amount that was to be raised by the energy tax and that certainly should be subject to approval by the cabinet as a whole.

The minister will probably say, "Of course that is going to be subject to approval by the cabinet because it is a matter of government policy." Well, that is fine. What we are saying in this amendment is that since he probably agrees that it ought to happen anyway, therefore let it be a matter of legislation rather than simply a matter of his assurance.

We don't know—and we will come to this in a later amendment—what other demonstration projects the minister has in mind apart from the intermediate-capacity rapid transit project. However, administratively, I would have thought that if the minister is doling out $5,000 and $10,000 on various small projects that can still be given routine cabinet approval without unnecessarily burdening the cabinet process. It still remains as a protection for this Legislature and as an aspect of the collective responsibility which the government has to bear for the project or projects that the minister may undertake. I hope he accepts this one.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question. The member for Ottawa Centre said that the two-mile track at the CNE was going to cost $15 million or $20 million. It didn't cost that much to tunnel the Yonge St. extension. Is that a fact that the two-mile track at the exhibition is going to cost—

Mr. Cassidy: The whole system, not just the track.

Mr. Givens: You said two miles of track was going to cost $15 million or $20 million.

Mr. Cassidy: The whole system including the cars.

Mr. Paterson: That isn't what you said.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): You should be accurate.

Mr. Givens: Even the whole system, Mr. Chairman—is it going to cost $15 million or $20 million for the whole system?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned at the outset of this debate that I would be unable to mention anything because we are negotiating with the two contractors.

Mr. Givens: Where does he get such a figure?

Mr. Singer: You should give us the ball park figure.

Mr. Givens: Give us the ball park figure. I mean, the statement he made is frightening.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: You might as well have kept the seven per cent energy tax.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. That is not under discussion at this point, anyway.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, perhaps before coming to the main point of the amendment I could help the minister whose hands are obviously tied by the fact that negotiations are in progress.

The costing of the three systems in the three cities concerned was of the order of $13 million, $16 million and $17 million a mile. That included rolling stock and it included double-track line. If one assumes that the single-track line—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. That has nothing to do with this amendment.

An hon. member: Sit down.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm just trying to help the hon. member for York-Forest Hill—

Mr. Chairman: Well, it's out of order.

Mr. Cassidy: —in suggesting that the $15 million figure is reasonable. I'd like the minister's reaction on the amendment.

Mr. Lawlor: He looks as though he needs counsel.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have a comment on the first amendment?

Mr. Lawlor: He's breathing hard.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I can hardly make these copies out, but I heard the amendment that the hon. member for Ottawa Centre was referring to. I would merely point out that presently this minister and my predecessors and my successors deal with a budget of some $700 million, and this is—

Mr. Cassidy: Of how much?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Approximately $700 million. And this is rather a large sum of money; it's rather an onerous responsibility. We accept that responsibility and in the light of that kind of responsibility I feel that the minister should be the one who should be able to enter into this particular contract on his own.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on now! Oh, Mr. Chairman, surely at this point, while we're embarking on this kind of fantasy in dreamland, surely the minister must give us something better than that he has grave responsibilities to spend $700 million.

He is embarking on something that has never been tried before. He's embarking on a new Davis memorial. We are going to initiate the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) into something brand new in the world of transportation.

Mr. Givens: Buckminster Fuller.

Mr. Singer: And somewhere out of the blue he should be able to pull a figure. Is it $1 million? Is it $10 million? Is it $50 million? Does the government really need the $65 million that the Treasurer (Mr. White) abandoned this afternoon?

Surely, Mr. Chairman, it isn't good enough to have the minister tell us about his onerous burdens of being a minister of the cabinet. He must tell us how much this silly experi-

ment is going to cost the people of Ontario. Obviously the government is determined to carry this through, but how much is it going to cost us? How much is the government going to waste down at the Exhibition?

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Let the member for Downsview tell us!

Mr. Singer: Well, tell us!

Hon. Mr. Carton: Well—

Mr. Givens: If it's $20 million, it's an awful lot of bread.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: Tell us how much it is.

Mr. Chairman: An answer was given to that earlier.

Mr. Singer: It wasn't an answer at all.

Mr. Chairman: Well, it's the only answer he could give.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the minister have a comment on it?

Mr. Singer: It's none of our business. We have no right to know!

Mr. Givens: The minister will hear about it if it's $20 million.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I merely pointed out—and I pointed this out at the opening today—that there are $7 million in my estimates that relate to this for the year 1973-1974. We will be going into the estimates for my ministry within the next week or two weeks. At that time there will be ample opportunity to debate the $7 million. I signed a contract on behalf of the ministry on the Tobermory ferry in the Grey-Bruce riding for $13 million or $14 million.

Mr. Singer: What's that got to do with it?

An hon. member: An awful lot.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Simply, Mr. Chairman, that the cabinet has faith in this minister.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the minister is asking for a blank cheque.

Mr. Givens: The cabinet has faith? What does that prove?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the minister is asking for a blank cheque, and surely before he is given this blank cheque he should have learned a lesson from what happened here this afternoon. Surely the minister has a responsibility—and he's not a stupid man; he has substantial intelligence.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I agree.

Mr. Cassidy: But misguided, mind you.

Mr. Singer: The minister has a responsibility to tell us how much he has in mind that this fable and fantasy is going to cost the people of Ontario. Tell us what the government is going to waste down at the Exhibition.

Mr. Turner: The member doesn't agree with transportation.

Hon. Mr. Carton: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would again point out that we are presently negotiating contracts with the two remaining contestants.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Those contracts will be signed this week. I am not going to be sucked into any position of divulging anything that is happening vis-à-vis each of the companies that are vying for this contract. That's the last thing that I want to have done.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, that's not the question that we're asking him. We're not asking him for an exact dollar-and-cent figure. Is he talking in the vicinity of $5 million, or $10 million, or $15 million, or $20 million? Surely the people of Ontario are entitled to have that ball park kind of figure? If the minister is not prepared to give us that kind of information, how can we expect that he is going to be honest with the people of Ontario?

Mr. Givens: And while he's at it, has he stopped beating his wife?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I really don't indulge in ball park figures. I just don't.

Mr. Singer: Or any figures.

Hon. Mr. Carton: And Mr. Chairman, when the successful applicant is chosen May 1, both contracts become public documents.

Mr. Singer: After it's done he tells us. Shame!

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Mr. Cassidy: No, Mr. Chairman. For the minister's benefit, I would repeat what I said earlier, that is, that the amount will be $15

million to $20 million. If that estimate is wrong, then I would image it will be higher rather than lower. If the minister wishes to deny that, I suggest that he—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. That has nothing to do with this amendment. All those in favour—

Mr. Givens: I think neither one of you knows.

Mr. Cassidy: However, given the minister's silence, Mr. Chairman, I think that those figures had better stand on the record. The problem that we were raising, though, is not even the expenditure of money down at the Exhibition, it's the fact that the whole system that the province is proposing right now has got some pretty basic and fundamental kinds of inconsistencies. I don't think that the minister, with all of his talent, is really going to be able to justify them when he seeks to, as he did not this afternoon.

I wonder, though, in a more genial kind of tone, whether the minister would accept that this decision about the intermediate-capacity rapid transit project is really something different from a Tobermory ferry or the extension of Highway 599 up in the member for Thunder Bay's (Mr. Stokes) riding or a connecting link to the village of Manotick or the routine kinds of things that he is doing. I wonder whether, therefore, he would accept a slight amendment to that amendment I just offered him in these terms to make it read, that all such agreements requiring an expenditure of more than $500,000 should be subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that by doing that, then we do really single out the intermediate-capacity rapid transit project, because that is the project at which this is directed. I think that not just the minister, but his cabinet, should really take responsibility for that, and more responsibility than is taken just by Management Board saying, "Okay, we'll spend $20 million on it this year," and that kind of thing. We want a decision; we want to see that the man who makes decisions in the seat over there is, in fact, involved and doesn't try to let the minister loose like a rat from a sinking ship—does a rat sink from a ship?—anyway, to let the minister loose, to cut him adrift, if he finds that the minister's pipedreams are not working.

I want to say to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that the comments that we have offered from this side—perhaps different from the comments of the official opposition, who don't want public transit at all—are genuinely directed toward the need for more public transit and toward a much greater investment. They are a reflection of our fear that the minister may have been duped by all of this expertise, because of the noted capacity for even the best paid experts in the world to make some pretty grievous mistakes.

Anyway, would the minister accept a $500,000 limit, so if he wants to give $200,000 for another Bay Ridges project, that's fine? Or if he wants to do some other innovative project, and I would hope there would be a few in Thunder Bay and Sudbury and some cities of the north, rather than always in the south, he's got the freedom to do that and the administrative flexibility. But on major demonstration projects, he would require cabinet approval.

Mr. Givens: The estimate on Ontario Place wasn't—

Mr. Singer: That was when they started.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I cannot accept that, and I will give the hon. member for Ottawa Centre a very valid reason why. The demonstration project for two of his colleagues for the city of Sudbury amount to $3 million.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, so? My colleagues wouldn't object to getting cabinet approval.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The point is, Mr. Chairman, that these demonstration projects that we are presently carrying on relate to other things besides intermediate capacity. We have had this power, this carte blanche power, as you call it, for the last five or six years.

Mr. Lewis: Carton blanche, I think they are calling it.

Hon. Mr. Carton: It has not been abused.

Mr. Singer: Who is to stop it and what's $20 million?

Hon. Mr. Carton: We do have the dial-a-bus which is a project that has received recognition all over the continent. We have the GO system which, despite some people who have criticized it, has been a tremendous success. We have our air demonstration in northern Ontario. We have many demonstrations going on.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question? Those in favour—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, you're in a very impulsive mood tonight, wanting to drive this vote through by your using the powers of the monolith over there. They were so excitable earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Lewis: I just wanted to rise for a moment to say that all of us on this side of the House don't especially appreciate the sophistry of the minister. He is, of course, an able politician—we all know that—and a man who has some tender grasp of his portfolio, although it may be eluding him in this particular circumstance.

But he knows, as everyone in the House knows, that he jeopardizes the contract not for one moment on May 1, to give us a general estimate of the cost. He doesn't imperil the contents; he doesn't imperil concluding the agreement. He doesn't risk any revelation before the fact. He would do himself a service and the Legislature a service and the public a service were he, in the context of this bill, to give us a sense of what the cost would be for this demonstration project.

He may make specious arguments—ministers do in defence of the indefensible—but let him not believe that those of us on this side of the House are somehow taken in by it. For him to say $15 million or $18 million or $20 million doesn't stop him from signing the contract on May 1. It does no damage to those who have submitted contracts to him and certainly won't particularly detract from the excitement of the announcement itself, which he will adorn with all the language and statistics he needs in order to make it a page one, headline story.

What my colleague from Ottawa Centre is putting to the minister is surely valid. The minister is entering into a world that seems to some of us surreal. He casts himself in the role of sorcerer's apprentice. We will see how it works. We are all profoundly sceptical of this venture. I think that he owes it to the opposition and to the public to let us know a little more specifically what is involved. I just wanted to register our concern at this point and very strong support for the contention of the member for Ottawa Centre at the way the minister is behaving.

If I can add a gratuitous aside, it is not in character for the minister. And an even more gratuitous aside from that, this is precisely what is causing the minister's government such harassment day after day—its refusal to come clean in areas of extreme public importance. For some reason, all of the cabinet ministers over there are now addicted to a conspiracy of silence and everything they do of consequence is then reversed.

Mr. Givens: Straight from the Watergate syndrome.

Mr. Lewis: Spadina was reversed, conflict of interest was reversed, election financing was reversed, the Queen's Park complex was reversed, regional government is reversed, the energy tax is reversed. The government is entering into one ill-gotten venture after another, and it is raising such spectres about itself collectively as a government that I don't know what's wrong with it.

Now the government is giving us a piece of legislation for which it wants carte blanche, that it knows in five days time is going to lead it to an expenditure in excess of $15 million on what may well be a totally inappropriate expenditure, an absolute white elephant—a catastrophe in the field of public transportation. And the government won't even condescend to tell us what it will cost at the point at which it is asking legislative approval.

Mr. Singer: Who is to stop it? And what's $20 million!

Mr. Lewis: Well, some would say the government is arrogant. I don't. I just think it is really quite foolish and that all of its members are intoxicated with using the Legislature as a sort of private forum to get things out of the way—and that's not the way the Legislature works.

An hon. member: Oh, come on.

Mr. Lewis: It happens in here day after day. Perhaps the minister can give me an example of another piece of legislation where in effect the government is asking for approval in advance of an enormous expenditure for a project, which is on the face of it questionable and in the substance of it perhaps preposterous.

Mr. Givens: It is not even a project.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is not even a project. I mean I don't mind the government—

Mr. Singer: It's just a ride at the Exhibition, that's all.

Mr. Lewis: I don't mind the government bailing out the CNE, but this is going to inordinate lengths. You know, $15 million to $20 million on a little mini-ride through the CNE seems a bit much and I—

Mr. Givens: Paddy Conklin could do it cheaper than that.

Mr. Lewis: And Paddy Conklin would tell us how much it cost. He would have it to the penny.

Mr. Chairman, I will take my seat. I know that I am intruding on your exemplary patience. The minister is making a mistake. He is signing the contract on May 1 and without jeopardizing its contents one jot, he could tell us in general terms what this project is going to cost the people of Ontario. It bears directly on this—that's why the bill is before us. Is this bill not before us because the minister has to have approval before entering into the agreement? Well, then, why does he ask the Legislature for agreement without giving us an idea of what it will cost?

Mr. Givens: We want to know how much!

Mr. Lewis: What is this business of forever concealing costs?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): We don't like giving the government carte blanche.

Mr. Lewis: We really resist it and that's why we voted against it on second reading. That's why we are moving this amendment. We concur with the government in its wish for public transit, but not these supernatural schemes which the government dreams up—the Premier (Mr. Davis) and Buckminster Fuller and the minister and his associates.

Mr. Singer: McCarthy and McCarthy.

Mr. Lewis: Surely you can give us more substance than this when you are asking for this kind of money. I am sorry we will have to vote against you on this, but it makes no sense your hiding in this case—no sense at all.

Mr. Givens: That's the kiss of death.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party may not have been in the Legislature when I mentioned originally that I presently have power to carry on demonstration projects. The power has been there for the past number of years.

Mr. Lewis: I understand.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Well then, take this out.

Hon. Mr. Carton: And I point out to you, as I pointed out to you when I introduced the bill, that the hon. members do not realize it is not just a case in any demonstration project of giving ball park figures; second, it is a more complete picture than just buying a demonstration project at the CNE—

Mr. Lewis: I agree.

Hon. Mr. Carton: We are buying all the technology, all the knowhow, all the expertise; it will belong to this province. Therefore, supposing—and I just pose this as a supposition to you; you are a man of fairly good sense—

Mr. Lewis: I can handle supposition.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Supposing, for example, that company X had a certain price for the demonstration project, but their price for the other was excessive.

Mr. Lewis: But that's not the point.

Hon. Mr. Carton: It is the point.

Mr. Cassidy: We are simply asking the price—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Carton: We are dealing with two companies, and there is no way, Mr. Chairman, that I am going to jeopardize four years of work by this ministry now that we are down to the wire. I stated at the outset the problem that I had, that I could not compare one with the other or go into the figures. I just cannot do it, because one of them may have been low on the demonstration project, for which you want a ball park figure, and high on the other one—

Mr. Cassidy: But that is not what we are asking.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —therefore, that would not be the one that would get the contract. It is a very difficult question you are asking.

Mr. Singer: What are you spending?

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Mr. Cassidy: No, Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment on the obsessive secrecy of the minister. If in fact he had the power to do this, then I am not sure why he is before us. However, he should be enough of a parliamentarian to realize that sometimes powers given to governments are in fact excessive, and when the legislation comes before us there is time to reconsider whether the situation that prevailed before was justifiable or not.

I guess it would not have crossed the minds of many members on this side of the House that the minister had power to enter into contracts for demonstration projects. However, now that we are seized with the question, we want to do something about it. We think that a mistake was being made; this is a chance to correct it.

What troubles me, Mr. Chairman, is the way in which the minister is acting. We are not asking how much Krauss-Maffei is bidding on this stage, or phase 2 or phase 3, and how much Hawker-Siddeley are bidding on this stage and how much their overall bid is for what might follow, and the same in relation to the other firm. We are asking a very simple question: Are they both between $15 million and $20 million, or between $15 million and $25 million even, or are they both around $10 million?

The requirements for the project are set out in this red book. I would imagine that, in the same way as you don't have to pay twice as much for a Ford car as you have to pay for a Chevrolet car that does about the same thing, the bids are not that far apart; they are within 25 per cent or 35 per cent of each other. Therefore, this is what is known commonly as a ball park figure, which the minister, his experts and everybody else uses day after day; and it would not be too much to bring the House into his confidence—

Mr. Lewis: You can't have much more of a ball park figure than $1.4 billion over 10 years. I mean, that's pretty ball park.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. And that's all we have been given.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing $1.35 billion over 10 years. Let's use our common sense on the approach that has been taken by this government. We are spending X millions of dollars, which are considerably lower by far—and I am not mentioning any figure—to have a demonstration project; and it shows the eminent good sense of this government to have a demonstration project before plunging into a $1.35 billion programme.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: He is intervening.

Mr. Singer: Surely the minister is hoist with his own petard. For some reason that he hasn't seen fit to tell us, he has been advised to come here and ask for another bill. Obviously the section that he is replacing doesn't give him or his advisers enough scope to go ahead. They have chosen to change the ground rules so he comes here and asks for a new bill. He brings us Bill 93.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, it makes abundant good sense that when he does he will come clean with the Legislature and he will be frank and honest with the people of Ontario. When he says it is something less than $1.3 or $1.4 billion, that is something less than frank and honest.

We are entitled to know, Mr. Chairman, how much in round figures this merry-go-round or kiddy-car ride at the Exhibition is going to cost. How much is the government going to spend on what many of us think is this futile experiment? How much of our money are you going to spend?

Today, surely you descended into some pretty deep caverns of humility when your Treasurer had to get up and abandon $65 million for this year and $100 million for next year.

Mr. Turner: We rose to greater heights.

Mr. Singer: If you would be frank and come clean with us, we could find out in what context your Treasurer talks. Should we put on sweaters to protect your kiddy-car ride? Should we make sure that our pets aren't taxed? Should we turn down the thermostats at night? Just what is involved?

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the people of Ontario are entitled to know how much this experiment at the Exhibition is going to cost. The minister has chosen his ground for reasons best known to himself and he comes here and asks for a new bill. Obviously those who advise him think that he hasn't enough authority. He asks for the bill and he's got to face the House with these premises in mind. How much are you going to spend? Tell us.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, just before the member for St. George speaks. The amendment says, "All such agreements shall be subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council." That's really the gist of this amendment.

Mr. Singer: It is the amended motion that we are talking to.

Mr. Chairman: I have had an opportunity to check a later proposed amendment which

deals with some dollar amounts, but certainly this one doesn't.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, if I can comment on this. The minister is being very unco-operative and doesn't see any particular point in amending the original amendment. If you will, this question has now assumed symbolic significance because of the intransigence of the minister. What I want to say to the minister is this.

First, you were refusing to say or to give us some kind of an estimate, not of the overall project—we have a figure on that, $1.3 billion over 10 years—but of the cost of this demonstration project. Perhaps your people don't know; if they don't know then something is seriously amiss within the ministry. I assume that they do know and I assume that you have been informed. This secrecy does not become you well.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the minister and his people chose not to bring forward this legislation which is probably the only occasion on which the decision the minister is about to make will be open to debate in the Legislature. He chose to introduce it last Wednesday, was it?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Two weeks ago.

Mr. Cassidy: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Two weeks ago Thursday.

Mr. Cassidy: Two weeks ago Thursday? All right, in that case I guess I have to blame myself rather than the minister for the way in which it was introduced. I thought it was introduced before.

However, it was printed at the beginning of a short week, Mr. Chairman, and brought in right after the Easter recess—fairly hastily! That isn't being particularly square with the minister although I do acknowledge that perhaps as a spokesman I might have been a bit quicker on the draw.

The third thing, Mr. Chairman, and this relates directly to the amendment, is that the minister is refusing to reveal the amount of this demonstration project, or an estimated amount—which he can certainly do without betraying any trade secrets or anything of either party. We are not asking what each one is bidding. We are just asking how much, roughly, is it going to cost. If you are $3 million over or $3 million under you will be met with warm and generous treatment on this part of the House, I assure you.

Mr. Lewis: Right, because for that government a $3 million error is nothing, either way.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the minister is being covert and secretive even with his own cabinet. He says "I do the Tobermory ferry" and he does the highways and 401 and this kind of thing. But what kind of control of the policy of the minister is there when he lands estimates—I don't have them in front of me—for $200 million or $300 million or $400 million worth of road construction on Management Board's lap? Ministers are busy people; they are politicians; they work in this House; they have their own ministries. They are not going to quibble over $3 million here or $15 million there. They are going to say, "Well, okay, if he says it's all right, it's all right," and Management Board sort of streams it through fairly routinely without thinking about it.

In this case the minister will come to this House after the fact with his estimates in order to talk about the Exhibition—not before the contract is let, but after, according to his present timetable—and, Mr. Chairman, he is not even willing to get approval of cabinet for this proposal, which is a commitment, as I was saying earlier, or is the very strong likelihood of a commitment to the spending of over $1 billion over the next few years on that part of the province.

When you look at it that way, Mr. Chairman, the minister is asking this House to give him the power to make what amounts to an almost ironclad commitment for a particular system on which he hopes the government will spend over $1 billion over the next few years.

My leader suggests that the minister has too many fine qualities to call it arrogance—I don't know what it is. I really think it's inexcusable. I think that the amendment should be accepted and that the minister should not flatter himself that he has such powers of wisdom that he can make decisions of this import to the future of our cities and to the budget of this province, as he intends to make, completely on his own hook and without cabinet approval.

Mr. Chairman: The member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I have some sympathy for the minister. I have found on occasion in the past that there are times when one cannot make, shall we say, a full disclosure, while one is negotiating a contract.

Mr. Cassidy: That is not the point.

Mrs. Campbell: I am aware that that isn't the point, but I didn't interrupt the hon. gentleman down the way. I like to be free to say what I have to say, too.

Surely, there are two things involved in what is before us, Mr. Chairman. Could we know if the minister is in the midst of negotiations with two different companies which have been named in this House? Is the municipality privy to these negotiations at this time, since the whole force and effect of this bill is the power first to enter into agreements with the municipality?

It is important to me, Mr. Chairman, in taking a position on either the bill or the amendment, to know just what is the position of the municipality vis-à-vis these negotiations. Does the municipality at this point in time have ball park figures? Does the TTC have ball park figures? If they do, then, Mr. Chairman, I say that it is absolutely incumbent upon the minister to at least give the same information to this chamber as may be available at this point in time to the municipality and/or the TTC.

Surely in those figures we should have some type of disclosure that can be translated into some sort of consideration without jeopardizing the specifics of the negotiations, which I thoroughly understand. Could I have an answer, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, firstly, the municipality has not been a party to the negotiations, therefore it does not know. The ministry officials, together with legal counsel, have been negotiating and are presently still negotiating at this very hour with both companies. And that is why—

Mrs. Campbell: I am sorry, may I get that clarified? The minister's officials?

Hon. Mr. Carton: My officials—

Mrs. Campbell: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —and my officials only—

Mrs. Campbell: I see.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —along with counsel, have been and are presently negotiating with the two companies involved, and that is why —and I regret this very much—I cannot divulge anything in this House that would jeopardize the bargaining power of the ministry officials with either of the two companies.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Carton: It is not nonsense. Something that may seem harmless to members of this House could convey information to one of the bargaining parties that would give them an inkling as to what may be happening with the other company. There is no way—

Mr. Cassidy: That is nonsense. The figure has come out before. You just won't say it in the House, that's all.

Hon. Mr. Carton: If the figures came out before then I would suggest the hon. member go back to the figures that were related before and have a look at them.

Mr. Cassidy: We'd like to hear it from the minister.

Mr. Lewis: You know to whom you are awarding the contract, don't you? I mean it's April 24. It's probably at the printers.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member for St. George, that the TTC also are not party to the negotiations.

Mrs. Campbell: But do they know what your negotiations are about?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier this afternoon that on the technical evaluation, which is not the bargaining, there are four experts from the TTC who have been involved with some 25 or 30 other experts. That is only on the technical evaluation. The TTC does not know of the negotiations that are presently being carried on by my ministry officials with both companies.

Mr. Givens: This is what you call—

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, if that is the case—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I'm afraid I'm going to have to tighten this up a bit because the amendment says, "All such agreements shall be subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council," and here you're away off base really.

Mrs. Campbell: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't—

Mr. Chairman: The Lieutenant Governor in Council. We've already passed subsection (1) which says, "The minister and a municipality may enter into agreements," so that part of the discussion has been carried.

Mrs. Campbell: But surely, Mr. Chairman, while we are trying to find out what this

minister is proposing in this, and with this sort of amendment before us, we are entitled, with respect, to know further about what type of approval we're apt to be giving at this point in time?

Mr. Chairman: The gist of the amendment is that, "All such agreements shall be subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

Mrs. Campbell: And those agreements relate both to the municipalities and to the government.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It's out of order.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I have a brief question of the minister before we come to a vote on this amendment. There has been some talk of this; is there any possibility that, in fact, you may delay the final awarding of a contract past May 1?

Mr. Lewis: No, not according to the question period.

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: You know who is getting it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. All those in favour—

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I have a point of order. I object, sir, to the fact that you let the member for Ottawa Centre go on for an hour this afternoon and you cut off the member for St. George. That's not fair treatment.

Mr. Chairman: No, I let the member for St. George make her comments.

Mr. Sargent: Well, why don't you run that chair orderly?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. We have to get back to the amendment that's before us.

Mr. Sargent: You'd better sharpen up there.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. "All such agreements shall be subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

Those in favour of Mr. Cassidy's motion will please say "aye.'

Those opposed will please say "nay.'

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Who is the leader over there?

Mr. Lewis: We just want to stack at the end of the bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Reid: You people better practise that standing up.

Mr. Lewis: I didn't think it would be necessary.

Mr. Reid: It is hard to tell which one the leader is.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Does the hon. member for Ottawa Centre have any further amendments?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, on the list that I sent along, I think the principle of 87c(4) has already been covered in the debate that we've covered up to now, and therefore I have only one further amendment which would be 87c(5) (a) to (d). Section 87c(5)(e), if you can follow me, at the bottom of the succeeding page was covered in the amendment that was already accepted by the minister in relation to Canadian content.

Mr. Chairman: You wish to place it? Would you read it and then I'll read it.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I'll read it, Mr. Chairman. The amendment is that the bill be amended by adding the following section—I think it's 87c(5):

(a) In this paragraph, "intermediate-capacity rapid transit demonstration project" means the demonstration project as specified for the Canadian National Exhibition grounds in Toronto by the systems research branch, research division of the ministry.

(b) No agreement shall be entered into under this paragraph until there has been a full public review of the specifications for the intermediate-capacity rapid transit demonstration project as prepared by the ministry.

(c) The public review shall be carried out by an independent commissioner appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council who shall be empowered to call for persons, papers and things and to examine and make public all documents and submissions related to the intermediate-capacity rapid transit project and to hear testimony from ministry officials, the firms tendering for the project, outside consultants to the ministry and from the general public.

(d) The commissioner appointed under this section shall submit to the Legislature before June 24, 1973, or such later date as the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall prescribe, a report—then there is a word omitted—evaluating the proposals required or

being considered by the ministry and advising on the feasibility, technological risks, costs and necessity of each of the innovative features being sought by the ministry.

Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively long and complex amendment. Perhaps I can summarize it for the members very briefly. What this does in effect is tell the minister, "Hold off on your contract for two months from today. There should be a public review at which the work of the ministry effectively over the past four years can be laid before the public; the proposals to the ministry can be laid before the public."

There would be a chance for people who are concerned with this to evaluate what the ministry is doing before embarking on what could be a potentially disastrous or extremely high-cost project rather than afterward, after $20 million is spent for a demonstration project or after half a billion or more is spent on the actual operating system.

The wording of the amendment is all to that purpose, to give the commissioner power to tender a report by June 24 to the Legislature and to try to say in broad terms the things that he should evaluate. Those are specifically the feasibility, the technological risks and the costs and the necessity of each of the innovative features being sought by the minister.

Perhaps I can draw an analogy, Mr. Chairman. Let's suppose that the minister goes down Bay St. in order to look at cars. There are Vegas and there are Cadillacs. He decides that on behalf of the people of Ontario he will buy a Cadillac, with power steering; power windows; power seat; air conditioning; with an enormous wheelbase and huge wheels; a very powerful and thirsty engine—

Mr. W. Newman: Well, he wouldn't have to buy any fuel with the member around!

Mr. Cassidy: I think the minister gets the picture and so does the House. He says, "I'll look at the Cadillac and I'll also look at the top-line Buick and I will make a decision on the part of the people of Ontario as to which to have."

Since he has refused to accept the amendment about cabinet approval he would have the power to make that decision himself. He decides which one to have. The Buick has self-regulating brakes but the Cadillac has a system which automatically dips the headlights and there are a number of differences between them. One is a bit bigger; one is a bit more luxurious and so on but the minister makes his choice. It's essentially between an $8,500 automobile on the one hand and a $9,400 automobile on the other hand. Maintenance costs over the long term may be slightly different. Anyway he has reserved to himself the power to make that decision, if I can continue this analogy.

What this amendment does, Mr. Chairman, is say that perhaps the 2½ or three-ton weight of the Cadillac or Buick wasn't a necessary feature. Perhaps the basic goal, which was to provide economical and efficient transportation, could have been met by one of the compact or subcompact cars available there. They didn't have power steering; they didn't have a computer-controlled injection system; they didn't have self-regulating brakes, or automatically dipping lights, or rawhide upholstery—which I am sure the minister would choose—or various other features like that. But the purpose of this report or evaluation would be, if you will, to protect the minister and the government, and the rest of us who've got to pay, from getting into the Cadillac class, when it may well be that there are other options which the ministry isn't looking at.

Perhaps I can force that over to considering the actual system that the minister has talked about.

I had the chance during the supper break to have a look at the specifications which the ministry sent me late last week. Members will recall that the government wanted a system with a capacity of up to 20,000 people per hour, and that it had wanted a number of other features.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I find from this evaluation study that, in fact, the capacity of the system which is being proposed for the two-mile track at the Canadian National Exhibition isn't 20,000, or 15,000, or 10,000 people per hour, it's 2,000 people per hour. The projected traffic on the network at first will peak at about 1,300 people per hour. The system should be capable of expansion, again not to 15,000 or 20,000 people per hour, but to 4,000 people per hour. That is roughly two-fifths of the capacity of the old Bloor St. streetcar lines in this city, or half the capacity of a well-travelled bus system on arterial streets.

The system will have 10 cars, Mr. Chairman—only 10—and each one will have a capacity of around 20 passengers. The system will be a one-way system; it won't go two ways, it'll just go one way.

The system, with all the technological frills built into it, will have an average speed, according to the ministry, of 22.7 mph. Coincidentally, the speed projected for the new

Spadina subway, whichever route is chosen for it, will also be about 22.7 mph. And the average speed, including taking passengers on and putting them off, of the Yonge St. subway extension past Eglinton is also about 22 or 23 mph. That involves dropping off and taking on passengers from a train that carries 700 or 800 people or more, maybe 1,000, and not from a train which at the most will carry, the minister said, 140 people or, in fact, far less if the cars run on an individual basis.

Mr. Chairman, one final technical point—I won't go much further on this—the cars are to run at headways of as little as five seconds, that is 200 feet apart. As I recall, a car travelling at 30 mph covers 44 feet per second, and therefore that five seconds is equal to 200 feet, and it is a very short distance for these things to travel. I am not technical enough to know exactly how long it takes to stop. I believe it is about 70 or 80 feet, and that means that there are terrific demands, and quite possibly unrealistic demands, being made on the system by the requirements that the minister and his people have laid down.

All we can do is raise questions right now. The minister keeps on beating his chest and talking about the tremendous work that has been done in the ministry. I have had a look at the specifications and I admit that obviously they have thought through the technical details of this system to a fair degree. Whether they have thought through the whole system is another question. I think that is one of the areas which such a public study as recommended in this review would have to settle.

But it has all been done in house, Mr. Chairman. It's all been done behind closed doors up at Downsview or in the minister's office with the co-ordinator sleeping on the couch between bursts of work. The public has not had any access to the kind of thinking that is going on in the ministry. The public until November was not really aware at all of the concepts that were being debated in the ministry. There has been so little information, apart from that original PR presentation. There has been so little information made available that the public has not had the equipment, the information, really to come to grips with what the minister is doing. I think it's significant that this debate here is the first time that there has been discussion or an attempt at full debate on what the minister is intending to do.

If he wants to go to some other country where there's a dictatorship and make decisions that way, that's fine; and if technical experts can advise him, then he can simply go ahead and make them. But, darn it all, this is a different kind of system.

The minister is making a decision which affects a billion dollars or more of provincial spending. What this amendment suggests is that there be the chance to look it over, to see whether the work of the ministry has been valid or not. I'm able to raise questions but I can't find answers, because I haven't been able to get the information so far nor has anybody else. To do it after the fact doesn't make an awful lot of sense.

If I can return to my earlier analogy, it's as if you drove up here to the front, having paid for your Cadillac on behalf of the people of Ontario, and then somebody said, "But, Mr. Minister, didn't you really only need a Vega, in terms of what people actually require for transportation in and around the city?" Once you've laid out your money, there's a no-refund kind of policy from the people who are putting up the bids for this particular project. You can't get the money back. You're sunk, you're in it and you're in it deep just as the Treasurer was in it deep. The minister can't even get out as easily as he can because the Treasurer can say, "Okay, we won't raise that tax." In the minister's case, he will have hardware there and he can dismantle it, but I must say he is going to look awfully bad, if that's what's going to happen.

I admit that enough money can make any kind of system work. I admit also that there is a seductive attraction, particularly to people with the class interests, if I may say so, of people of the minister's party, to this kind of "press a button and go all the way from Malvern downtown and don't stop to pick up the plebs" kind of system that the minister is designing. There are certain seductive features to it. But it seems to me that at the very least we may be picking up a champagne system when he ought to be looking at it from the point of view of a beer budget.

So this is designed, Mr. Chairman, to raise those questions by ensuring that there can be a public review. Two months, given the slippage which has taken place already, are not going to be that extreme. The government had intended, if I can recall the timetable, that the selection of a system would be made by April 1 and that the specifications for final design would be out by May 1. The minister is running a month or so behind.

To bring the public into his confidence and to ensure that, if the government is going

to go ahead, they have looked seriously at what they are getting into, and that they have looked seriously particularly at the extra cost dictated by this desire for personal rapid transit rather than simply a new mode, a new technology for lightweight rapid transit without all of these kinds of luxury features, the extra months' delay would be well worthwhile, and I hope the minister accepts this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask—and I'm not being facetious—does the hon. member have any alternative system?

Mr. Cassidy: I'll speak to that, Mr. Chairman, since the minister chose to raise it. I have a number of alternatives that have been put to me in the course of work that I have done in trying to evaluate what the minister is trying to do. As the minister is aware, as I think he may have had a meeting, a group of people in Ottawa are suggesting that something like 50 or 60 miles of monorail to serve the entire national capital region, including Hull and Gatineau Point, and so on, on the Quebec side, could be built for a sum of money very little more than the amount suggested for 12 or 13 miles of the system proposed by the ministry.

I don't know whether that's correct. I have certain questions in my mind about their particular proposals. However, some of the points that they raised I think are very valid, Mr. Chairman. One of the points they raise is that they want a system where the line costs are cut down by the elimination of switching, the elimination of offline loading. The trains will simply run on a fixed network without switching, apart from the switching needed to get to maintenance yards, which need not be at high speeds.

They have certain concepts in terms of the savings in money that can be done by operating a free fare system, which I think is important to consider. Once they eliminate switching, then it is possible to run the system on a block signal rather than a computer monitoring system with relatively short headways of a minute or so, which are not going to greatly extend the waiting time of the trains. As the minister has already said, his trains will run in seven-car units with 140 passengers or so. Their suggestion is for maybe 300 passengers per train—something like that.

The system they propose has ultimate capacities up in the 40,000 or 50,000 range, as opposed to the 20,000 the minister talks about and the theoretical capacity of 15,000 that the specifications talk about for the system selected for the CNE, and the actual capacity of this system of only 12,000, Mr. Chairman—because it says specifically here that the design capacity will be 80 per cent of the theoretical capacity.

Now, I think they raise a number of good points. They estimate that, by eliminating switching, eliminating the offline loading, eliminating the computer controlled system and having block signal control, they can cut 30 or 40 per cent from the cost of their system—or for that matter other systems such as the Krauss-Maffei or Hawker-Siddeley system.

In other words, they could provide a service which may take two or three minutes longer from the extremities to downtown, but on the other hand provide so much more service to the Ottawa public than what the minister is proposing that its net overall effect is much more favourable in terms of effecting a switch from automobiles to public transit.

Now, as I say, even the technology that they talk about, which is monorail, is not essential to some of the concepts they have raised. It could even be applied if the minister uses some of the new technology that he wants to use.

In the long run it is possibly more workable, requires less maintenance, or creates less noise and is therefore more acceptable in an elevated mode.

Another alternative which I think requires very careful consideration, Mr. Chairman, is the concept that is known as light rapid transit. Light rapid transit is a development, if you will, of streetcar technology. It is based on high-speed electric vehicles which have been developed, or evolved, if you will, from streetcars like the PCV or PRV—whatever the Toronto streetcars are called now—and that was the most successful model ever used in North America.

Light rapid transit relies on wider station spacing on a reserved right of way. It achieves average speeds the same as those of the system proposed by the minister. It can be built for costs which are about a third less, I believe, than the costs that have been estimated by the ministry in announcing systems for Toronto, Ottawa and Hamilton.

It is much more flexible, it need not be built all at the same time, nor need it all be built in the elevated mode all at the same time.

Particularly in Toronto, light rapid transit

is compatible both with certain kinds of subways and also with streetcars. It would be possible, for example, to have a Queen St. line—and I hope the minister is listening carefully to this because it makes a lot of sense; it comes out of the Toronto Transit Commission planning and suggestions.

A Queen St. underground subway running for three or four miles, whatever there has to be, would then lead into light rapid transit lines to Downsview, possibly to Malton, or maybe it is to—I am sorry, there is another line out there which the ministry projected in its intermediate-capacity rapid transit system —and also along the present reserved right-of-way of the Lakeshore street cars.

In the east end there are rights-of-way available to take cars which could join into trains through the Queen St. subway and then split up to provide light rapid transit service with the required intermediate capacities and high speeds out to Malvern, up Don Mills Rd. and out in the direction, I suppose, of the Scarborough Expressway; or let's hope the never-to-be-built Scarborough Expressway. In other words, a very substantial portion of the system, which the minister wants to cover with intermediate-capacity rapid transit using his new technology, could be met with existing technology that has more than 50 or 60 years of history and development behind it. This is in the form of lightweight articulated vehicles that could also be automated, could also run at short headways, could also be run without drivers if necessary, and could also lend themselves to automated fare collection systems. They could provide about the same kind of speeds and standard of comfort, and in æsthetic terms could be made very similar.

It boggles the mind that because light rapid transit is not a proprietary system coming from one particular manufacturer but because the transit systems in Europe and North America that have used it have tended to be their own entrepreneurs in developing light rapid transit for their own particular needs, the ministry wouldn't consider it for the situation here in Ontario.

I don't know whether light rapid transit would fit Ottawa conditions, but it's quite possible that it would. It's clear that light rapid transit, which is also faster to build and less prone to technological risk, could provide some pretty significant solutions in the Toronto area an awful lot sooner. In my examination of the ministry's study of various systems that were available a couple of years ago, I noted that the section on steel-wheeled, dualrail systems contained no printout on light rapid transit. There was no printout at all; I'm not sure why. The minister might have an explanation for that. This system now is in use in 20 or 30 cities and certainly is useful here. Why isn't the minister considering alternatives like that? The monorail itself may or not—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order please.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, the minister asked a question.

Mr. Chairman: Then the question was out of order because this amendment has nothing to do with all the other alternative systems. This is information which I think could be exchanged in a private dialogue at some other time between the hon. member and the minister, quite frankly.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Let's get back to this amendment.

An hon. member: You'd better sit down.

Mr. Cassidy: Okay. I've been making a case for public review. The minister asked what all the alternatives are. They should come out during the course of a public review. They are not coming out right now, and one of the purposes of this debate is to ventilate an issue like this before the minister makes a pretty crucial decision.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have comments on this amendment?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, firstly, I would like to make two corrections with respect to the demonstration project at the Canadian National Exhibition. We are only purchasing a certain number of vehicles for that demonstration project. That is why there are X number of vehicles, which is understandable and makes abundant good sense. It is a one-way system, as the hon. member stated, because we do not need a two-way system for demonstration projects or experiments; and the speed is 50 miles per hour.

Mr. Deacon: I thought the minister said it was just an experiment.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The maximum speed is 50 miles per hour. The speed of 22.7 miles per hour was taken out of context; that's the average speed related to curves and grades which we're doing the testing on.

The hon. member made some remarks a

moment ago about why not this and why not that. He mentioned no switching. No switching results in an inflexible system; it results in many passenger transfers, making it unattractive to the users. Both the systems—in other words, the one that the member is mentioning and this one—can carry up to 20,000 passengers per hour per direction.

Light rapid transit has been reviewed, based on information supplied by the TTC. All advantages claimed for the light rapid transit system also apply to the intermediate-capacity system, but the intermediate-capacity system also offers us advantages that the light rail doesn't. It offers greater flexibility, fewer environmental problems of noise, etc.

Mr. Chairman, basically what I am trying to say is that over the course of the last three years we have had about 30 to 35 experts from all over the world zeroing in on a new intermediate-capacity system that will be utilized in this province. And I think I owe it to this House to tell the hon. members some of the factors that have been studied. I feel it is incumbent upon me now to go into detail and show what has been taken into consideration, rather than just saying that the minister took a trip around the world and looked at three systems and picked them out.

First of all, I mentioned this afternoon the experts that are engaged in this. Apart from the ministry experts, we have the experts from the TTC, which is acknowledged as being one of the outstanding transportation groups by the members of the opposition.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister has the technical experts but not the planning experts.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The technical experts, and that's what they have been doing all along.

Mr. Cassidy: But not the planning experts.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Technical experts.

Mr. Cassidy: Not the planning experts?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Well this is what we are talking about now, technology. The member is talking planning.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is talking about planning as well.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Let's talk technology, which is the basis of this demonstration project—technology. Apart from the experts I just mentioned—and I won't go into all their names again because they are a matter of record—we have experts on each particular phase of this particular project, whatever the phase may be. I gave the member the names this afternoon.

Now, dealing with evaluation criteria—and this is what has been going on over the past number of months, evaluating these two systems. On system performance: The technological assessment of this system and the subsystems in terms of feasibility of design, quality of design, and integration of all subsystems; suspension and guidance; switching; propulsion and motor control; including electrical braking, mechanical braking; coupling; power collection; power distribution; command and control; vehicle body and passenger compartment and guideway.

Under flexibility: Flexibility of the application; the range of capacities up to 20,000 passengers per hour per direction; the range of vehicle sies; the range of operating strategies; line-haul service, with stops at all stations, express service, personal service; the geometric constraints; the operating flexibility, meaning the transitions in service level, ease and range with which changes in speed and train spacing may be effected; ease of coupling; the network expandability, the potential for higher speed, the freight handling.

Safety for the users: The users' safety, strongly dependent on the command and control system, the failure modes and effects analyses; the design for safety (failsafe design, redundancy, interlocking, etc.); the safety for the bystanders and the trespassers; safety for the maintenance and operating personnel.

Under reliability: Equipment reliability; availability; cycle time to failure; mean time to restore service; all-weather reliability; snow, ice, wind, rain. The environmental effects: Pollution emissions, noise and vibration. Aesthetics; space requirements; the user attributes, the time and convenience factors largely related to command and control, the ride comfort.

The system cost; the future revenue system, capital costs excluding right of way; the CNE demonstration system; the company criteria; the long-term contractual agreement; the data rights; the licensing and royalties; the competitive bidding; the ability to deliver; project management capability; the level of commitments, i.e. performance time, contracted cost, and status of the hardware development.

Those are the criteria for these particular systems, Mr. Chairman, that 30 to 40 experts have been examining over the past number of months. The result of the evaluation of

eight systems was the elimination of five, and then one withdrew. These are the things that have been gone into by the experts over the past many months, nay years, because they started this search, as I say, three years ago.

Now obviously this does not preclude other considerations. As a matter of fact, one of the members of the party of the member for Ottawa Centre brought me a particular system that he thought had some merit. We are looking at everything. One does not close one's eyes; one does not become blinded; one goes ahead and one looks as one goes along. All I can advise the hon. member is that this has been one of the most stringent and one of the most dedicated appraisals.

There was mention this afternoon of this contract. I only wish that the members of this House realized the time and effort expended—and I am not just talking about the 9 to 5, I am talking weekends, I am talking midnight until 3 and 4 in the morning—in coming up with the particular evaluation that we said we would meet, as the member for Ottawa Centre mentioned, by April 1. It is now May 1, and we will meet it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am simply stating that we have done everything possible. We have engaged the best experts in the world. We have used what I call the only way that one could arrive at a proper system—in other words, by having a competition which is akin to a tender. And this will result in our having the successful applicant named on May 1, and that is why we have this bill before the House.

I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that I did not need this particular bill had it just been a demonstration that we were going ahead with it. As I stated at the outset, the reason that we had to bring in this bill, very simply and very basically, was that we want to have all this within the power of this province, we want to own the rights, the technology, the expertise, the knowhow, the patents, and everything that goes along wit it. So, Mr. Chairman, with that, I cannot go along with the member's particular amendment. Again, I would point out that we are not committing anything by passing this bill. The expenditures will be before the House during my estimates.

Mr. Cassidy: After you have signed the contract?

Hon. Mr. Carton: One has not seen the contract. One does not know what is in the contract. One does not know what escape clauses may be in that contract. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, when one does not know, one cannot question what may be in them.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. Cassidy: No, I am not. Mr. Chairman, the minister says if only the members on this side of the House—and I presume he is speaking to his own backbenchers—could realize the time and the effort and the concern and the commitment that have gone into the evaluation of this project over the last three years.

There's a very simple way and it is provided for in this amendment—or some elaboration of it or some other kind of technique—by which, in fact, before the minister enters upon this contract, we would see the evaluation; we would see the process through which he has gone. He has not done that.

He has been working behind closed doors and therefore to try to palm off this House by saying if only we would appreciate the dedication—of course, they are dedicated! Sure, and I think they are probably having a ball. They are having fun going ahead and evaluating this and really getting into their various technical specialties.

The minister wants the House to be impressed by the list of features which are being evaluated, the sub-systems and that kind of thing which he very carefully read out to the House. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I would be surprised if they weren't doing that. I really would be, considering the extent of the investment which may flow from this.

What I am worried about, though, is that the big picture may be overlooked in all of this. I will give to the minister an illustration of this which I believe is accurate. In November, after, I believe, about three years of evaluation on the part of the government of these various systems, they were down from 250 to eight and eventually to three. The three you had were two systems which were prototypes or had never been tried or whatever. Anyway, there were two systems, which have at least hung in to the end, and a third system from Ford Motor Co. I guess you would call it a kind of a sky bus and it was subsequently withdrawn.

What impressed me about the Ford proposal was that apparently the prototype, which they had in service or else was, I believe, projected to be in service before very long in a new satellite city in the Detroit

area, had a maximum speed of 12 mph. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I believe it is 30, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, 12 mph is the figure that I have. Possibly that's the service speed; the average speed. At any rate, 30 mph is a far cry from the 45 to 60 mph which the minister—

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly why they withdrew from the competition. They didn't want to meet our criteria.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the point, though, is how on earth could this process of evaluation by all of these experts—with all of the expertise that the minister has been crowing about today in the House and at other times—have led them to come up with a system whose developer said, "We really don't think our system is capable of getting up to the kinds of requirements you have. Anyway, we are interested in something else"?

The degree of interest in other things on the part of Ford Motor Co. is debatable. I don't know; I am not privy to their internal councils. Certainly one of the things that obviously affected them was the extraordinary difficulty, if not the impossibility, of operating their system in order to meet the ministry's standards. How, then, could these experts have got to the point of putting Ford on the final short list of three? I don't know but that bothers me.

It seems to me again, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is totally enamoured of technology and he is not looking at—I don't know what you'd call it—the big picture. He is not looking at whether all of this technology is, in fact, necessary or desirable.

It would be nice to prove to the world that Ontario can be the first or second place in the world to have computer-controlled monitoring of these vehicles. That would be nice but at what cost, Mr. Chairman? How does that cost relate to the needs on a system of intermediate capacity?

The Victoria line in London to which the minister referred has, I believe, a capacity of something approaching 50,000 or 60,000 passengers per hour. It is an incredibly busy line and I presume that the trains must of necessity travel with very short headways in order to carry the kinds of loads that are carried by public transit in the city of London. Well, the line from Malvern through to Union Station is not quite the same as the Victoria line.

The minister states in answer to my comments about light rapid transit that the intermediate-capacity transit system does everything that light rapid transit does. I can reverse that and suggest to the minister that light rapid transit therefore does everything that intermediate-capacity rapid transit does with one exception, which the minister mentioned. That exception is that it is probably more environmentally acceptable to have an intermediate-capacity transit system than to have light rapid transit.

Well, fine. It would be more acceptable to me to drive a new car than to drive one that is five years old. However, I choose my priorities. And the minister is not coming clean because we have no means of judging what will be the cost of this one feature which he chose to mention in the House, the environmental acceptability—i.e., relatively less noise created by the proposed systems that he is considering.

If the minister can get the new systems and get them in for the same price as light rapid transit, then he should by all means go ahead. If they can come in possibly for a million or two more a mile and have slightly lower operating costs and more sex appeal to passengers—fine, that might be okay too.

But on the other hand, let's suppose that the minister can get twice as many miles of light rapid transit, if we want to engage in that one, for the same price as intermediate-capacity transit systems in the city of Toronto or elsewhere in the province. Let's suppose he can get twice as many miles for the same price, and that by the time you look at operating costs and other things like that the subsidies per passenger are the same—or even that the overall subsidy for a greater number of passengers on a bigger system would be the same as for one of the new systems that have been proposed.

At that point the environmental argument breaks down. You can't pay an infinite amount for noiselessness. At some point in effect you have to make a choice; you have to put a price on it.

Maybe it is worth $1 million or $2 million a mile, Mr. Chairman, but it would be nice at any rate if this House had information before it to enable it to judge whether the noiselessness that the minister wants is going to cost $1 million or $2 million a mile or $5 or $10 million a mile. If it is going to cost $5 or $10 million a mile, Mr. Chairman, then

I would say to the minister that we won't accept that, because we would feel that the government had got itself off on a technological limb and was not spending the taxpayers' money fairly and efficiently. We would feel the government was denying many people within the city of Toronto and other parts of the province transit service that it could have provided if it hadn't insisted on gold-plated standards and was, in fact, contributing to the overall level of urban noise, because the areas not serviced by the new system would continue to generate noise-producing automobile traffic, which could be avoided with the supposedly noisier LRT system that might cover far more miles.

I wonder specifically whether the minister would agree to table in this House the studies of light rapid transit that have been done with the Toronto Transit Commission and could he say when those studies were made, and by whom.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I'll check into that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the minister know when that study was made? Was it made in the last few months? Or was it made two or three years ago? Or was it made five years ago?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Chairman. All I'm advised is that it was made.

Mr. Cassidy: In other words the minister himself has not been seized with it and has not really come to grips with it?

Well, will the minister agree to table those studies when they can be dug out from their dust-infested files?

Will the minister agree?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, the minister advised the hon. member, and he full well knows, that he can go up to Downsview and speak to the ministry officials up there and any of the material that he wanted would be available.

Mr. Cassidy: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, the minister has just gone through an elaborate and unnecessary exercise in the House, denying the House even a ball park estimate of the cost of the projected demonstration project down at the CNE. As the minister knows I have made a number of attempts to go to Downsview and they have so far been unsuccessful.

I will be happy to accept his invitation. However, I think he is dissembling, after denying information to the House, to tell me that as an individual member I can go and get any information I want from his people at Downsview.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I have not denied information to the House.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister has.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I have explained to the hon. member and he is being very devious. He knows at the outset I pointed out that I would in no way jeopardize negotiations that were presently going on. I cannot; I would be abdicating my responsibility as minister if I did so, and I have no intention of being lured into that.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions?

Mr. Cassidy: No, Mr. Chairman, just to conclude that point, I think it has gone on long enough. The minister—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We are becoming very repetitive now, so just—

Mr. Cassidy: No, just come back to the minister—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! If the member has something to add, he may continue. If it is repetitive, then no.

Mr. Givens: Why doesn't the Chairman apply closure on the member?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I simply don't understand what the minister is saying. He seems to be saying that I can have information at Downsview that he isn't willing to reveal to the House, and I don't really understand how that jibes at all.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Those in favour of Mr. Cassidy's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost.

Any further comments, questions, or amendments to any other section of this bill? Then we have one motion to dispose of.

Call in the members.

The committee divided on Mr. Cassidy's amendment, which was negatived on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 30, the "nays" are 54.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost; and the bill as amended shall be reported.

Bill 54, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1973

Mr. Walker, in the absence of Mr. Grossman, moves second reading of Bill 96, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, 1973.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the parliamentary assistant, the hon. member for London North (Mr. Walker), is going to pilot this bill through the House, I wonder if the House would agree that the member might sit on this side of the House for that purpose. I think it will facilitate debate.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): He has our agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Do the hon. members agree?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is going to go to all their heads over there.

Mr. Speaker: Do the hon. members agree to that?

The hon. member for London North may then be seated on the other side of the House. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think that we would benefit from some preliminary remarks on behalf of the government by the parliamentary assistant. The complexities of the bill, dealing with mutual funds and so forth, is one area that in my view would benefit from some elucidation; and I would ask the parliamentary assistant if he would be prepared to make some preliminary remarks before we go further.

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): Mr. Speaker, basically, the amendments contained in Bill 96 are housekeeping amendments.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): We sure have heard that line before.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well, he's on his way to the top.

Mr. Walker: Section 1 in Bill 96 is basically an approach to avoid double taxation in respect of mutual funds. The other matters are truly housekeeping and basically redefine matters relating to the property tax credit, involving the definitions of occupancy cost in section 2; in section 3 principal residence; and regarding foreign diplomats, in section 4, excluding them from the benefits accruing under the property tax credit system where they do not pay income tax; in section 5 allowing for the seizure by the appropriate federal minister of the tax credit where there are other liabilities or responsibilities; and in section 6, in respect of life tenants related to section 2 and section 3.

With respect to the amendment to section 3, which is paragraph 1 of Bill 96, mutual funds are, of course, taxed at present in two particular circumstances. They're taxed when the benefit accrues to the mutual fund; and secondly taxed as a capital gain to the individual unit holder when they are distributed to him as a dividend. This will avoid a double taxation by allowing for a refund, to the mutual fund, of the capital gains tax that it would have paid.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If it's all right with him it's all right with me.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I was fascinated by the explanation that was given. Would the parliamentary assistant give us a mathematical example of the proportion which is contained in section 1 of the bill? It's so abundantly clear from the language that it would be helpful for all of us to understand that mathematical proportion more clearly.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I can give both the—

Mr. Speaker: I should point out that on the second reading of the bill, the debate should be completed by all members who wish to participate. Perhaps if the hon. mem-

ber for Riverdale has any other comments he would like to make?

Mr. Renwick: I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, to perhaps avoid the bill having to go into committee in order to obtain that explanation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: I take it that, in fact, the budget is correct, that this is of minimal revenue significance to the Province of Ontario and that it's introduced for the purpose of paralleling in the Income Tax Act of the Province of Ontario similar provisions which are contained in the federal Income Tax Act. I take it that that's the principal reason for the mutual fund provision.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, it is not.

Mr. Renwick: Now with respect to the property tax reduction, the only point in it that I could ask for some comment about is that I see now that the Treasurer is required to apply it not only to any arrears of income tax of the taxpayer before he gives consideration to actually paying it to the taxpayer, but he is also required to apply it to any arrears in which the taxpayer may be with respect to the Canada Pension Plan or with respect to any obligations which he may have under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

I can, perhaps, understand why the Treasurer would not refund the tax directly to the taxpayer with respect to interest charges and other penalties which he is obligated to pay under the Income Tax Act of Canada or of the Province of Ontario. That seems to me to make very good sense. But if the Province of Ontario is granting a credit to a taxpayer in Ontario with respect, for practical purposes, to his Ontario portion of the federal income tax, I do not see any reason he should be required to have it applied first of all to any amount that he may owe under two other federal statutes, namely, the Canada Pension and Plan and the Unemployment Insurance Acts, both of which are federal statutes.

We all know that at the present time, once an application is made of an amount of money otherwise due to a taxpayer to meet other liabilities of that taxpayer to the government, the possibility of the taxpayer contesting the right of the government to so apply it is minimal with respect to Canada Pension Plan payments and with respect to unemployment insurance payments.

There are procedures by which he can appeal matters with respect to income tax application of funds otherwise due to him. With the present operation of the unemployment insurance plan there is no real way in which he can claim to get the money back because there is no recognized appeal procedure.

It would seem to me that while there is justification for providing that, before paying to the taxpayer the credit accruing to him, the Treasurer may apply it against moneys which are due under the Income Tax Act, there appears to be no justification for amending this Act to provide for the application of those funds by the Treasurer of Ontario to amounts which are stated by the government of Canada to be owing under the Canada Pension Plan or under the unemployment insurance plan, having regard to the very poor administrative appeal procedures available to a taxpayer under both the Canada Pension Plan and the Unemployment Insurance Acts.

That is not to cast any reflection upon the validity of the basic principle of the Canada Pension Plan or the unemployment insurance plan. I certainly don't think that the Treasurer of Ontario, with money in his hands otherwise owing to an Ontario taxpayer, should first of all look to the federal government to have the federal government tell him whether that taxpayer owes money to the federal government with respect to the Canada Pension Plan or unemployment insurance.

It would appear to me to be perfectly clear that the government of Canada can look after itself with respect to collecting moneys due from a taxpayer under the Canada Pension Plan and under the Unemployment Insurance Acts without having an assist from the Treasurer of Ontario about a credit which is established in Ontario for Ontario taxpayers with respect to the income tax liability of Ontario citizens to the Province of Ontario for income tax which is collected by the federal government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So say we all.

Mr. Renwick: If I were to go on, if it weren't this hour of the night, I would almost feel that we had hit upon a matter of basic principle.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North was first.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say a

word regarding this principle whereby credit accruing to an Ontario taxpayer may be used for the purpose outlined by the previous speaker, that is to pay any deficiency in federal income tax, unemployment or Canada Pension payments.

The principle is deficient in this bill in that it does not provide that the first and basic purpose for which that credit should be used is to apply it to any arrears of municipal taxes. If there are arrears in municipal taxes it precludes the possibility of the person making that application in the first place—

Mr. Lewis: It should not be applied to anything.

Mr. Good: —with the result that those who need this tax credit most cannot receive the benefit if they have not paid their municipal taxes. And if they have not paid their municipal taxes and they are paid in the following year, then they can apply for the tax credit covering the two years' taxes. But the person then loses the one basic $90 credit which he would have had in each of the two years if it's applied to one year.

It has been brought to my attention already at this early date, in the first year of operation, that in the case of some families —and I am speaking in particular of one instance on welfare—and senior citizens unable to pay their taxes in 1972, the welfare department has now made arrangements where both 1972 and 1973 taxes will be paid in 1973, but the person who needs the payment most is losing the $90 basic tax credit for 1972.

The principle here is very deficient, in that this money can be used to pay federal charges against a person; but the one basic charge, which is a municipal charge and one in which the property tax credit should first apply, is completely neglected. I think this is a great deficiency in this legislation. I have spoken to the people in the department about it, they agree that there is a deficiency here, and I think the principle of this bill should be changed so that it includes that one point.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It's good enough for him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, there is just one area in which I would like to make a few comments, and that is with respect to subsection (3) of clause 2. Now, in subsection (3) I note from the explanatory notes that there is a definition which is changed; in addition, it provides, as the notes say, "for the exclusion from eligibility for a property tax credit of foreign diplomats who are exempt from income tax."

It would appear that in a situation where visiting professors are involved at various universities and colleges, there are on occasion exemptions given from the payment of income tax or arrangements made for other tax advantages, much in the same form, I presume, as foreign diplomats are taken care of. If these exemptions are given for, say, a two-year term, occasionally we have seen that the presumed visiting professor decides to extend his or her visit and remains within the country, having had a certain benefit, especially with respect to tax payments.

I am wondering if the parliamentary assistant might consider the problem of persons such as certain visiting professors who receive this additional benefit, which may not prove to be recoverable when they change their minds and decide to remain.

It is understandable that a foreign diplomat may be posted to or from Canada on fairly short notice; this is part of the job. But I think that where a visiting professor is involved, it may be more a matter of personal decision than the requirements of the job to remain in the country. If that personal decision does take place, it would seem unrealistic to me to allow this tax benefit to continue if in fact the advantage which has been given to this individual because of a presumed short-term commitment is now extended to the individual's advantage by that person's own decision.

I think that if some consideration were given to that possible abuse, the section could better resolve the problem that you are attempting to solve.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise one point with the parliamentary assistant, and it has to do with the definition of occupancy cost. I have been in touch with the minister and I would have hoped that, at this time, when we are amending the bill, the definition would be more clearly defined and that some of the inequities were taken out of what occupancy cost means.

If I might cite an example of a person who lives in his own dwelling, he is allowed to use only that portion of his cost which is purely taxes, whereas a person living in an apartment and who probably has heat supplied and water supplied and parking supplied, this is calculated in his rental agreement and he takes 20 per cent of this portion, and he does then get an advantage over a person who is living in his own home. And then you have a third category of a person living in an older apartment who pays rent and who pays hydro and who pays water outside of his rental factor, and these figures for water and hydro are not taken into consideration when calculating his 20 per cent rental.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Good point.

Mr. Germa: So it seems to me that the person who gets the major advantage, and gets a disproportionate advantage, is the person who lives in a newer highrise apartment, where all services are included in the total rental package. He, in fact, is being subsidized for hydro, water, parking and maybe a steam bath and maybe a common room and swimming pool, and all the amenities which go with highrise living.

I just wondered what the parliamentary assistant would have to say on this. Has the minister taken this into consideration? And why weren't the proper amendments made here to more equitably define what occupancy costs really are?

Mr. Bounsall: Good point. Spell it out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, there is great difficulty in interpreting certain points in relation to the benefits that come back, insofar as they discriminate as between married couples and people who are living together who are not married.

As I try to work my way through clause 2, it seems to me that the government is carrying forward the principle that if a married couple is going to be entitled to claim any rebate, then they must take into account, even though they are both working, the higher salary of the two spouses. If the husband is making more money than the wife, and he is making a sufficient amount of money so that his income would not entitle him to any rebate, notwithstanding what kind of a salary the wife might be making, the rebate is gone.

Now, by contrast, if two people are living together, both their incomes can be taken into consideration, and they can benefit from the lower income, and distribute whatever benefit comes back as between themselves.

This was drawn forcibly to my attention by a young lady who finds herself in this position—and I see nothing in this statute that changes it at all; in fact it makes it even more clear. She pointed out to me that even though she had a reasonable job she wasn't making as much as her husband and therefore they were denied any possibility of getting any benefit back from such a claim in dollars and cents. She came to the conclusion that, if she divorced her husband but continued to live with him common-law, because of the unusual wording of this statute she would then be entitled to claim a rebate which she is not now entitled to claim.

I have—not with me tonight but I will have them when we send this bill to committee—the extracts from the instructions that are given which bear this out. I have tried to relate the definitions in section 2 to the existing instructions where it seems to me that this very serious inequity is perpetrated.

I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me, how it makes sense that when the rebates are figured out, the married couple is penalized when both of them are working, but that two people who are not married, who are living together are not treated in the same manner. It's an anomaly that makes no sense whatsoever.

While the hour is getting late and we are getting close to the adjournment hour I would leave this with the hon. parliamentary assistant so that by the time we come back on Thursday, he can perhaps clarify my thinking if I am wrong. By that time I will have with me extracts from the instructions that this government sends out, which I think makes it quite clear.

The situation as it appears to me is most inequitable. The situation is not clarified or improved by the statute, and it is most unfair and one would have thought with all of the intelligent advice available to the minister that they would have cleared up this obvious unfair anomaly.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the hour, I wonder if we should have a motion to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Stokes moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, on Thursday we will return to a consideration of the bill that is before us and I would hope to call item No. 17, Bill 98.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 24, 1973

Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act, reported 1233

Income Tax Amendment Act, 1973, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, on second reading 1257

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Stokes, agreed to 1261

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1261

No. 29



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 26, 1973

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1973

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again we are pleased to have visitors with us. In the east gallery we have students from Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute of Scarborough; in the west gallery students from Mt. Mary Academy of Ancaster and West Prep Public School of Toronto; and in both galleries students from Madonna High School of Downsview. At 3 o'clock, p.m., in the east gallery, we will be joined by students from Glendale High School of Hamilton and in both galleries students from Stayner High School of Stayner. Today in the Speaker's gallery we have a very special group of people, a group of international junior curlers from Sweden, Scotland, Norway, Switzerland and West Germany.

Statements by the ministry.

EXTENSION OF DON VALLEY PARKWAY

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, in response to a resolution of the Metropolitan Toronto council on April 17, 1973, requesting that the ministry undertake construction of the extension of the Don Valley Parkway north to Steeles Ave., I met yesterday with the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Ab Campbell, and members of his council and staff; the chairman of the regional municipality of York, Mr. Garfield Wright, and members of his council and staff; Mayor Mel Lastman of the borough of North York and members of his council and staff; Mrs. Gladys Rolling, the mayor of East Gwillimbury township, and the member for York North (Mr. W. Hodgson).

Both the borough of North York and the regional municipality of York have, for some time, been pressing for the completion of Highway 404. Their position was reaffirmed at this meeting. The ministry now proposes to construct a four-lane arterial road with intersections at grade, from Highway 401 to Steeles Ave., reducing to two lanes on the Highway 404 alignment northerly to Newmarket, which is Davis Dr.

While the original plans for Highway 404 provided for an ultimate freeway development, the ministry proposed to those present that for the following reasons we undertake stage construction now but acquire property for future development of a transportation service corridor with provisions for future rapid transit if it is found necessary. The reasons for this proposal are: It will provide much-needed relief for the traffic congestion north of Highway 401 to Newmarket; stage construction will provide us with the opportunity to develop future plans as a result of the recommendations of the Metro plan review now under way; with stage construction we will be able to effect early relief of traffic congestion and protect our future transportation options by constructing additional facilities when and if traffic demands warrant them; the need to exercise financial restraint at this time makes stage construction desirable, in that the cost is less than half that of a full freeway from Highway 401 to Newmarket.

I would again draw your attention to the fact that this proposal provides for early relief of traffic congestion in this area and at the same time keeps our options open for future transportation developments.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement in connection with a bill which I am intending to introduce later this afternoon and which will provide some substantial assistance to those people whose property has been affected by the current high levels of the Great Lakes.

This bill, which will be known as the Shoreline Property Assistance Act, 1973, will provide a procedure for those municipalities affected to make loans to individual property owners for the rehabilitation and protection of shoreline property and for the repair of damage to buildings and other structures which has been caused either by the high

water levels, by the impact of ice, or as a result of damage or erosion to the shore.

Under this legislation, $50 million will be made available from the provincial Treasury for the purchase of municipal debentures for this purpose, thereby enabling the municipalities in turn to provide direct assistance to those whose property has been affected. Such assistance will take the form of municipal loans for the construction of retaining walls, dikes, breakwaters, groynes, cribs and other structures designed for the rehabilitation and/or the protection of property on lakes, rivers or other bodies of water whose shores have been damaged or eroded by the elements.

This will include repairs and improvements to any existing works of this kind. As I have indicated, it will also include repairs to any buildings or other structures which have been required on account of damage to the buildings or structures caused by high water levels, ice or erosion of the shore. Loans for such repairs, however, will not exceed 90 per cent of the total cost of the repairs or the maximum amount which will be prescribed by regulation, whichever is the less.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, this money will certainly provide substantial assistance to those people whose property has been affected in this manner and I trust that the legislation will be dealt with expeditiously by the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

WILD RICE FROM NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, today I have placed on each member's desk and delivered to our friends in the press gallery one of the most interesting products of our resources production programme and one which is produced almost exclusively in northwestern Ontario—a package of wild rice.

Wild rice was used by the Indians in the Lake of the Woods area long before Europeans came to North America. Today in Ontario it continues to be harvested largely by Indian people with their traditional techniques.

Last year there was a large harvest due to good water levels and excellent weather conditions. Over 1,000,000 lb of natural wild rice was harvested. It brought about $650,000 to the Indian pickers and added much more to the economy of that region.

Processing of wild rice is now being carried out in the region, partly through the assistance of loans made available through the Northern Ontario Development Corp.

It is the objective of my ministry to encourage full utilization of this unique and highly prized product.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why doesn't the minister help them process it themselves?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are.

Mr. Stokes: And get more money out of it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is, of course, growing competition from the agricultural paddy wild rice development in the border states of the United States, and we too have been carrying out some development in this particular area.

As part of our programme to make more people aware of this product and to use it as a gourmet food the booklet, "Man-O-Min," meaning wild rice in Ojibway, is also being distributed. This booklet contains a number of recipes, some of which have been developed in northwestern Ontario; 10 of them have been examined and checked by the Ontario Food Council of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

I recommend this northwestern Ontario gourmet product to the members and, of course, to the members of the press gallery, and know that after they have tried this excellent sample, they will be looking for more. Of course, it can be obtained from the address shown on the bag and from others in northwestern Ontario.

FOREST FIRES

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the members that the period from April 1 to Oct. 31 each year is the official forest fire season. During the past few years an average of 1,500 forest fires have burned approximately 51,000 acres during this same period.

Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, most of Ontario experienced an unusually mild winter, particularly in northern and northwestern portions of this province. Precipitation in northern and northwestern Ontario during the winter months was approximately 20 per cent below normal. The rest of the province received near normal precipitation.

Similarly, ground moisture is somewhat below normal in the north and northwest

and is normal in the south. Recent mild spring temperatures and the early disappearance of much of the snow have resulted in greater than usual evaporation. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the forests and fields, with associated fuels, are much drier at this time of the year than is normal.

It is estimated that spring breakup and the resulting spring forest fire occurrence is two to three weeks ahead of normal. As a result, our fire control staff are expecting an above-average occurrence of forest fires in 1973 and are gearing themselves accordingly. This situation became apparent by mid-April of this year when 75 wild forest fires had been reported, consuming 360 acres of forest land. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, early indications, combined with past experience and statistical analysis, suggest that 1973 may be a very hazardous fire year.

In addition to our normal fire suppression capability, this year for the first time we will have in operation an additional four Grumman Tracker aircraft converted as fire bombers using liquid retardants. These aircraft will be based at Dryden and Sudbury but will be available to fly from any of the eight retardant bases situated across the province. Each aircraft has a retardant load capacity of 800 gal. and an air speed of 200 mph. We anticipate that these aircraft will further add to our ability to combat fires in their incipient stage.

Mr. Stokes: We need more airstrips for that.

CONSUMER REPORTING ACT

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House today our intention to introduce this afternoon a revised Act to Control the Storage and Supply of Personal Information for Rating Purposes, known in its short form as the Consumer Reporting Act.

As the hon. members will recall, my ministry first introduced this Act last autumn. Our purpose at that time was to stimulate informed comment on how the Ontario government should move to protect the consumer from inaccurate, outdated or indiscriminately used information about his personal lifestyle or credit rating. We received a number of briefs from the consumer reporting industry and from consumer groups and interested individuals.

Having considered this comment, we have made some changes in the legislation. In some cases we have attempted to make it easier for the consumer reporting agency to comply with the intent of the Act. In other cases we have heeded the complaints that have been made about some aspects of the consumer reporting industry and we have increased the degree of protection offered to the consumer.

But the two most important provisions of the first draft remain. First, we are recommending that powerful procedures be established to provide full disclosure to the consumer of information about him assembled by consumer reporting agencies. Second, we believe that consumer reporting agencies should be fully accountable to the consumer for the accuracy and fairness of their information.

In our view it is a necessary step toward balancing the growing power of consumer reporting with the rights of individual consumers. In addition, we believe that possible legal action for damages will provide a strong incentive for consumer reporting agencies to adopt the best possible reporting procedures.

The new Act includes one major new provision: investigators working for consumer reporting agencies, as well as the agencies themselves, will be made subject to government registration. We believe that government evaluation and control of those engaged in the investigation of consumers will lead to higher standards of conduct.

But it is the requirement for disclosure to the consumer that most clearly identifies our legislation with the need for greater consumer protection. We believe that if the consumer is informed when a file on him is used, and if he is able to check and dispute its contents without fear or confusion, then his right to accurate information and responsible reporting will be assured. To this end, the following disclosure procedures are contained in the Consumer Reporting Act:

1. Anyone rating a consumer for credit, employment, insurance or other business purposes, must upon the request of the consumer, inform him whether or not a consumer report has been referred to and if so, the name and address of the agency supplying the report.

2. Anyone requesting a report containing personal information must inform the person about whom the report is being made before the request for the report. Personal information is defined as information about the con-

sumer's character, health or lifestyle. It is considered separately from credit information, which is defined as factual information about a consumer's address, place of work, credit balance and income. The Act addresses itself to the accuracy in disclosure of both credit and personal information.

3. Notice must be given in credit applications that a consumer report will be requested.

4. When a benefit is denied or an increased charge assessed because of information in a consumer report, the consumer must be informed of that fact as well as the report, his right to be informed of its contents and the name of the consumer reporting agency supplying it. If the information comes from sources other than a consumer reporting agency, the user must inform the consumer of the nature of the information if he requests it.

5. Consumer reporting agencies must, on written request, show a consumer his file. At a minimum the file must contain the sources of all credit information, the names of all recipients of a report within the previous six months in the case of credit information and within the past 12 months in the case of personal information, and copies of the actual written reports made or particulars of the contents of any oral reports.

6. Disclosure of the sources of personal information will be required, but only if requested by the Commercial Registration Appeal Tribunal.

7. Finally, when a consumer reporting agency adds, changes or deletes information following a dispute with the consumer, the agency must send a notice of the change to all those who received a copy of the unamended report within the 60 days previous to the change. The amendment must also be sent to any other person who received the unamended report within the previous six months in the case of credit information and within the previous year for reports containing personal information, as directed by the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Reporting Act will have a number of other important provisions. Every consumer reporting agency will be required to adopt all procedures reasonable for insuring the greatest possible accuracy and fairness of its reports. Unfavourable information based on evidence that is not corroborated must have the lack of corroboration noted in the file and all reasonable efforts must be taken to substantiate such information.

Generally speaking, information on judgements, criminal convictions and single bankruptcies which are more than seven years old will not be permitted in the reports. Judgements that remain outstanding will require the creditor's name, address and the amount owed.

Information on writs issued against the consumer must be updated yearly and writs more than seven years old will not be permitted in the report. Restrictions will be placed upon the availability of a consumer's file, and legal sanctions will be imposed against indiscriminate use of a file or false reporting of information for use in a consumer report.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Did the minister skip section 37?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, the consumer will be able to initiate procedures to amend his file by application to a registrar of consumer reporting agencies in my ministry if he fails to get satisfaction from the reporting agency. Subject to the decisions of the Commercial Registration Appeal Tribunal, my ministry will have the power under the Act to revoke the registration and right to operate of those agencies or agency investigators who violate the terms of the Act.

These are only some of the provisions of this Act, which promises to increase substantially the individual's right to be represented fairly and accurately when decisions are being made that affect his life. We intend to do away with secret reports or inaccurate reports based on hearsay. We propose to limit the kind of information permissible, set standards for its quality and control access to it.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that only by bringing the entire consumer reporting industry out into the open shall we prevent abuses and ensure the individual his right to fair treatment. To fail to do so would invest too much arbitrary power in too few hands and risk far too much to potentially faulty reporting and storage procedures.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I neglected to mention at the outset that at that particular meeting, the mayor of Markham, Tony Roman, was in attendance.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Why didn't the minister invite me?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I didn't invite anyone. I invited only Metro and the

region. Whoever was invited was invited by those two particular districts.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The member was specifically excluded as a member of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. member for Downsview.

EXTENSION OF DON VALLEY PARKWAY

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In light of his statement about the extension of the Don Valley Parkway at the expense of the government of Ontario, does that mean that the clearly announced policy that cities are for people and not for cars has now been abandoned, or is it just being modified?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I had expected that question.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I thought the minister would.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): The minister's conscience is bothering him.

Mr. Lewis: He must have an answer ready then.

Hon. Mr. Carton: This means that cities are, and will continue to be, for people. This is a four-lane arterial; this is not a freeway or expressway.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I see. Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary, could the minister tell me if the people of Ontario are going to be entitled to rely on this statement to a greater extent than they could rely on a contract signed by Mr. MacNaughton when he was Minister of Highways, which apparently guaranteed the building of Spadina?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Spadina is dead!

Mr. Singer: The member only wishes it.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Downsview knows full well, that contract was signed, as he stated, by the previous minister—

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —and, in fact, if Metro had gone ahead in 1969 the Spadina would have been built. Metro stopped the Spadina for review—

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Now the government is blaming Metro!

Hon. Mr. Carton: It led to those particular representations being made, which in turn—

Mr. Roy: That's not what the Premier (Mr. Davis) said.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —led to the OMB decision, which in turn led to the appeal to the cabinet, which then cancelled the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What is the difference between a four-lane arterial and a four-lane expressway?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Spelling.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A very interesting question.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Well, first of all, with a four-lane arterial there are streets and roads that come on to it.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, and overpasses come on to expressways.

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, they do not. For example, on Highway 401 there are just overpasses at interchanges. There are no signalized intersections.

Mr. Lewis: As there are on the Queen Elizabeth Way. Or does the minister call the QEW an arterial highway?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Those are service roads.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, those are service roads! They don't attach at street level? Come on!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary to the minister, why does the ministry feel it is important to provide greater relief to the east side of Metro when no relief at all is being provided to the west side of Metro?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): They vote better.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): It's not for Metro. This is for the region of York.

Mr. Shulman: They vote better too.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. member that we are providing service to the northwestern part.

When the decision is made with respect to the subway, this will be built; in addition, we are having a dial-a-bus demonstration project in the northwestern part of Metro. We are looking after them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: And kiddy-cars at the Exhibition.

Interjections by hon. members.

GREAT LAKES FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Government Services in relation to the announcement that he made this afternoon. Regarding the money that is going to be advanced to municipalities, which they can use by debenture, are the municipal taxpayers going to have to pay the interest on those debentures?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, Mr. Speaker, the interest on the debentures will be paid by the borrower of the funds.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary, and further to the minister's statement, when these moneys are being lent to taxpayers whose property has been damaged, are there going to be any criteria established which will require the relocation or rebuilding of buildings that might have been damaged in locations that apparently will be safe? Or are we going to allow this kind of expenditure on locations where properties can be damaged by floods? What I have in mind, particularly, is the kind of work that was done after Hurricane Hazel, when the conservation authorities came in and said: "You can't build on certain low-lying lands now and for ever more." Has the government considered this facet at all?

Hon. Mr. Snow: First of all, Mr. Speaker, this Act doesn't provide funds specifically for rebuilding any buildings that have been totally damaged. The funds will pertain to repairs to a building that has been damaged to some degree. I'm sure if a building were damaged, or even for the repairs, a building permit may very well be required or probably will be required for the repairs or for the rebuilding of the structure. I'm sure the regulations of the municipality and those of the conservation authorities regarding building in flood-plain lands would or could prevent the building of a building if it were not in the right location.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, the kind of emergent action that originated from the tragedy caused by Hurricane Hazel brought about a whole new line of thinking. The kind of information I'm now seeking from the minister is whether or not, in view of the province's commitment to supply, I think up to $50 million, this should be bound up with some kind of rethinking as to the location of the damaged building.

Is this kind of thinking going on or is he going to expect hopefully that either building inspectors or conservation authorities, which now have enough jobs, are going to step in? Should he not have specific criteria which will govern the granting of these loans to make sure that when buildings are rebuilt or repaired they will be built in a safe place where this kind of damage likely will not occur again?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the major reason for this bill, of course, is for the protection of the shoreline itself. There is a section, a part of the bill, that provides funds for the repairs to buildings and structures.

The main impact of the bill will be to protect the actual shoreline to allow people to build sea walls or groynes or put in armour-stone or whatever might be the appropriate type of shoreline protection in the particular instance. Because there have been buildings with some damage caused by the flooding or by the breaking of a dike, then the Act also will provide funds for the repairs to that particular building.

As the member will see when it is presented, the Act will call for the application to be made to the municipalities. So, certainly, this would give some authority to the municipalities to have some control if they felt the particular building should not be built at that location.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, may I have a supplementary? May I ask the minister, with regard to the shores of Lake Erie where there was flooding and where 3,600 septic tanks have been made useless on account of the flooding conditions, will the people be able to benefit by that programme he has announced this afternoon to replace those septic tanks that have been made useless by the flooding?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I hadn't been aware or thought of that particular aspect, Mr. Speaker, but if the damage has been caused by flooding, I don't see why they would not be able to make use of this particular method of financing, although really we are looking at assisting people with repairs or protection of a more major nature. I'm doubtful very

much whether the average homeowner would want to go through this process of long-term financing for a relatively minor repair of a few hundred dollars to a septic tank.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Don Mills, a supplementary?

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Mr. Timbrell: Could the minister indicate whether the debt limits of the municipalities involved, which are established by the Ontario Municipal Board, will in any way limit the amount of money which they will be able to get out of this $50 million fund?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, this bill calls for approval as usual by the Ontario Municipal Board. We have discussed the matter with the OMB. It does really become a debt of the municipality to the province, covered by the debt of the landowner to the municipality. The provincial Treasurer will purchase the debentures from the municipality; so I'm sure the Ontario Municipal Board will take this into account. But I can't assure the hon. member that it will not have any effect whatsoever on the credit rating of a municipality.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Will it be necessary for the municipalities to go through all the normal procedures with regard to advertising in order to take advantage of the issuing of the debentures? Will they have to advertise and receive the approval of the OMB, prior to the borrowing of the money from the province in order to lend it out?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the bill calls for the bylaw to be passed by the municipality and to be registered at the registry office for that county or area, and then to be forwarded on registration to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval. The OMB has assured us that it has been dealing with these in a very prompt manner.

Mr. Deans: What happens if there are hearings?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since Dr. Moss, the medical officer of health, has indicated that the flooding on the Toronto Islands has, in effect, rendered useless the whole of the septic tank and drainage system, requiring a complete replacement before people can even use the islands for normal recreational purposes to the same extent as in the past, will the assistance to which the minister is now referring be available for that kind of situation?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I can't exactly say, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, the Toronto Islands are publicly owned property. This Act pertains to assistance for privately owned property and does not really take into consideration publicly owned property. It's not designed for publicly owned property. My colleagues are looking at other programmes that may assist us in that area.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary and on the same point: Would the minister, in light of the questions and in light of the vagueness of some of the information he has given, not be best advised to take this back and rethink it a bit and perhaps lay down more definite criteria so that while provincial money is being used, it should be made available to publicly owned land and should be made available only where we aren't going to recreate the same kind of risk? Granted that there is an urgency to take some kind of action, wouldn't it be better that another look be had at this whole problem with some of these ideas in mind?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that perhaps the member might wish to look at the legislation, once I have a chance to introduce it, before he suggests too many changes to it. This legislation is designed for assistance to private property owners and there are other things available or being considered for publicly owned lands.

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will permit one more supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the minister if the assistance is going to be available only to Canadian residents or will Americans be allowed, too, to get this financial assistance?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the way the bill is drafted at this time there are no restrictions. It is not a subsidized programme; it is designed to assist in the protection of Canadian or Ontario lands regardless of the owner. This will be discussed, of course.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Is he able to tell the House at this point in time anything more about the hearings in relation to North Pickering than he was able to tell us on April 17?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House on April 17 exactly what the government's position was at that time, and I am sure that within the next week or 10 days we'll have a full announcement relating to the development in North Pickering which will answer more specifically the question by the member for Downsview.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

MERCURY TASK FORCE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: When does his ministry intend to act on the specific recommendations of the mercury pollution task force relating to northwestern Ontario and provide food or food substitute to the Indian population on the affected reserves?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I understand there'll be a statement made in the very near future on that.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask by way of supplementary: Is the minister willing to indicate to the House, without giving details, that, in fact, he will be providing food as is requested in this instance?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, we'll await the statement which will be made shortly.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—oh go ahead!

Mr. Reid: A supplementary: Can the minister indicate exactly when that statement is going to be made? Is it going to be made at the end of this week or next week? Surely three years of inaction should be brought to an end?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The government will wait until they starve.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It'll be made very shortly; I expect tomorrow.

APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN TO ARBITRATION PANEL AND LABOUR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. Lewis: A question, largely out of curiosity, as a follow-up to the Minister of Labour: Has the Minister of Labour yet found it within his power to appoint a woman to the arbitration panel in the Province of Ontario beyond the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), and to appoint a woman to the Ontario Labour Relations Board?

Mr. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, not as yet, but I wish to assure my hon. friend that I did correspond with 10 or 12 possible nominees and we are awaiting replies. We did receive a couple of replies, but we are still waiting to hear from eight or 10 of them.

Mr. Lewis: I will await with interest the minister's appointments.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Government Services: Can he indicate to the House how many trips he took on government planes in the last year, the year 1972, and whether he took friends, relatives or departmental officials with him?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I can't recall exactly how many such trips I took, but I assure the member that if I am called upon to do so by the public accounts committee I will be prepared to give it full details.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: With the greatest of respect to the public accounts committee, the Legislature is almost of commensurate power. Would the minister be willing to indicate to the House the number of trips he took and with whom he travelled in the year 1972?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I can't tell the member offhand how many I took, but I will—

Mr. Lewis: Will the minister get that information for us?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I will take it under consideration.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Oh, come on!

Mr. Lewis: Well, will the minister table it in the House; and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly get the information. As I say, I feel it is a matter that can more properly be supplied to the public accounts committee, which is considering last year's expenditures.

Mr. Lewis: Well, if the cabinet one by one wants to go before the public accounts committee no one will deny them that right, I am sure.

Mr. MacDonald: An interesting procession.

Mr. Lewis: An interesting procession, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Line up to the left!

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Revenue how often he used government aircraft, and with whom he travelled in the year 1972?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague gave the correct response to that. I would think it is more a matter for the public accounts committee. If the public accounts committee wants the information then I will find out and get the information for the public accounts committee.

I can assure the hon. member that anything that was done was done properly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Revenue whether he was privy to any information as to whether the government is going to have its majority on the public accounts committee forbid this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not privy to any such information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could enlighten the hon. member with respect to his last question? I have been with the public accounts committee from 12:30 to 2 o'clock today and we did, in fact, discuss my use of government aircraft. There was no attempt made, I can assure you, on behalf of government members to block any part of that discussion.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer was likely there in his capacity as provincial Treasurer before the committee, but the others won't all automatically be there, so that this among other questions might be asked. So my question is: Is the government going to use its majority in the committee to deny calling each of the ministers to come before it?

Hon. Mr. White: Hardly!

Mr. MacDonald: The minister says "hardly". Hardly what?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, has the member ever known the government not to make full representation when required by the public accounts committee?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, since the minister asked the question. That is why I am asking it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Well, we have known the minister to reverse his position, so it runs to much the same thing.

TORONTO DOWNTOWN HOUSING

Mr. Lewis: One last question briefly of the Minister of Revenue: Is it his intention to consult further with the Hydro block working committee in the determination of the housing project for that section of downtown Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon. member hasn't been kept up to date as to what is going on. There have been quite a number of meetings. As a matter of fact the steering committee was set up, on which residents had representation. Two aldermen of the city council also are on the steering committee.

I understand, as a matter of fact, they had their latest meeting 2½ weeks ago. So they're all being consulted—they have been all the way through the piece—and I am hopeful that we will get a recommendation from them pretty soon, because, as the hon. member knows, every week that goes by means about an additional $5,000 in cost.

Mr. Lewis: No questions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources has the answer to a question previously asked.

FLIGHT OVER ESCARPMENT

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question asked of me by the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor)—I thought I saw him here a moment ago.

An hon. member: Don't worry, he's listening.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Wherever he is.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Millardair has continued charter flights for school groups, associations, etc., over the Toronto area and the Niagara Escarpment area for some four years now. It was a charter service that had originally been provided by Air Canada. These flights were made at the request of school boards and others on a charter basis, and were usually arranged by the teachers for their classes.

Due to the increase in annual insurance for such flying and the lack of volume, the company found the service uneconomical and decided to drop it this year. All who had booked such flights, including the Bruce Trail Association, were advised by registered letter of the cancellation of the service and the reason for it.

The company is prepared to try to reinstate the charter programme, provided it can be made economically viable, and is making efforts toward this end. I would say to the hon. member for Lakeshore that my ministry was in no way involved in this service, as it was purely between the individual groups and the charter company.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Doesn't the minister feel it is very convenient that at the time the people want to review what depredations are being made in the Escarpment area, nobody is willing to fly over it? And is the minister prepared, then, to provide government aircraft at the cost price in order that groups such as the Bruce Trail Association may carry on their flights and have a direct look?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, to provide a government aircraft for such a service to the general public, or to any such group such as the Bruce Trail Association, would be in violation of our charter with the federal Air Transport Board. In other words, we have a charter only for the privilege of carrying our own staff members and members of government across the Province of Ontario and into other areas.

Mr. Reid: And their friends.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Being consistent with government duty.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would have to say to you again that this is purely a matter between the individual groups and the charter company. It it's uneconomical then it would be pretty difficult to force a company to go into something that's just not paying.

Mr. Cassidy: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister then, in view of his involvement in providing some kind of air services, suggest what the public should do if they wish to find out what is happening in the Escarpment area by direct observation?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As I mentioned in my statement, Mr. Speaker, the company is trying to reinstate this service, and it is doing all in its power to make it economically viable. They're working to this end, and if they are successful, fine, it will be reinstated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

POSTPONEMENT OF SEWER PROJECT

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of the Environment: Could the minister inform the House why the sewer project for the village of Wellesley has been postponed yet another year, because it has now been placed lower on priorities, when as far back as 1967 the Waterloo county health board pressured the municipality into starting to make plans for sewer services?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I can't give the hon. member a detailed answer at the moment, but I'll get the information and give it to him tomorrow.

Mr. Good: Supplementary: When he is looking at the matter, could the minister review the priority position of this village, in light of the fact that they have already indicated that OHC is going to build 16 senior citizen housing units as soon as sewers are put in? Senior citizens have already sold their homes because of this, and generally speaking, the people are now going to be faced with higher costs because the ministry has delayed this yet another year. Engineering has been completed, so would the minister look into it, please, and get some action?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Question, Mr. Speaker! Not statements.

Mr. Roy: Never mind, just keep quiet up there.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further response?

The hon. member for Sudbury.

GOVERNMENT AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice: Now that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corp. has demonstrated that it can effect a 15 per cent reduction in insurance premiums for automobiles, is there any conceivable reason why this government can't institute such a programme in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, I read the press report on the programme in Manitoba—Autopact, I believe it's called. As the hon. member knows, it's a relatively new programme. I think it should be given a little longer time to see if it really has achieved the benefits that the minister claims at the present time.

Mr. Renwick: We can get the minister more information if he wants.

Mr. MacDonald: The one in Saskatchewan has been there for 25 years.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As far as Ontario is concerned, we are continuously looking at ways to improve the automobile insurance field, including no-fault insurance and the general insurance field as well.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

ARBOUR DAY PLANTING ON LEGISLATIVE GROUNDS

Mr. Drea: I have a question of the Minister of Government Services. In the light of the decision of scores of schools and thousands of secondary school pupils to take part in Arbour Day festivities this year, will the minister consider compelling his staff to break with their prejudices and allow the planting of a native shrub for the first time on the legislative grounds?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Urgent public importance.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't really thought of it. I didn't know there was any tradition to break, but I'll certainly give it consideration. I know on Friday, which is Arbour Day in Oakville, I myself am going to plant an oak tree in Oakville Park in the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

PARKING OF MINISTRY CARS ON LEGISLATIVE SIDEWALKS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Solicitor General. I wonder if the Solicitor General might assure the House that he will advise the OPP, who are in charge apparently of security around the premises here, to ticket or have towed away cars which are illegally parked on sidewalks impeding traffic and walking around? For the assistance of the minister, I might point out that today the following cars were illegally parked: car ONT 007, Ministry of Industry and Tourism; car ONT 019, Attorney General; and car ONT 001, Ministry of Transportation and Communications. Will he advise the OPP of this?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, not having arrived at the grounds until after 8 o'clock this morning, I don't know how early those cars were parked outside.

Mr. MacDonald: So far the minister's reply is irrelevant. Answer the question. We don't care what time the minister got here.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister have a logbook with the information?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't know whether the hon. member would do me the favour of covering all of the grounds. Have I his assurance that he covered all of the grounds?

Mr. Renwick: Every morning.

Mr. Lewis: Why does the minister not make a tour each morning? Why doesn't he delegate him?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He's nodding his head. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether this comes within the jurisdiction of the OPP, but I shall be glad to look into the matter.

An hon. member: He should put his uniforms to work.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: If I might advise the minister, if he will give me his salary I will do his job.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, this is the only part of my job the hon. member is fully capable of doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I might advise that these cars were in the east entrance at noon today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur. Order.

SCHOOL BUDGETS

Mr. Foulds: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Education. In view of the minister's response in the last few days, offering the Metro board a loan possibility of up to $8 million to meet its ceiling on spending, how does he find that consistent with the treatment his ministry gave to the Nipigon-Red Rock Board of Education in 1971, when he or his ministry levelled a fine on that board for exceeding its 1971 ceiling? That fine totalled $14,196. The ministry's phrase was "penalty." How does he find that consistent?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, they are of course two entirely different situations. The 1971 ceilings were set, and after reviewing the financial statements, those boards which had exceeded the ceilings were informed that there would be a fine levied. I think there has to be some indication that the ceilings are something that can't be tampered with easily; and this was the case with that board and eight or 10 other boards in this province.

Now as far as the Metro board and the offer made there, we are talking about something that's happening right now, a proposition that was put to us and our response to it; and really, the two instances don't relate. If the Nipigon-Red Rock board has any indication, or indicates to us it is having difficulty because of that levy, which will have to apply against its grants for this year, well then I would be happy to meet with it and talk to it about that.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary: Is the minister not aware that his deputy has been in touch with the administrator of that particular board and asked them to hold off on the payment of the penalty until they can review the particular circumstances in the case? In view of the assurance by his deputy that it is being looked at, will the minister not now consider removing the penalty, for the very special reasons that they mentioned to his deputy—that is because of the hiring and payment of teachers, that the penalty would be forgiven?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well I can't assure the hon. member at this time that we will remove the penalty, but our consideration of this special situation will continue if it is found that it was justified—I shouldn't say justified, but that there were special circumstances of a very unusual nature that necessitated this happening—well then we will consider something in that regard.

Now this is particularly—and I want to emphasize this—for the boards of northern Ontario. I have said all along they have particular problems and should be considered individually and not considered with the rest. I have told the Hamilton board, for example, that there will be no special consideration for its penalty, imposed in that it has gone over the ceiling, because I think we have to make it clear that the ceilings are there to be adhered to and that they can't be frivolously ignored.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Well, supplementary within the context of the minister's reply about boards and ceilings: Would he consider making a special grant to the board in which he and I are represented, in the borough of Scarborough, given their particular difficult situation of which he knows?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Speaker, on that question I think really there's no answer possible at this time, because the ground rules which now apply are that grants be given to the Metropolitan Toronto school board; and given this ground rule, the money we give to the Metropolitan Toronto school board is then allocated according to its own equalization formula. As the hon. member knows, and I know I feel, there are inequities in the distribution formula within Metro, once they receive the money.

This is really what we have to get at, and that is why I suggested in my letter to the Metro board that we would appoint a commission to review the structure, organization and financing of the Metropolitan Toronto school board. I intend to announce within another couple of days the makeup of that commission so we can get to the root of this problem.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary; I think the hon. member has had a question or a supplementary on this topic.

Mr. Reid: No supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No supplementaries; all right, the hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to get back to the minister's original response. Could he be more clear about what the differences are? Is that difference simply the public pressure built up in the Metro press; and because the Metro board is a large and powerful board and the Red Rock board is a small board that just simply made the usual representations to the minister? What are those vast differences that he talks about?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The differences I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, are the different circumstances. We were talking here about boards that had exceeded the 1971 ceilings. The Metropolitan Toronto situation was a response to a situation which applies in Metropolitan Toronto concerning the 1973 ceilings and their ability to live within them:

But I think I have indicated we are willing to look in a particular way at the boards of northern Ontario and the hardships they may endure, which certainly aren't endured by other boards. If the Nipigon-Red Rock board, in their discussions with my ministry, can arrive at some conclusion that there were special difficulties, I think we can come to some mutually agreeable arrangements for them.

But as I say, inherent in all this is the basic premise that the ceilings are not there to be frivolously ignored. We have to stick by that premise and we intend to.

Mr. Foulds: The minister means you've got a better chance if you lobby ahead of time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel South.

PRE-CLEARANCE OF CUSTOMS

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism regarding Malton international airport.

Mr. Cassidy: Can't the member speak to him outside?

Mr. Kennedy: Could he advise as to the pre-clearance at customs for passengers leaving Malton?

Mr. Martel: The answer must be all set up by now.

Mr. Kennedy: Is this being resolved? There was earlier discussion about it; is there anything to add? It is of great interest to Mississauga people.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, you will recall some days ago the Premier spoke on this particular subject. He indicated that we would communicate with Air Canada and the federal government to see exactly what position they were taking in regard to pre-clearance and post-clearance at the airport in Toronto.

May I say that I believe that this afternoon some time, as a result of my discussions today with Air Canada people and the federal government, there will be an announcement by Mr. Marchand, which I am sure will clear up the matter for all the people of the Province of Ontario and Canada relating to post-clearance and pre-clearance in this country. Until that statement is made I would not wish to make any further comment.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Revenue has the answer to a question previously asked.

Mr. Lewis: Now that's dangerous.

ELIZABETH GARDENS PROJECT

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as a result of questions asked on March 30, I advised the Legislature that I would order an investigation into the complaints of occupants of the Elizabeth Gardens condominium townhouse project in Windsor.

Many of the residents of this 112-unit project complained of deficiencies in the construction of their units and of their difficulties in getting the builder to correct them. I am advised that a thorough investigation has now been completed by OHC inspectors and the inspectors from the building department of the city of Windsor. All occupied units in this development were included in the investigation and OHC has prepared and presented to the builder a detailed, unit-by-unit list of deficiencies. The city of Windsor officials have also submitted a list. On April 13, 1973, the builder wrote as follows:

> This is to advise you that we have received the list of infractions that the city of Windsor would like adjusted and also

the infractions as set out by the Ontario Housing Corp. I have instructed Mr. Mann who is on the job that these infractions must be cleaned up by April 30, 1973.

Signed,

Yours very truly,
Essex Developments.

Mr. Speaker, as I advised the House on March 27, until such time as the noted deficiencies are cleared up to the satisfaction of OHC, a holdback in the amount of $345,000 will be maintained. OHC will continue to review the progress of this development until its satisfactory completion.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I believe the miinster referred to the occupied houses. Were the unoccupied or incompleted houses not inspected also?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't have that information but I rather imagine, Mr. Speaker, that they would have examined all of the buildings. If the member wants that specific information I'll get it.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask of the minister if, as a result of the inspections, he has drawn certain conclusions that can be incorporated into future proposals to buildings of Ontario Housing projects?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the hon. member is referring to or if he has anything specific. When people undertake to do a job, if they are undertaking to do something in which the OHC is involved, OHC has certain requirements, and OHC won't be satisfied unless those requirements are met. The requirements are those which one would expect. They must be of high standard—the quality, the building and everything else that must be done. If there is anything that arises from this investigation which would lead us to change our requirements in respect of financing these projects, of course, we will take that into consideration.

Mr. B. Newman: In light of the numerous complaints concerning the Elizabeth Gardens project, is the minister now satisfied that all of this will be completed and that the specifications in the original contract have been completely fulfilled? I am referring to some of the specifications in regard to the landscaping.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't think I can add to the statement that I have read, Mr. Speaker. There is a holdback, and unless Ontario Housing Corp. is satisfied, unless the city of Windsor is satisfied, that holdback will be maintained until they are satisfied.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister considering, as a result of the number of complaints, having a residential inspector from Ontario Housing to see in the future that such complaints would not be as numerous as they are in this instance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't give such a guarantee; I would have to find out what the economics are of such a proposal. I don't know whether it's economical or even necessary to have a man on duty all the time. If it is deemed necessary in any particular instance we will do it.

But by and large, I think the hon. member will agree that the work that has been done for OHC over the years is of a very high standard. Indeed there is considerable opinion that it is of a higher standard than private developments in many instances.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park; a new question.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Solicitor General: Can the Solicitor General explain why he would take a government airplane to St. Catharines when there is no time saving, but an increased expenditure of some hundreds of dollars?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should take a look at the map of Ontario and he would realize that on the direct flight from the Toronto Island Airport to St. Catharines, there is a considerable saving of time.

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister not aware that the Toronto Island Airport informed me that the flight time is 20 minutes; the time taken to get to the airport is another 20 minutes and the time taken at the other end is 20 minutes. The total saving is 15 minutes. Does he really think his fifteen minutes are worth $300? In other words, is he worth $1,200 an hour?

Mr. Yakabuski: Was the member worth $67,000 last year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to argue the fact that it takes just as long to get from here to the Island Airport as it takes to get from here to that point of the Queen Elizabeth Way, the Lakeshore highway, that would take one out to the Island Airport. On the other hand, Mr. Airport—Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: This subject bothers those fellows!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It doesn't bother me.

Mr. Lewis: The Solicitor General never has his feet on the ground anyway, so it doesn't matter.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I would say to that Charlie McCarthy sitting in the NDP leader's seat—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He is Charlie McCarthy today.

Mr. Lewis: That is a nice compliment.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Charlie McCarthy. The voice was that of Esau in the back.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: A brilliant piece of repartee!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But I will say this for the hon. leader of the NDP, he didn't ask—

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not answering me. He is being provocative. Sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He has changed the kind of question. He is not as insulting as the member for High Park is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: We are going to learn about that.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the Solicitor General know the punch line in the Charlie McCarthy exchanges? "How can you be so stupid?" And that is his position over there on this issue.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cassidy: He is really losing the track there. He knows he is really having trouble.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member doesn't realize is that I had made a commitment to be in St. Catharines and had to be in Windsor at the same—

Mr. Lewis: This isn't a flight to Cuba. This is just to St. Catharines. It doesn't take an hour and a half to explain.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That's right. Why doesn't the leader of the NDP tell that to the hon. member for High Park?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! This is a waste of the question period. Other members are waiting.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Keep it going.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I flew on to Windsor from St. Catharines.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier says of the Solicitor General what Henry II said of Becket: "Will no one rid me of this man?"

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Three premiers, four leaders of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The time has actually elapsed, but one hon. member has been trying desperately to get the floor, and in view of the unnecessary delay I am going to permit the question of the other hon. member. The hon. member for Rainy River.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Reid: I have a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister's department been involved in the negotiations between the construction labourers' union and the construction companies because of the possibility of a strike within a week's time if this contract is not arrived at?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would think that through our construction industry review panel, which of course is getting in touch with all the construction industry, I can assure members we are presently

keeping in constant touch to see what is going to happen next month when the contracts are up.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has now elapsed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did you say collapsed?

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Ewen, from the standing private bills committee, in the absence of Mr. Taylor, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting Hobin Homes Ltd.;

Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Barrie;

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting S. B. Young Ltd.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the city of Windsor;

Bill Pr38, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Your committee recommends that Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the town of Vaughan, be not reported.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I am not sure what point I should rise on here, but it was understood specifically in the committee that amendments to the bill respecting the city of Ottawa, Pr38, would not come forward to this House until it had been checked with the city of Ottawa legal people; and I also had an assurance that I, as a member for the area concerned, would have a look at that before it came forward to the House.

I'm not even sure who is responsible for this, I suppose it is the chairman of the committee. I would ask that Bill Pr38 not be reported at this time to the House, if that is possible; or is there some other procedure?

Mr. Speaker: I am informed that this particular bill, if it is reported as included in the report, may be held on the order paper for second reading. So I think probably the best procedure would be to adopt the report, and then deal with your interests on second reading.

Mr. Cassidy: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. As long as I would have assurance from the government it would not go forward at this time.

Hon. Mr. McNie presented the 1971-1972 annual report of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, of the ministries named be referred to standing committees as follows:

The Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations to the administration of justice committee;

The Ministry of the Environment, Management Board, Speaker, Provincial Auditor to the estimates committee;

The Ministries of Industry and Tourism, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Communications to the resources development committee.

The Ministries of Colleges and Universities, Community and Social Services, and Health to the social development committee.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, can I ask a question for clarification of this? I was under the impression that we were going to move from policy field to policy field. We're now in the Justice field and, indeed, I was rather curious to find out to which field we were going after that. Since we have a mix of ministries from at least two fields, the Resources field and—

Mr. Lewis: Social Development field.

Mr. MacDonald: —Social Development field, is the House leader going to be mixing them from this point forward?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I wouldn't say necessarily so. I think we can agree upon that after the provincial secretaries make their introductions of their fields in the House. We'll do it as is most convenient to the committees concerned.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me clarify this then, by way of illustration. If we next move, for example, to the Resources field and that group of estimates is, in effect, introduced by the Provincial Secretary who is responsible for that area, will we then complete all of that, or is the minister going to intervene before it is completed and have the Provincial Secretary for Social Development move in and have a mix of both of them?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No. I think I know what is concerning the hon. member. I would say to him that we'll endeavour to get both provincial secretaries' statements in the House and function in such a way that the appropriate standing committee of one field might sit while another field might possibly be heard in the House.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a comment or question on the motion, we will never have more than one ministry in the House and one out of the House simultaneously?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That was the basic meaning of my response.

Mr. Stokes: And never the same policy field meeting concurrently?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is exactly correct.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Hardly ever.

Mr. Deans: Except when he does it.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Can I have the unanimous consent of the House to revert to reports? There is one report that was missed.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Snow presented the annual report of the Ministry of Labour for the year 1971-1972.

Mr. Stokes: Has the minister got the logbooks there?

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

ONTARIO PLACE CORP. ACT, 1972

Hon. Mr. Bennett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Place Corp. Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Martel: Is the minister going to sell it?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Send it up to Sudbury.

Mr. Martel: Put it in Happy Valley.

An hon. member: He would soon change the name if he did.

Mr. Lewis: He wouldn't put a hovel like that beside the member for Sudbury East's new home.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the amendment removes the authority of the corporation to employ, and govern the terms of employment of its own staff, and provides for the appointment of a staff under the Public Service Act.

SHORELINE PROPERTY ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide Assistance for the Rehabilitation and Protection of Property on or Adjacent to Shorelines.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is not so independent after all, eh?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, this is the bill which I described in my statement before the question period and I think that probably explained it well enough.

CONSUMER REPORTING ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to control the Storage and Supply of Personal Information for Rating Purposes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I have no further comments to make at this time in spite of the regret expressed by the member from Downsview.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, the bill removes the practice of calculating the cost of borrowing on the previous monthly balance in a variable credit transaction. The average daily balance is to be used instead. In this way a purchaser will pay interest only on the amount he owes and not on amounts that he may have paid off two or three weeks before.

Mr. Bullbrook: That bill has been long needed. That's a very good piece of legislation.

Mr. Burr: Thank you.

BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Business Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I must say that when the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations introduced his bill I was disappointed to see that the item covered in the bill I have just presented was not covered.

This bill actually was presented last year and deals with the question of fingerprinting individuals so they may have the right to shop in certain stores. Although one cannot stop people from giving their fingerprints, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is first of all to require notice by the stores to the people that they will be fingerprinted, and that the only time they can be fingerprinted will be on payment by way of cheque and when there is no other form of identification, and to limit the use of fingerprints taken from individuals.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READING

Clerk of the House: The first order, third reading of Bill 93, An Act to amend the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Has the minister (Mr. Carton) abandoned the bill? He should have.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: He made a big mistake when he brought that bill in.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on the bill. I've had the opportunity since Tuesday to reflect on a number of statements made by the minister, and I think that it's worth bringing them to his attention again, and also to the attention of the House in general.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): But without repetition.

Mr. Cassidy: As the House will recall, what this bill does is to give the minister authority to commit the province to a system in which he may well spend $1.3 billion on transit systems around the province. The authority for that entire sum is not contained in this bill. However, the commitment to a technology is contained in this bill, because as the minister has explained he is going to tie up the rights no matter what systems are planned in Toronto, Ottawa and Hamilton and other cities, and ultimately they will be built.

Mr. Speaker, we have raised questions about this bill, because frankly we are a bit concerned about the technological aspect; and we are even more concerned about the systems aspect of what the minister is getting into.

We are far from convinced that, for all of his reputation, the minister really knows what on earth he is doing. That suspicion or that uneasiness we have is added to by the manner in which he replied during the course of the debate on Tuesday afternoon and Tuesday night.

The minister told us that for the past four years the Province of Ontario has had studies of this project underway and that he himself has gone around to see some of the contenders; there have been evaluations and so on.

Well, here we are—and if I can just go back and quote the minister from Tuesday:

> It didn't just happen within the past year or two. There was research made of all the various components. The components have been tested.

And then he went on to talk about his own experts and how good they were; about how he had independent transportation consultants come in and support him in what he was intending to do; and that when he was out visiting and talking to people in Britain that everybody told him what first-rate chaps he had working for him.

Well, the minister, I'm afraid, is rather vain—he succumbs to this kind of flattery. Because, quite frankly, I'm not convinced now that he knows a darn thing about the project, apart from what the experts have told him. I don't think he is asking the right questions, and that is why I think that he may well be making a grievous mistake as far as this province is concerned.

It is a mistake which is liable to cost this province not just $15 million or $20 million for a demonstration project down at the National Exhibition, but far, far more than that. It will create a distortion of priorities and a misspending of public money. This, in turn, will hurt efforts to improve the environment in our major cities in the province.

The minister was really quite hurt, Mr. Speaker, that I would get up and talk about technology and raise questions about that. He said: "But to criticize the technology is beyond my comprehension."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the technology itself is beyond the minister's comprehension, and that in addition the kind of basic parameters which surround the system have not come under the right kind of critical scrutiny.

That was the major reason we said that the bill should be opposed, that there should be at least a couple of months' hoist while some of the basic underlying assumptions which went into this system would be considered. It's my conviction that they never have been, because the minister certainly hasn't answered very satisfactorily.

In order to demonstrate to this House that he was competent to judge what was being done, the minister went through an elaborate exercise to show that he had memorized the definition for telecommunications something about which he had admitted he has very little knowledge. I am sure that he can also define for this House intermediate-capacity rapid transit; something about which he also has very little knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, the problem the minister is putting before us, quite bluntly, is that in common with other jurisdictions in North America, he has become enthralled in looking at these personalized rapid transit systems. He has become convinced by his people that they can meet all of the requirements that exist in a city like Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Singer: He has to find something for the Premier (Mr. Davis) to put his hat on. He knows that.

Mr. Cassidy: In other words, the systems designed to carry maybe 2,000 or 3,000 per hour, will also carry up to 20,000 people per hour. Without going into all of the details, I would suggest that the costs, the additional costs, of personalized rapid transit bear very close consideration. I would suggest the technology and the technological risks bear very close consideration. I would suggest that the goals of the ministry, of allowing people to get onto a little car and then go through a network almost anywhere within the city of Toronto, simply cannot be reached except under certain very special circumstances, and those circumstances are as follows.

If the minister's system is ever completed, it will be possible, from three o'clock to four o'clock in the morning, to get on one of these cars anywhere in the city, to press a button and be taken to any other point along the network, along any line. But I would seriously suggest to the minister that the social utility of that kind of service, in the wee small hours of the morning, when there are so few people on board that personalized rapid transit in the ultimate sense can be provided, is really not worth the kinds of expenditures which are being entailed.

Mr. Speaker, the kinds of expenditures which are being entailed are in the range of $15 million-a-mile, and when that kind of money is being spent then the pipe dreams of the technological planners for intermediate-capacity systems within walking distance of every home in the city simply cannot be achieved. You just can't do it because you haven't got the bucks; you haven't got the bucks to provide that kind of expressway system service; and you haven't got the dollars to provide that kind of intermediate-capacity service.

It will never be done. It's a chimera which the minister has been convinced to follow by his advisers; and he is a prisoner, he is a captive of these advisers; and this is why the whole question needs to be brought out in the open rather than being left in the current unsatisfactory kind of situation, where after four years the minister will begin to tell us something about what is involved in the system, when he has signed the contract that commits the province to $15 million or $20 million at the exhibition grounds, and which also effectively commits the province to using that technology in an intermediate-capacity system for Toronto, Ottawa and for Hamilton. You know, Mr. Speaker, there are some sceptics in my party who believe and are firmly convinced that once the little toy line—and it is a toy line in fact, the minister himself admitted it; capacity 3,000 or 4,000 people per hour, nor more than that. The minirail up at Expo, which was built for a tenth of that price—

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): It is not 3,000 or 4,000 an hour, and I never admitted that. It is up to 20,000 per hour.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the figures which are given in the red book of specifications for the line down at the Exhibition indicate very specifically that the initial capacity will be—I can't remember the precise figures, I have it here, let me find it. The initial capacity, Mr. Mr. Speaker, will be to accommodate peak loads of 1,300 people per hour; that is the actual number they expect to accommodate.

They want the capacity of the line down at the exhibition to rise to 4,000 people per hour, and that is all.

Now I grant to the minister that the system ought to have the capability of rising up to 20,000 per hour, but in fact the specifications, in this red book again, do not insist on that. They demand a maximum of 12,000 people per hour at 80 per cent of the theoretical capacity.

Now I am raising these questions and we will continue to raise these questions.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question. When we were debating this the other day, in answer to exactly what he just put forward again today, I asked him was it not because we were just buying a certain number of cars, because it was a demonstration project, and he admitted it. That is why; we are having a fewer number of cars because it is a demonstration project. That is why the carrying capacity is limited, and he admitted that. But now he is bringing out the same thing again, which is not proper.

Mr. Cassidy: But Mr. Speaker, the—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Much of what has been said so far, of course, has been said previously in the committee stage, and at second reading, approval of the bill in principle. This, of course, is third reading. I have permitted the hon. member to continue and make some remarks on third reading, but I should point out to the hon. member and to the House that, in connection with third readings the ruling of previous Speakers in this House make it very clear that debate on third reading is a very limited and carefully restricted one.

I do not say there cannot be any debate on third reading. The bill has been approved in principle at second reading and has been considered by the committee of the whole House. I was listening very carefully over the speaker system to the debate in committee, and I do know that some of what the hon. member has said is repetitious; but it wasn't too far astray, so I permitted him to continue.

Third reading debate is very closely restricted in most provinces today, and the restriction tends to increase as to debate on third reading. For example, in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom it is now required that at least six members give notice of a desire to have a debate on third reading before any such debate can be held at all.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That's just an effort to exclude the UK Liberals, that's all.

Mr. Speaker: Having made these few remarks to the hon. members, I would ask the hon. member for Ottawa Centre to confine his remarks and wind up this debate on third reading. We are not trying to be too restrictive, I don't think, and perhaps he would go along with the suggestions I have made.

Mr. Cassidy: I am always anxious to heed your admonitions, Mr. Speaker. I would point out to you that the last few minutes were in fact provoked by the minister and not by myself; he insisted on getting into that level of detail, which of course was repetitive and should not have come up at this time. I would suggest that you should rebuke the minister rather than myself for that particular thing.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I hereby rebuke the minister too.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I stand rebuked.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He sits rebuked.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, my comments flow from consideration of what the minister had to say. I had a chance to look at the instant Hansard and to study his statements; I thought on reflection that perhaps the minister could have persuaded me and our party, but he has not. He is buying something or making a major commitment, and we are convinced he is rushing into it and has not allowed himself to benefit from some of the rather sensible observations being made by the opposition parties and which might be made by the public, were they to be brought into his confidence—but they are not being brought into his confidence.

He is in the position of closeting himself with people who are paid by him and who therefore, in order to continue their salaries, just might want to continue to tell him what he wants to hear. He is in a position where many transit experts in other cities, and particularly in the United States, have become intrigued by the kind of technical problems and technical solutions which the intermediate-capacity rapid transit field offers.

In the United States it appears they are working on budgets which are virtually without limit. The budget for rapid transit for the City of Washington, for example, is some-

thing like $2.5 billion; that's for a city somewhat comparable in size to Metro Toronto. We are not quite that affluent in this country, and I would suggest to the minister that we should protect public dollars if we can; we shouldn't just throw them away because the minister feels he will be immortalized by this legacy to the province.

The minister might want to comment in a few minutes, but I have not heard from him or had any information come across my desk about the study with the TTC of light rapid transit, which he informed the House had been made. During the debate he was not able to say when or how that study had been made; of all the alternatives, that is the one which probably required the most serious consideration, and that was not done.

I don't want to engage the minister in a lot of things, because we will do that in the estimates, but the House should bear in mind that when we come to the estimates this matter will be after the fact unless this minister decides to delay this bill in order to look at some of the questions which have been raised in the House.

Mr. Speaker, in the computer industry there is a saying, "Garbage in, garbage out." That means that we get wrong answers if we start with wrong assumptions or wrong information. I am not disputing the calibre of the technical experts who have been brought in on this; they probably are pretty good. I am not disputing that they haven't worked long and hard. I am not disputing that each one in his field knows an awful lot about computerized controls, automated signalling, or whatever it is they happen to be looking into.

What we are saying, though, is that the overall picture has not been adequately examined; it is at that level that the mistakes have been made, that wrong assumptions either have been made or may well have been made, and therefore wrong answers are liable to come out. We are going to oppose this bill on third reading, Mr. Speaker, and we would hope very sincerely that the minister will heed what has been said in this House and will hold over his signing of the contract until there has been an opportunity to look in detail at some of the very disturbing questions that already surround the intermediate-capacity rapid transit project.

If the minister actually succeeds in getting the line in running for the 1975 election, and if by some bad fortune for the province his government is re-elected, is it true, as some members of my party suspect, that that will be the end of intermediate-capacity rapid transit for the province?

Mr. Lewis: Of course! Except if you live at the exhibition year round.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. Is it true that the costs of the system by then will look so high in relation to the benefits that the minister will simply say: "Well, that was tough, but it was nice trying;" and will go back either to leaving the cities to rot the way they're going now or building subway lines? What are the minister's intentions?

Mr. Speaker: This sort of debate is apart from whether or not the bill should now receive third reading.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the minister has answered none of the questions raised in the debate very satisfactorily. We are going to oppose the bill, despite the fact that we endorse very heartily the principle of a very substantial shift in resources to rapid transit from expressways, which the ministers and his predecessors have built for so many years. We endorse the shift from arterial roads, for that matter, too. We endorse the concept of rapid transit. We believe this should be going forward. We think that in Toronto the TTC probably has a lot more sensible ideas than the minister about it. Their advice should be heeded rather than ignored in the planning process which has taken place in the ministry. But with all that endorsement of rapid transit, Mr. Speaker, we cannot bring ourselves to allow the minister to climax four years of work in camera by signing for a pig in a poke, or a possible pig in a poke.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, we in this party, as I think most politicians in the House, endorse as strongly as we can the principle of public rapid transit as an alternative to the madness that envelops us. But I may say to the minister that this bill mutilates the phrase "public transit", just as this government seems to be willing to do in other areas. I recall that they destroyed the meaning of the phrase "regional government." I note that they are undermining the meaning of the phrase "tax credit." With this bill they are significantly depreciating the worth of the phrase "rapid public transit," because they are hanging their hat almost solely on an experiment which they know and we know is perilous at best.

The minister does it and the government does it without giving us, in advance, any idea of the cost, knowing that its timing is perfectly propitious, whether it was calculated or not, to mesh with a general election in 1975, after which it can then be happily abandoned at a cost—reckless indeed—of $20 million or more.

We can't allow that to be done to public transit in this province because the government will disown it. We will be reduced to the old forms or to forms which won't work. So we're opposing this bill and we are dividing the House. We want the minister to know that we feel deeply about what he has introduced and we object to it in principle.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, lest there be any doubt about our position, which we thought we'd enunciated quite clearly, we'll just very briefly repeat it. We do not believe there is any point in having this bill here. We do not believe in this experimentation at some substantial cost. The government is continuing to fiddle while Metro burns, while traffic gets piled up throughout the northwest sector of Metro, while no alternatives are being provided—

Mr. Cassidy: Let it go on the record that the member does not believe in public transit.

Mr. Singer: —and while this minister with a straight face can stand up in the House today and make a great commitment to extend the Don Valley Parkway without taking care of the problems that now exist. Mr. Speaker, this bill really is a mistake, as has been the government's whole transportation policy. We shall, as we made quite clear on second reading and in committee, oppose this bill. We think the minister is stuck with a plan thrown out by his leader, who got caught up in political propaganda two years ago in June. He was creating an image and now he has to try to bring forth some alternative. First came the image; now comes the alternative.

The alternative is a farce. Why should the minister waste $20 million of public money? There is no answer. There is no excuse. The bill should not pass. The minister should not be given the approval he asks for.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): It's a blank cheque for a white elephant.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to participate? If not, has the minister any comments?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I shall be very brief, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I appreciate the concern of the opposition. Frankly, I think that when one enters into an experiment of this magnitude everyone has concern, and the concern has been there for three or four years. It has progressed through that length of time and we have now come down to the point at which we sincerely believe that we are in a position where we can have this demonstration project.

Again, I do want to point out, I appreciate very much the concern of the opposition on this. I, personally, had my concerns at one time.

First of all, as far as the power that may be given to me today is concerned, as I pointed out originally, I presently have the power. The only reason this bill is before the House is to get additional powers to garner in the patent rights and the expertise and the technology so that we will not have to purchase these at the conclusion of the demonstration project.

I might also mention, Mr. Speaker, that apart from the expertise in the ministry and the hired consultants, and all the other people I mentioned earlier, the TTC has been very much a part of this. We have the endorsement of those at the TTC who are, within our knowledge, the experts on rapid transit, those who have the knowhow themselves. They are keenly interested and are looking forward to this particular project of the provincial government.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Carton: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to finish—I don't mind accepting—

Mr. Cassidy: Why did one of the TTC technical people get thrown out of that project because he didn't agree with it? Why was he taken off the minister's team? Because he didn't agree with it; he was so upset.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, all I can say, again, is we have had the expertise of the TTC.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister waited until he got the yes-men to come in.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Carton: From the very top level down, Mr. Speaker! Again, I point out that we are giving the ministry the enabling legislation. There are $7 million in our estimates for this current 1973-1974 fiscal year, at which time the members of the opposition will have time and will be—

Mr. Cassidy: It is like buying a Cadillac with $10 down!

Hon. Mr. Carton: –questioning the minister and his officials on this particular project.

Mr. Cassidy: Do members want to do that?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, again I point out that we are in the position where I cannot, as I explained to the House, go into the detail of negotiations which are presently being carried on because of the very fact that the contracts are almost at the signing point. I would not want to divulge anything that might in any way hinder the negotiations that have been ongoing for some six or seven months now in the contract stage.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this is enabling legislation which we do require for the signing of these contracts. It is not $1.25 billion that we are talking about today; it is $7 million in our estimates for the year 1973-1974.

Mr. Singer: Notwithstanding what the minister puts in his estimates, how much is this one going to cost us? He won't tell us.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for third reading of Bill 93.

The House divided on the motion for third reading of Bill 93, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Bounsall
Apps	Breithaupt
Auld	Bullbrook
Bales	Burr
Beckett	Campbell
Belanger	Cassidy
Bernier	Davison
Birch	Deacon
Carruthers	Deans
Carton	Dukszta
Clement	Edighoffer
Downer	Ferrier
Drea	Foulds
Eaton	Gaunt
Evans	Germa
Ewen	Gisborn
Gilbertson	Givens
Grossman	Good
Guindon	Haggerty
Hamilton	Lawlor
Handleman	Lewis
Henderson	MacDonald
Hodgson	Martel
(Victoria-Haliburton)	Nixon
Hodgson	(Brant)
(York-North)	Reid
Irvine	Renwick
Jessiman	Riddell
Kennedy	Roy
Kerr	Ruston
Lane	Singer
Lawrence	Smith
Leluk	(Nipissing)
MacBeth	Spence
Maeck	Stokes
McIlveen	Worton
McKeough	Young–35.
McNeil	
Morningstar	
Morrow	
Newman	
(Ontario South)	
Nixon	
(Dovercourt)	
Nuttall	
Parrott	
Rhodes	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Smith	
(Simcoe East)	
Smith	
(Hamilton Mountain)	
Snow	
Timbrell	
Turner	
Villeneuve	
Walker	
Wardle	
Wells	
White	
Winkler	
Wiseman	
Yakabuski	
Yaremko–59.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 59, the "nays" 35.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 96, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

INCOME TAX ACT
(*continued*)

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on this bill at the time the debate was adjourned and I had made a point to the parliamentary assistant about the unfairness of choosing the highest paid wage-

earner for these refunds if a husband and wife are living together and if they are both working. I have here some correspondence that was forwarded to me by a lady who finds herself in this position. She shows me this tax credit notice, and some of the instructions that are contained therein I think should be of some interest, I think Mr. Speaker, to the parliamentary assistant.

Under the heading: "Should the Husband or Wife Claim?" The printed explanation is where the husband and wife both live in the same principal residence, the one with the higher taxable income must claim; and if the higher taxable income is such that it removes the husband from the position of being able to gain a refund, then no matter what the wife is earning she loses it.

"Where taxation incomes are equal or where neither has a taxable income, either spouse may claim, but not both." Well, all right, that's fine. That doesn't seem to be changed by what is before us in the House.

But then read the other set of instructions under the heading, "What Do I Do If I Share a Residence?"

> Two or more unmarried people who rent or own the same principal residence have two choices: They can designate one person as the principal taxpayer to claim the entire credit, or they can all claim as principal taxpayers and divide the tax bill or rent in whatever fashion they wish. The collective total of rents or property taxes claimed must not exceed the actual rent or taxes paid. In addition [and this is important] each person should show the combined claim and list the names and addresses of the other payers on the reverse side of the mauve claim form.

What this in fact means, Mr. Speaker, is that where you have a husband and wife who are both working, and the husband has the higher income, his income is the one that governs. If his income is high enough that he is not entitled to the tax credit, then it is lost. But, if you have two people who are not married, either renting or living in the same house, the rules are entirely different.

Let me tell you what this lady tried to do. She wrote to the Ontario Human Rights Commission. I think this is sufficiently unfair that it should all be in the record.

Ontario Human Rights Commission.

Dear Sir or Mesdames:

For the past few weeks I have been—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That sounded like John Diefenbaker!

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): That's the funniest thing he has said here in 14 years.

Mr. Singer: To continue:

I have been very much aware that I possess certain rights under the Ontario Human Rights Code, and that if these rights are denied me the Ontario Human Rights Commission stands ready to serve me. I therefore wish to register a complaint as follows.

It is my firm contention that discrimination is being displayed against me, because of my marital status, by the Crown in the right of Ontario. I base my contention on the Ontario Human Rights Code, part 1, section 1, sub 1, which prohibits the publishing of discriminatory material against any person because of marital status by amendment which received royal assent June 30, 1972; and section 6 of part 1 which binds the Crown in the right of Ontario to these prohibitions.

You can tell, Mr. Speaker, from the tone of the letter that the lady who wrote it had a little experience in a law office. In fact, she is a secretary to a very prominent lawyer who practises law here in the Province of Ontario.

As evidence that the Crown in the right of Ontario has indeed published matter indicating discrimination against me on the basis of my marital status, I quote from a copy of the Ontario tax credit notice left at my door recently and which copy I am keeping in my possession for future reference.

"Where the husband and wife both live in the same principal residence, the one with the higher taxable income must claim. 2. Two or more unmarried people who rent or own the same principal residence have two choices, they can all claim as principal taxpayers and divide the tax bill in whatever fashion they wish."

I am a married woman and hold the property in joint tenancy. My husband and I both work and are classed as single persons for taxation purposes. Were I unmarried, I could claim the property tax rebate. Since I am married and my husband earns considerably more than I do, both of us are denied any tax relief from property taxes.

This is outright discrimination and is particularly annoying since we have an 18-year-old son to provide accommodation for. Were we to get a divorce and then live together in a common-law relationship,

we would be free to claim the tax rebate. It would appear that the government of Ontario does not favour marriage and has published its antipathy toward marriage and married people in the beforementioned Ontario tax credit notice.

I therefore request that you take whatever steps are necessary to investigate this matter and redress my grievance. This letter is not written in the spirit of frivolity and I shall be satisfied with nothing less than a judicial decision to the effect that the Crown in the right of Ontario is not contravening a statute which the Crown itself enacted; or alternatively some satisfactory redress of my grievance.

I am firmly convinced that if the government of Ontario is sincere in its praiseworthy aim to rid the province of discrimination, it should be prepared to clean its own house first and to be willing to submit to prosecution if necessary. [I think this makes great sense.] If my complaint has not been submitted in the form prescribed by the commission, perhaps you will be kind enough to provide a precedent.

Yours very truly

I can give the parliamentary assistant the lady's name and address if he wants it. I have it here.

I thought it was also worth commenting upon the reply that came up from the Human Rights Commission. It's signed by Elizabeth Neville who is the director.

Dear Mrs. Blank,

I have now had an opportunity to consult with our legal adviser on the matter of your complaint about the provisions of the Ontario tax credit notice which you consider discrimination on the basis of marital status and allege that this was a violation of the Ontario Human Rights Code, part 1, section 1, subsection 1.

As I indicated to you over the telephone, we have to advise you that the above-noted section of the Code does not cover the explanatory guide to which you have referred. I am advised that the term "notice" and "other representations" in section 1, subsection 1 could only be extended to similar types of signs, symbols, emblems, etc., as specifically referred to in the section. [Perish the thought that it should extend to any official notice sent out by the Ministry of Revenue of the Province of Ontario]

However, [Elizabeth Neville goes on to say] I would suggest that you write to the director of taxation and fiscal policy branch of the Ministry of the Treasury and Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, who is responsible for administration of the property tax rebate system with respect to your concern that the tax is unfairly applied in the case of spouses who contribute to the rent of their shared principal residence.

I can assure you that we will also be seeking discussion with the taxation branch.

Yours very truly—

That's where it rests. There is a covering letter to me and the lady sets out reasons why she would like to have the redress that she claims, and I think it's quite logical.

I wonder if the minister will tell us, as he pilots this bill through the House, why this kind of unfair and unreasonable discrimination must continue to exist and is espoused in the notices that the ministry sends out? Is the government of Ontario really against married couples living together in the same house or would it recommend that they get a divorce and live common law so that they can take advantage of the beneficence bestowed upon them by the government of Ontario?

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the parliamentary assistant against marriage?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill? If not, the parliamentary assistant may reply.

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): Mr. Speaker, I'll try to review some of the questions posed last Tuesday evening by the members and attempt to provide the answers as best I can.

The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) raised a question about the mathematical formula. He is not present right now, but perhaps the formula will interest others. The new section 3(8) of the Income Tax Act—or the formula in section (8) before you—is that the provincial refund equals the federal refund times—and then there is an equation. The equation allows for 30.5 per cent times 39 per cent on the top line and 40 per cent on the bottom line. That's basically what all those words say.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): They say 30.5 times 39 over 40?

Mr. Walker: Right.

Mr. Lewis: That is clear.

Mr. Bullbrook: Has the member got that locked in?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Explain that to me.

Mr. Lewis: After this is over.

Mr. Walker: The equation for subsection (9) allows for the capital gains refund to equal the equation, which is the Ontario income over top of the world income.

Mr. Singer: The world income? Is that the whole world?

Mr. Walker: The whole world.

Mr. Singer: Behind the iron curtain, too?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Do we have a claim on that?

Mr. Walker: Oh, yes!

Mr. Speaker, the matter of mutual fund provisions and its paralleling of the federal legislation was raised by the member for Riverdale and he queried it. The answer is that the purpose is to parallel the federal provision in the Income Tax Act, Canada, so that all the capital gains tax paid by the mutual fund trust to both Canada and Ontario may be recovered by the trust. The legislation was requested by Canada. The language is of their making and the purpose is to provide uniformity throughout the Canadian provinces vis-à-vis legislation.

The member for Riverdale went on and inquired about the revenue effect. There is a minimal effect. In fact, on a 40 per cent personal tax rate, which I think is a taxable income of around $25,000, the province would pick up a few pennies on a personal capital gain approaching $100. The federal government is holding back the moneys waiting for our legislation, so that it can effect the appropriate refund.

The member for Riverdale raised the question about the property tax credit and wanted to know why the tax credit should be applied by the Treasurer of this province to pay taxes outstanding in other provinces and to pay taxes involving the Canada Pension Plan and the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

The reason is that the terms of the collection agreement entered into between Ottawa and Ontario require the provision. It is called the tax rental agreement and it dates back to 1962. The amendments regarding the property tax credit system date back to 1972.

If we want to have the federal government collect our income taxes, then we are obliged generally to play by their own rules, and their rules require that we eliminate as much complexity as possible. In fact, the more complex the less they are prepared to participate. They have offered us the alternative of setting up our own collection agency. I think the hon. members here will agree that that would be inappropriate, keeping in mind the number of district taxation offices we would need throughout the province.

In addition, the federal government has powers within its Act to seize by means of the third party demands. These are in the Unemployment Insurance Committee Act and in the Canada Pension Act and every other Act, so that they have total recourse. For all these reasons, we can hardly now attempt to change the rules.

The hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) raised certain questions involving the arrears of municipal taxes. He felt that the municipality should be the recipient of any of the tax credits which may be distributed by the Treasurer rather than the federal government. In this particular case, while not attempting to shift the responsibility, it must be kept in mind that the municipalities do have their own machinery for collecting back taxes, property taxes, namely, by the tax sale.

In addition to that, the reasons given to the member for Riverdale would similarly apply, that we are stuck with the tax rental agreement, and those are the terms. The terms are such that if we were to attempt to change them, we would be obliged, ultimately, to enter into our own collection agency, and of course to avoid the complexity.

The member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) raised the matter of foreign diplomats, and more particularly the question of foreign professors. He refers to the visiting professors who are on what is called a two-year tax holiday. One distinction we could make initially is that the foreign professors usually rent their own home and included in that rent is the payment of taxes.

Now a foreign diplomat usually has his home provided by the federal government, or by the government of his own country, and he is not obliged to pay taxes because of the exemption of section 149.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Oh, the teachers are getting a ride and the member knows it.

Mr. Walker: Now, my answer—

Mr. Martel: They are ripping off the system.

Mr. Walker: —to the member for Kitchener is basically that I agree with the sentiments that he's expressed. But at the present time, the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism is seized of the problem. It is going to report on this very question, and discussed the very matter yesterday, and presumably will come forward within a month or so with a report that will relate to this very question.

Mr. Martel: They've met their Waterloo.

Mr. Walker: In view of the fact that the 1972 question of taxes is not an issue—it's too late to do anything there—and in view of the fact that we have some time in the fall, if the select committee does make a recommendation in respect of the foreign professors and their collection of the tax credit, then at least we'd be in a position to consider it for legislation possibly in the fall.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Does the member want to bet the government will move that quickly?

Mr. Walker: It would be premature at this time to make any type of amendment which would alter it, in my opinion.

The member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa) raised the matter of the so-called advantage in calculating the occupancy costs for those who have such utilities as heat, hydro, water, cable television and such other benefits as swimming pools, garages and so forth, already included in their rent. This does inflate the occupancy cost by some 20 per cent of their determined value. The municipal subsidies branch, however, advise that the benefit is marginal—somewhat slight.

As an example, where $300 represents the overall utility cost for a year, something over and above what might be termed "pure rent," the tax credit would be $6 higher.

Now, it would be far too much of a burden for the taxpayer to attempt to segregate this on his own income tax return, and in respect of the province the inconvenience caused and the machinery required to correct the situation would far outweigh the marginal benefits which are going out to certain people. So there is a bit of a benefit to people, but under the circumstances I feel it is warranted, considering the complexity question again.

The question raised by the member for Downsview relates to the potential discrimination between married couples and people who are living together without benefit of clergy.

Mr. Singer: No, I didn't limit it to that; I just said any two. It was one lady's suggestion that she would be better off financially if she divorced her husband and lived with him common law.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): So would mine!

Mr. Walker: I might volunteer my own practice for the divorce.

Mr. Lewis: Without benefit of clergy? That is a little risque for southwestern Ontario, isn't it?

Mr. Walker: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't know about that.

Mr. Lewis: Well, for parts of southwestern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The way the leader of the NDP sneers about southwestern Ontario is the reason his party doesn't do very well down there.

Mr. Lewis: Well naturally, we actually run the clergy down there.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member could kid me.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, it is correct that in the case of married couples, the spouse with the higher taxable income is eligible to claim the property tax credit. In the case of unmarried couples, each member is considered a principal taxpayer and eligible for the credit.

The federal government, in its reform of the income tax structure did not choose to follow the family unit basis—and this is the Carter definition of taxation—partly because of the administrative difficulties of such a system.

As the income tax system now exists, an individual with the same taxable income as the sum of taxable incomes of two adults in the same household, in most cases pays more income tax than do the two adults in the same household. Should a move be made by the federal government to the family unit basis, the Carter principle of taxation, this anomaly in the property tax credit plan would no longer exist.

Mr. Singer: But it's this government's tax credit.

Mr. Walker: That's correct.

Mr. Singer: It's not the federal government's.

Mr. Walker: Since the property tax credit plan is an integral part of the income tax system, it would be administratively difficult and impractical to have diverging rules to achieve complete equity. The basic shelter rebate programme made no distinction between individuals in different financial circumstances.

Mr. Singer: Shame!

Mr. Walker: The Ontario property tax credit plan has made a major step forwards relating actual burden of property taxes more closely to the ability to pay.

Mr. Singer: But the provincial government's own statute says you can't discriminate against people because of marital status. The member knows it. Shame!

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to say that we should undertake a review of this entire matter—the legal implications, the marital status. In view of the fact that the policy was originally established by TEIGA, we might well take a look into it.

Mr. Lewis: The member for London North is rather less prone to error than the member for London South (Mr. White).

Motion agreed; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Singer: No; committee!

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House?

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Lewis: Does the House leader want to do this right now?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Okay!

Mr. Lewis: We'll bring our tax experts in—just a moment.

An hon. member: I thought they were here.

Clerk of the House: The third order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. MacBeth in the chair.

INCOME TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 96, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions, comments or amendments on section 1 of Bill 96?

On section 1:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): May I ask the parliamentary assistant, who certainly is vastly more informed on this than I am, where I might appropriately ask him a couple of questions that were raised by my colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick)? On which section would the formula section apply?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Which formula are you questioning?

Mr. Lewis: The first one.

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): Well, looking at page 1 of Bill 96, it refers to section 1, which happens to be an amendment to section 3 of the Income Tax Act; and the portion applicable for the formula that I gave initially is parts (8)(a) and (8)(b).

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Now please tell him the question to ask.

Mr. Lewis: No, I have decided on that.

Mr. Walker: That's the one with the 30.5 times—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, 49 over 30 by 30.5. I have that tucked away. The Treasurer is very impressed.

Mr. Walker: I am going to ask you that question—

Mr. Lewis: You want to ask questions? I'd be happy to answer them.

Mr. Walker: You wanted the second formula?

Mr. Lewis: No I'm responding to the Chairman, who asked for anything on section 1 of the bill, and I should now like to ask you a question on section 1. As a basic sort of principle of equity, I want to know why you enter into an agreement in 1972 which confirms, as I understand it, an arrangement originating in 1962 that allows the federal government to make these kinds of deductions from an Ontario tax credit, the purpose of which is to direct money to—

Mr. Walker: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. That has nothing to do with this section.

Mr. Lewis: All right, which section do you want me to raise it under?

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. Lewis: No, I am not going to be quite so easily deterred. The parliamentary assistant succeeded in misleading me; now I want him to lead me. Where does he wish me to raise it?

Mr. Walker: Well, Mr. Chairman, he can raise it under section 2(1), section 2(2) or even section 2(3) of the bill.

An hon. member: But not all of them?

Mr. Lewis: Not all?

Mr. Walker: Only one.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 carry?

Section 1 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Now, if the hon. member for Scarborough East would raise his question—

Mr. Lewis: Scarborough West! I'm not in the cabinet yet.

Hon. Mr. White: Actually it was section 1; you are too late.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member accepted their advice and gave in too easily. It was a trap.

Mr. Lewis: As I understand it, your response to the member for Riverdale was that the federal government has recourse under a variety of Acts to deduct from such credits if it wishes, but this particular credit which you introduced is applicable to the year 1972. Clearly the province has to agree to this invasion of the individual which the federal government would wish to pursue.

Why should we allow our direct payment to individuals such as they are in the Province of Ontario, under Ontario tax legislation, to suffer deductions by way of Canada Pension Plan or unemployment insurance for amounts outstanding?

Surely, if the federal government wants to do that it can use its own resources or a collection agency or whatever means it has at its disposal. Why allow a principle of equity introduced by the Ontario government to be used as a way of the federal government getting back amounts owing which may be matters of contentious dispute for the persons who owe them? Why are we allowing ourselves to be used that way?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You weren't blackmailed into this, were you?

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, the reasons are really very practical reasons. We really do not have much choice. The federal government firstly has the right to seize under the third-party demands. Whatever rule we may come in with, it can still seize under the third-party demands. There's no question of that.

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Scarborough West should get his daddy after that.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): They can seize money from you?

Mr. Walker: All right, that's the first reason; that's one of the paramount reasons. The second one is that the federal government has said to us, "If you want us to participate in this manner, you are going to have to play basically by the rules that we determine."

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, you were blackmailed, then?

Mr. Renwick: This wasn't in the original one.

Mr. Walker: I think it was.

Mr. Renwick: This is a change. Paragraph (a) was in the original one; (b) and (c) have just been added so you must have made some new changes.

Mr. Walker: They are merely housekeeping.

Mr. Renwick: They are not housekeeping.

Mr. Walker: They certainly are. They relate to the earlier 1962 Act; the original Act. Now, the Act itself was negotiated by TEIGA and it may well be that the minister—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That's for the province.

Mr. Walker: —the Treasurer may wish to reply in this area.

Mr. Lewis: Well, we have more influence with the federal Liberals than he does.

An hon. member: That's true.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Walker: The fact of the matter is that the tax agreement lays down the rules and we are married to tax rule agreements.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: The Treasurer has something else. Let him get rid of that.

Hon. Mr. White: I might add a further comment. The federal government says, "We will do thus and so for you under these conditions." We have accepted these conditions however onerous because we haven't wanted to face our people with a separate income tax return.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I don't accept that.

Hon. Mr. White: You don't accept anything.

Mr. Renwick: All right, let's get the ground rules correct.

Mr. MacDonald: We didn't accept the energy tax to begin with; you see how right we were.

Hon. Mr. White: You didn't have anything to do with it.

Mr. Renwick: Let's get the ground rules correct.

Mr. Singer: You didn't even wear a sweater today.

Hon. Mr. White: You didn't have anything to do with it.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Oh, a little bit.

Mr. Martel: You invented that in the back room today.

Mr. Lawlor: Just a minuscule.

Mr. Renwick: I hope you read Bruce West this morning?

Mr. Lewis: Good Lord! Why would he want to do that?

Mr. Renwick: It's one of the rare few times I have read him. He was poking fun at the Treasurer; that's why I read it.

Mr. Martel: I didn't know he had a sense of humour.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Almost everyone is.

Mr. Renwick: This clause in its present form, apart from the changes being introduced now, was enacted in 1972, and this is the first year in which this credit is being granted. I want to make it perfectly clear that this is money which the statute obligates the Treasurer of this province to pay to the taxpayers of this province.

Now, to provide a statutory setoff for moneys owing by the Treasurer of this province to be paid to the federal government, is a statutory form of setoff which I just do not believe that the government of Canada—if any real effort had been made by the Treasurer—would insist it would do only provided that the money could be set off against any claims it would have under the Canada Pension Plan or under the Unemployment Insurance Act. These are, of course, totally unrelated to the Income Tax Act, the income tax form and the procedure by which that calculation is made and the ultimate deduction to which the person is entitled is calculated.

It's one of those ridiculous silly little points which come out in a bill like this disguised as housekeeping. It shows that this government is quite prepared to let moneys it has publicly advertised as being moneys which will be credited to and paid to the taxpayers of this province be diverted for federal government purposes. The federal government, as anyone who has anything to do with the Unemployment Insurance Commission knows, has a very long arm to collect whatever moneys are due to it and doesn't need any assist from the government of the Province of Ontario. After all, it is still a federal country and not a unitary state.

The Treasurer of this province has some obligations with respect to the taxpayers of this province, when they have devoted the number of dollars which they have devoted to advertising this as a credit which will produce money to the taxpayers of this province not by way of setoff.

You couldn't possibly, without a statutory enactment, set it off. The rules of setoff are, as anyone knows, very limited. I don't agree with this kind of a ridiculous extension of that statutory right.

Mr. Chairman: Any reply from the parliamentary assistant?

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, it is hardly ridiculous. I think it is a recognition of the fact that in the negotiations we are relatively powerless no matter what we desire, due to the fact that the third-party demands that are totally available to the federal government make it impossible or impractical for us to suggest any other form of payment of this particular money. We have no choice.

Mr. Singer: We will get a better deal after the next election, I will tell you.

Mr. Lewis: What's that?

Mr. Singer: We will get a better deal after the next election.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Not from the member for Sudbury's friends.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury. Do you have a different point from that of the member for Downsview?

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): No.

Mr. Singer: Different from the one that they've been discussing.

Mr. Chairman: Then, the hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the point I was making on second reading of this bill is reflected in section 2, subsection (3), clause f and section 2, subsection (7), where the principles set out in this tax credit notice are given statutory authority. I thought that the parliamentary assistant was being most reasonable when he admitted that the complaint I received from this lady was, in fact, a valid one, and that there was discrimination, as in two people who were living together, and also in the definitions that follow, as are set out in the explanatory notice and now in the statute. If the recognition is there, and even the parliamentary assistant admits that this is an unfair attitude to take to married people, and—

Mr. Lawlor: Surely marriage should involve some sacrifice.

Mr. Singer: —if you are contravening the provisions of your own Human Rights Code, surely this is the time to do something about it. I can't quite figure out how any action of the federal government really concerns itself with a Province of Ontario tax credit notice. What this woman says is obviously correct. In taxation dollars, she would be further ahead to divorce her husband and stay living in the same house in common law. Then she could get advantage of the tax credit. As long as she stays married to him, she can't.

Mr. Walker: We are banking on her not doing that.

Mr. Singer: I think that's grossly unfair. This lady is not a stupid or uninformed person at all. She has investigated the possibility of taking legal action. I think the government would look pretty stupid if, in fact, she did bring an action before the Supreme Court for declaration that this notice, and now the statute, are contrary to the provisions of the Human Rights Code.

It isn't up to me to try to draft an amendment to your confusing notice and your discriminatory sections, but there they are. We know they are there and you admit they are there. Before this bill goes any further, surely you should take it back and get your people who are sitting under the gallery to work out a suitable amendment which will remove the discrimination. It just doesn't make sense that you should discriminate in this fashion against married people who are both working. That's what you're doing, and you admit that that's what you're doing.

Is it sensible that one arm of government keeps the airwaves busy by talking about the wonders and the improvements brought to the Province of Ontario by the Human Rights Commission? For a long period of time you have had regular paid advertisements saying, "If you have problems with discrimination that are covered by the Human Rights Code, come and see us at the commission and we'll look after it, as we've got legislation."

This lady goes to the Human Rights Commission. I have read you what the Human Rights Commission said. There was more to it than that. Over the phone, the lady who signed the letter, Mrs. Ethel Neville, said, "Well, you really don't expect us to crack our parliamentary authority against the head of the Treasurer."

Perhaps she didn't say it in quite that way, but she was inquiring as to how the Human Rights Commission, or some senior civil servant who works for that commission, can really bring any power to bear against all the might of the Treasury benches.

This is the time, Mr. Chairman, when it should be done. The statute is here right now. So I would ask the minister, if he hasn't got a properly phrased and worded amendment ready to bring before us, to withdraw the bill for an hour or so and bring it back in an hour's time with an amendment which will remove this apparent, obvious and admitted discriminatory section.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury—on the same section?

Mr. Germa: No, another section, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We did skip subsection (1) —is it past subsection (2) that we are presently talking about?

Mr. Germa: Subsection (1), Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We had better permit the member to go back on subsection (1) then.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary assistant recognized my complaint on second reading in his answer about occupancy costs and he did admit that there was some inequitability and there was some unfairness in the definition. However, he did treat it rather lightly when he said it only amounts to $600 on one particular—

Mr. Walker: No, $6.

Mr. Germa: —well $6—on one particular set of figures that he chose to run through a computer. This was based on a $300 offset for services such as cable television, parking, heat, light, steam baths, common room, all these luxuries that go into the rental package in a highrise apartment.

It wouldn't be too bad if the discrimination was in the right direction, but I think we are all well aware who lives in highrise luxury apartments. It is not the low or average income earner; it is usually the top income earner in any community, and there is no reason why this bill should be left to discriminate in this fashion against people who really would appreciate the $6 a year.

I don't for one moment even accept that the extra fringes attached to highrise living amount to only $300 a year. I have just made a rapid calculation of costs which would accrue to my own particular house in one year, and parking, heat, light and cable television would give me a figure of $588, and that doesn't include the swimming pool, the laundromat, or the common room. So in no way can I even accept that there is only a $300 offset in the package on highrise living.

Thet government's main opposition to the thing is that it would be an administrative nightmare to try to separate parking, heat and light, and swiming pool from what is known as pure rent. I would suggest to the parliamentary assistant that he has already done that in the case of a person rooming and boarding. The person who is paying room and board has to separate the amount of his board from that portion of his monthly contribution which is pure rent, so I would suggest that if the administration is there to separate board from room, then all one has to do is extend the exclusions.

I am sure every operator of an apartment block knows what is the pure rent. He knows what his heating costs are, and he knows what his water costs are. He knows his parking-lot costs and he knows his steam-bath costs. It would be no problem at all. It wouldn't be any administration at all, because we have already done it once in the case of room and board being separated. In no way can the tax filer include board for exemption to receive this credit.

So, you see, you have got yourself caught in your own flypaper, your stuff just does not stick. It is already in there.

I recognize why the government is not concerned about these people in highrise getting this extra added benefit. This government bends over backwards in favour of affiuence, the fine people in our community, and it shows very little concern for someone who is pressed to the wall to pay taxes. Even $6 is something to be be concerned with when you live on a minimal income. That is only 50 cents a month. I know some people who haven't got the 50 cents a month to spare. They go from payday to payday and they're broke three days ahead of payday. That might be the 50 cents they want that week. It could keep them going for another day.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Even someone in this chamber.

Mr. Germa: So don't pass it off as only $6. And your figures are not even correct, as I pointed out. In no way is $300 an accurate figure; $600 computed on top of the rent would be more likely the differential between what is received in pure rent and these added features. So I can't accept it and I think the parliamentary assistant should take another look at this.

If you don't want to go backwards on the thing how about another proposition? If a guy living in a highrise apartment deducts parking costs, cable TV costs, water, hydro and all these luxury items that go to highrise living, well, grant the individual homeowner the same privilege. Let the homeowner add to his occupancy cost—and it is actually an occupancy cost; what good is a house without heat? Heat is part of occupancy cost. In the case of highrise it is, so why not in the case of a homeowner? Electricity — a house is no good without electricity.

Let the individual homeowner have the same privilege as the one who lives in the highrise and you won't have to have any administration whatsoever. Let him add those same things in and then let's go through the calculation again. I'm sure you'd come to a more equitable solution.

I'm not in favour of expanding the bureaucracy. God forbid that, we've got enough of it. So if that's your only holdup, just grant us all the same privilege that the guy in the highrise has, because this fellow in the highrise usually does not need this advantage over anyone else.

You're talking about equitability in all your programmes: "We do this to equalize the impact upon various groups." Well, here's another case of discriminating against the poor section, because the poor section of our society is not living in those fancy highrises. They're down in those slummy apartments which don't even come with heat. You supply your own heat in some of these joints. And they all pay their own hydro. Most of them pay their own water and they park someplace down the street. So you're clearly discriminating against the man who hasn't got the wherewithal to defend himself.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, on this same point.

Mr. Chairman: Let me just check with the hon. member. Is your point on section 2 subsection (1)?

Mr. Lawlor: Mine's on section 2, subsection (4).

Mr. Chairman: All right, then, we'll hold that. Is yours on 2(1)?

Mr. Good: Yes, on the same point—

Mr. Lawlor: And then I have one that covers the waterfront!

Mr. Good: —occupancy cost. Mr. Chairman, it's the same matter of the unfair treatment being given property owners as compared to people living in highrise on occupancy cost. And I would like to read into the record excerpts from a letter received by me:

> " . . . the principle of Ontario property tax credit is unfair because it gives an advantage to the person who rents over the person who owns a home.
>
> For example, take the case of a person in this city [and he's speaking of the city of Waterloo] who rents a two-bedroom apartment in a good apartment building and pays $250 per month, or $3,000 per annum. The rate covers water, hydro, parking in a covered garage, cable TV, use of a common recreation area, taxes and interest on investment, repairs, decorating and profit for the owner. The occupancy cost then is 20 per cent of the $3,000, or $600.
>
> The property taxes for a comparable house [and this letter, I may say as an aside, is written by a municipal employee who knows his way around as far as the comparable conditions of taxation in the city are concerned] would be $400 (mine are substantially less than this amount). The owner must pay extra for water, hydro, repairs, redecorating and is not allowed anything for the interest on his investment. How can you possibly consider this an equitable arrangement in figuring out occupancy cost?
>
> In 1972 a leak developed in the plumbing of my house and it cost over $2,000 to repair and renovate. A person who rents doesn't have costs of this type, but you give him an additional advantage under the tax credit plan.
>
> On the form which came with my income tax papers you show the maximum credit is $250. The only way I can come up with anyone qualifying for the maximum is a ridiculous situation of a person who makes $5,000 a year, who pays $2,100 a year, or a tenant who pays $10,500 in rent.
>
> Then you send me a tax credit notice which advertises you, the Treasurer and the Minister of Revenue, which I help to pay for out of a general fund for printing and delivery, and says "Special tax benefit to Ontario residents." For some reason, I am not laughing.
>
> Mr. Premier [and I will say this letter is addressed to the Premier] it seems to me your experts are giving you advice which is not realistic. Some of us are fed up with these charades, flim flams, and snow jobs, and are objecting in the only way left to us.

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Good: He goes on:

> I don't object to paying my fair share, but I do object to being considered stupid. It would seem to me that voters in the two recent by-elections share my views, and you lost two strong Conservative seats.

And this is a point I think which many people—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): A true-tempered letter.

Mr. Good: Oh yes. —many people living in average types of homes where the taxes are only $300 or $400 a year, as they are in some of the areas in the city—

Hon. Mr. White: Do you think apartment dwellers are undertaxed?

Mr. Good: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. White: Do you think people in apartments are undertaxed?

Mr. Good: No, I am not saying they are undertaxed. I think they are getting an advantage—

Mr. Deans: Sit and listen!

Mr. Good: They are getting an advantage in the way you figure the occupancy costs. Now if you can hand up such a lucrative tax credit to them, I think you should then do the same for those people who are living in property with taxes of $300 or $400. You know what the situation is.

Hon. Mr. White: What are the property taxes on these two dwellings?

Mr. Good: What two dwellings?

Hon. Mr. White: The point I am making is this. In the city of Toronto we learned, during the meetings of the select committee on taxation, apartments were assessed at, I think it was 43 per cent of the market value, while single-family dwellings were assessed at, I think it was, 27 per cent of market value. Which is to say the apartment property tax per unit—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): That has nothing to do with it at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh yes, it has everything to do with it.

Mr. Good: Not with how occupancy cost is figured.

Hon. Mr. White: It has everything to do with it.

Mr. Good: We are talking about what makes occupancy cost.

Mr. Singer: Besides which, your percentage figures are wrong.

Hon. Mr. White: These words on how hard done by the highrise apartment dwellers are—

Mr. Lewis: You have more respect when you talk about us in this House!

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other questions in regard to section 2, subsection (1)?

Mr. Lewis: Let's have the response.

Mr. Chairman: I just want to get the questions first and I think yours is on (2). So are there any other questions in regard to 2, subsection (1)?

Mr. Deans: There may be after we hear the response.

Mr. Lewis: There is a waterfront observation right here.

Mr. Chairman: He's on (4). The waterfront's on (4).

Mr. Lewis: Oh.

Mr. Chairman: Will the parliamentary assistant answer please?

Mr. Walker: I think the waterfront was on second reading and that's over with.

Mr. Lewis: That is just your hope.

Mr. Lawlor: This is the waterfront on third reading.

Mr. Walker: The member for Sudbury raised certain matters. He indicated that $300 was an inappropriate appraisal for the cost of these various utilities, and that may very well be. However, I might explain to the member that it was his colleague, the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr), who wrote to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) and it is from that particular set of circumstances that this reply has been framed.

I took that particular correspondence out last evening and the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside cited a case where there were utilities, etc., that totalled $300 per year. And in that particular example, the difference was $6. No doubt for those individuals such as yourself who pay more for utilities and other benefits in your own particular accommodation, the figure may well be higher and accordingly the actual difference in benefit may be somewhat higher.

Now, the member raised the question with respect to the actual difference of benefiting a certain segment of society. Let's keep in mind that the higher the occupancy cost, generally speaking, the higher the rent; and generally speaking the greater the taxable income—thereby causing a far greater de-

duction. The one per cent of the taxable income would be somewhat higher. No doubt the individual of whom the member is speaking who pays perhaps in that area for utilities, may well find that he is getting little, if any, return on his property tax credit. So there is an offsetting balance to what you are suggesting.

In addition to that, all other factors taken into account—the complexity of altering the forms, the complexity of requiring the individual homeowner to attempt to segregate the utilities and the cable and the ping-pong table and everything else from his pure rent, and even the complexity of a landlord trying to do that, and the complexity that the provincial government would suffer, and the complexity which the federal government would suffer in attempting to administer this —all suggest that the difference is not sufficiently important to warrant the alteration.

Mr. Germa: Well, Mr. Chairman, could I just respond briefly?

Mr. Chairman: Is the member asking another question? Yes.

Mr. Germa: It would be no problem to me to add on to my taxes the amount of fuel I used last year or the amount of electricity—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, you can't interrupt us.

Mr. Bullbrook: What is this!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. What is the objection?

Mr. Singer: I am rising on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You have no right to order this debate. This debate goes on as long as the members want it to go on.

Mr. Chairman: I don't think I ordered it. He asked if he could make a response.

Mr. Singer: As long as he didn't ask the same question. The Chairman has no right to direct him how to speak. Nonsense!

Mr. Chairman: Let me finish my answer. I said he could ask another question.

Mr. Singer: He could speak on the debate as long as it was relevant.

Mr. Chairman: I said he could ask another question. We will proceed with the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, I don't feel offended because I didn't hear your admonition anyway.

But I would like to respond, Mr. Chairman. The complexities the government has put into this thing are really not there. It would be no problem for me to add to my taxes the amount of fuel I use—I know that exactly. My parking costs—I know that exactly.

So that there wouldn't be any administration costs on my behalf as far as the government is concerned, and it would be to the benefit of the taxpayer. I am sure he wouldn't complain. Then we would all start out on an equal plane.

We would all be equitable then as far as occupancy cost is concerned and the government's one per cent deduction on taxable income would take over and further equalize the tax burden on various people across the province.

I can't accept administration as a factor in removing it because I am sure the taxpayers of Ontario, living in these circumstances, are willing to do the administration for the government.

Mr. Walker: It may not be very difficult for the member for Sudbury to add on his electricity costs and to add on his fuel costs and to add on his cable TV costs and to add on various other utility costs, such as his gas costs and so on, where there are billings that apply two months at a time and one month at a time. But I dare say in the preparation of the purple sheet—which is inserted in the federal income tax form—that it would be rather difficult for a number of people in this province to complete that; and the importance of these forms and avoiding the complexity, I think, is paramount.

Mr. Deans: Not so!

Mr. Good: Clutching at straws.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the government try it and see?

Mr. Lewis: Now you are arguing class.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, now that we have left that one, could I get a reply to the point I was making earlier?

Mr. Chairman: Let me clear this one. Are there any other questions on section 2, subsection (1)? Does the subsection carry?

Agreed!

Now, I believe the member for Downsview has a question on subsection (2).

Mr. Singer: Yes, on (2).

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other questions on subsection (2) of section 2? Then does the parliamentary assistant recall the question in order to reply?

Mr. Walker: No, I don't.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on! I made two speeches about it this afternoon. If the member wants, I will make it over again. All right! Very briefly I—

Mr. Chairman: The chairman takes responsibility for it. I got out of order.

Mr. Singer: I asked the parliamentary assistant that since he admitted that this was inequitable, and since the government is now enshrining it in legislation, why doesn't he take back those two subsections to which I referred, draft an amendment, and bring it back in an hour's time and remove the inequity. Because it's against the government's statute and it isn't fair and the member admits it isn't fair; so do something about it!

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, I did not admit it was inequitable. I did say that it is correct that in the case of married couples the spouse with the higher taxable income is eligible to claim the property tax credit, and that in the case of unmarried couples each member is considered a principal taxpayer and eligible for the credit. I don't think you will find there any comment in respect to inequity. If the hon. member wishes to offer an amendment, it might be considered.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Didn't even say it was a fair deal.

Mr. Singer: Now surely the member is smarter than that. You did say—and I haven't got the instant Hansard here but you look at it—you said you agree substantially with what is said.

This lady makes a very good point. The Human Rights Commission agrees with her. You've admitted this is correct. Now why should you treat different taxpayers in a different way? It's not fair. You have these sections here. Surely it isn't up to me to attempt to redraft a very complicated section of a very complicated act. Since the inequity is obvious, and it is obvious to you and it is obvious to me, why don't you take it back for an hour and have your experts redraft it in a form that will be palatable and make it equitable. It is just as simple as that.

Mrs. Campbell: Take out the discrimination; surely that isn't too much!

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, we are certainly prepared to consider that aspect of it. However, we are still bound by an agreement whereby this is completely a part of our tax rental agreement. How can we change it at this point without some degree of negotiation going on?

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman; this has nothing to do with an agreement. This is the Ontario tax credit.

Mr. Walker: Well it is the tax rental agreement by which this is collected.

Mr. Singer: But in your forms you set out the basis on which you allow credits. In your statute you are now about to set out the basis on which you apply credits. I don't think you are going to indicate to me any provision in any agreement you have with the federal government that says you must discriminate against married wage-earners who are living together and give them an unfair burden, which you don't attach to unmarried wage-earners who are not living together. Now there is no such provision in any rental agreement you have with the government of Canada, at least to my knowledge. If there is such a provision show me where it is.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, there is no actual statement within the tax rental agreement which says we shall discriminate against people. However, there is an agreement by which these forms have been prepared, and they are all part of the subsections and sections of that tax rental agreement. If you want to change that, we are talking about a negotiation to change them.

Now we are prepared to consider a negotiation to change it. But that is how it must stand. It is obviously not going to be done in the next hour.

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Chairman, if what the parliamentary assistant say is correct, then he is saying you have gone ahead and prepared forms for which you didn't have statutory authority. Because you are presently asking for statutory authority to do this. You sent out your notices about tax credits. They state what is in this statute; that we haven't passed yet.

Now how are you going to ask anybody to revise anything, because the enabling legislation that would carry out the provisions of this tax credit notice or part of them is presently here before us? Why are we asking you to change anything, except what you have done without authority?

Mr. Walker: Which section are you referring to?

Mr. Singer: I was referring to sections 2(3)(f) and 2(7) where you define principal taxpayer; and where you define what happens when two or more principal taxpayers together occupy and inhabit the same principal residence.

Now that is what you are doing; and you are doing it now. You jumped the gun when you sent out these tax credit notices; and you jumped the gun when you got your forms prepared. You didn't have enabling legislation, because apparently this is the enabling legislation.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, in section 6 b (1)(f) we are merely amending the existing definition under 6 b (1)(f) of principal taxpayer, which in the old Act was about 2 or 3 in. long, and which in the new Act has an extra inch to it. The only alteration is that section 6 b, (1)(f) (iii).

Mr. Bullbrook: You are not helping any. Don't think you are fooling us; he knows more about it than you do.

Mr. Singer: Well the parliamentary assistant obviously is prepared to enshrine again in legislation something that is obviously inequitable. It is inequitable on the face of it; it is inequitable in the statute; the Human Rights Commission agrees it is inequitable. It allows you to discriminate against a married woman who is living with her husband and both of them are wage-earners. If that's what the government is determined that it is going to do, so be it; and people will know about it. I am merely asking him to remove an obvious inequity which he knows is there, which I know is there, which this lady who wrote to me knows is there; and now is his chance to do it. Be a hero today!

Mr. Chairman: Any reply from the parliamentary assistant? Any further questions in regard to 2(2)?

Subsection (2) of section 2 agreed to. In regard to subsection (3), any questions there? I think the hon. member for Lakeshore probably has priority, if you would.

Mr. Lawlor: Let the member for Kitchener go on, I have nothing against the guy.

Mr. Chairman: He is ruling the chairman out of order. Will you please proceed?

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, I am glad that control is clear within the operation of the committee, Mr. Chairman.

The matter which I raised with the parliamentary assistant dealt particularly with visiting professors. I appreciated the comment which he made in response on second reading, but I think there still is some merit in proposing an amendment to this section in order that this problem can be resolved.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the particular problem is one where persons may have been receiving a benefit during a one- or two-year stay within Canada and then decide to remain in the country. By deciding to remain they perhaps should not be eligible for the benefit which they had already received, so that there could be the possibility of some abuse in this particular circumstance.

I am not saying the abuse is going to be a particularly large item, nor might it be that there are a large number of persons who are going to be involved. But I do think that where we are giving particular tax benefits, they should be given to people who are receiving them on certain clear terms. If the terms are not met by the individual, or if the individual changes the situation in which he or she is receiving this benefit, then I think there should be some recourse within the statute.

I would put it to the parliamentary secretary that there would be merit in adding to subsection (3) of section 2, and making in effect a subsection (iv) to that subsection (f) referred to therein, something along the following lines: "A non-Canadian professor or teacher visiting Canada, who received in that year any special benefit under the federal Act." It may be that the wording of this is not fully acceptable or does not completely encompass the problem, but I think the principle is clear in that anyone who might be involved in a possible abuse of this situation would not receive the benefit.

I do commend an amendment in that form to the parliamentary secretary and I would hope that he would see his way clear to ensure that the exemption under principal taxpayer situations would as well apply to that form as subsection (iv).

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions in regard to subsection (3)?

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Let him reply!

Mr. Chairman: I was going to let him reply to them all at once. Do you wish to reply to them individually?

Mr. Bullbrook: May I just rise on a point of order? Not being offensive at all but it completely detracts from the well-established purpose of debate in committee to undertake what, in effect, are the rules of debate on second reading, because there might want to be continuation of dialogue.

Mr. Chairman: All right. I follow the reasoning. If the member would reply please.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, I can't agree more with the member for Kitchener. However, I'm not prepared to make any alteration by way of amendment at this point in time, because I really think that you are stealing the thunder of the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism. You might well consult your associate beside you for his particular opinion on it. The committee is making a determination on this very question and it's my guess that they'll come down with opinions not dissimilar from what you are suggesting.

Mr. Stokes: Another leak!

Mr. Walker: However, at this point in time it would be inappropriate and it would certainly be premature to attempt to make the alteration, particularly in view of the fact that, if the recommendations of the committee happen to be in this particular direction, the recommendation may well be enveloped in legislation sometime in the future.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the parliamentary assistant should anticipate what the committee may or may not do. Maybe we're doing the same thing in anticipating what the committee may not do.

I believe that he should deal with the legislation that is before him and not with what the select committee may or may not do. In fact, if the select committee moves in one direction and recommends that it will leave it to the federal government to do it—and of course they are very prone over there to say that the federal government usually doesn't act anyway — perhaps he should do it now and stop waiting for a committee report that may or may not contain something that has been referred to.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic to what the member for Nipissing says. However, the committee is really wrestling with the problem.

The committee as recently as yesterday, as you will recall, thought there was a complexity to the problem far greater than just the matter of foreign nationals in our province collecting the benefits of this tax credit. Its members felt the problem may well extend beyond the question of the professors and might well go to those on NATO contingency; might go to those connected with the World Bank or many other organizations which may be related in this country and in this province.

Accordingly, I think it is just premature to attempt to second-guess the committee, particularly when the committee is spending a great deal of time on this very question. I would hate to be the member for Nipissing appearing before the select committee's next meeting!

Mr. R. S. Smith: It doesn't really bother me at all because the legislation is here and the committee is not, until perhaps next month or next year sometime.

Mr. Walker: Next Wednesday.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But not dealing with this subject particularly in regard to the tax. It is a question—

Mr. Chairman: Is there any other discussion on section 2, subsection (3)?

Agreed to.

The hon. member for Lakeshore; on subsection (4) I understand.

Mr. Lawlor: I can tell, Mr. Chairman, that you have been sitting there with hungry anticipation having called upon these learned comments on several occasions without effect. I know you are heartbroken and chagrined.

Hon. Mr. White: Turn up the microphone!

Mr. Bullbrook: He meant turn it the other way.

Mr. Lawlor: But now your countenance may brighten. We'll get on with it. I want to talk about the tax rental agreements for a moment under this section, which is the mulcting section of the bill.

As I understand those agreements, and perhaps you can clarify this for me, if you're brought within the benison of the federal

government, it is prepared to do the collecting on its terms without taking any quid pro quo with respect to those collections. In other words, it does it free of charge. The government of Ontario saves very considerable sums of money because of this largess coming from the federal source, and the reason for the accommodation having been achieved after the Second World War was precisely this.

But under this particular proposal coming from yourselves, they thought they would add springers, or riders, or whatever they may be, and you said: "Well, all right, if we're going to do this for you we expect something in return and if there is any money floating around—the tax spread over and above the terms of the tax credit—rather than return it we are going to put it in our coffers and these are the conditions upon which we are prepared to negotiate."

Would that be a fair picture of what went on? Or what is the picture?

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, I didn't negotiate the agreement. The member for London South would be more appropriately versed in this matter.

Mr. Lawlor: Well then, let the member for London South—

Mr. Walker: However, I rather suspect that was some of it—a quid pro quo.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I didn't negotiate it either. The fact of the matter is the federal government collects these taxes for us because in so doing it gains indirect influence over our tax structure which it then utilizes for the overall fiscal policy of Canada, in a way that cannot be done with the Quebec income tax which is completely beyond Ottawa's purview.

To illustrate, the most recent budget of the Minister of Finance for Canada made certain changes, as you know, in the exemptions provided—for a minimum $100 relief from taxation and so forth—the consequence of which was to remove $25 million from our 1973-1974 revenues. It collaterally transferred $190 million into other provinces—much of which, naturally enough, was paid for by Ontario taxpayers.

The Quebec plan was not touched at all by those federal changes. I quite understand the implicit quid pro quo enjoyed by the government of Canada. It collects these moneys for us free, gratis, and in the process it has a little more control over the total fiscal policy in effect in this economy.

Now, dealing with the claim against credit, I'm sorry I don't know the background of that; I didn't have any knowledge of the negotiations at that time. The fact is inescapable that the federal government has a very strong position in any negotiations, assuming only that we don't want to impose a separate collection system on our people. So certain of the changes in here no doubt spring from its determination to gain certain rights, no doubt including this particular claim against credit which it has insisted upon.

Mr. Lawlor: I take it the basic answer to the question was that it does absorb the administrative costs of the whole system and then is asking something in return on this particular occasion.

Mr. Walker: No, I might just correct that. The federal government charges one per cent of the amount of moneys collected—pardon me, one per cent of the property tax credit programme, the entire programme. They have a charging fee on it of one per cent.

Mr. Lawlor: They do, eh? Then you have something to argue about.

Mr. Walker: They don't charge for the actual collection. That's a fee they've imposed. In addition to that, we do have a benefit—this quid pro quo bit—in that from the taxes collected in the province, we receive all the moneys directly from the federal government as assessed. They bear the charge and they bear the arrears but the arrears do not matter for us.

Mr. Lawlor: Have you an estimate of what that one per cent might mean in terms of dollars?

Mr. Walker: I don't know what you mean.

Mr. Lawlor: You said they do make a charge of one per cent with respect to the property tax credit, and based upon that property tax credit what does that come to in hard cash?

Mr. Walker: One point six million dollars.

Mr. Lawlor: On a wider range, with respect to this present Act—and I'm sure the present minister must be presently involved and responsible for the added tax credits that are forthcoming—I would have thought that they would have been forthcoming in the terms of this particular legislation. After all, in theory all taxes from different tax fields diverse from income tax flow into the central

income tax channel; and, using the income tax as the device, the credits are given, the refunds are made and the whole system works. But you haven't anything in here with respect to either the pension tax credit or the retail sales tax credit. What is the situation on that at the present time and how could you go forward with legislation without including those?

Hon. Mr. White: In fact, we have no such agreement, as the Ontario budget of April 12 revealed. Frankly, I didn't feel free to enter into these negotiations with the Minister of Finance for Canada before the budget was delivered here. I will be meeting him on May 8, at which time we are going to put these requests to him. My expectation, based on the previous acquiescence, is that he will agree to this; and then of course it will be formalized by legislation.

Mr. Martel: What if he says no?

Mr. Lawlor: You will have trouble if he says no.

Hon. Mr. White: If they say no, then we will have to find an alternative.

Mr. Lawlor: You will have to start a new department.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I think he won't say no in a hurry, for reasons I touched on a minute ago.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion in regard to subsection (4)?

Mr. Lawlor: Will there be a ripoff there too?

Mr. Chairman: Shall subsection (4) carry?

Subsection (4) agreed to.

Shall subsection (5) carry?

Agreed to.

Shall section 3 carry?

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 4 carry?

Section 4 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the bill be reported?

Bill 96 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

RETAIL SALES TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves second reading of Bill 98, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): One presumes, Mr. Speaker, that this was marked down from 100.

In the fervour of the public outcry against the imposition of the retail sales tax on energy, it seems unfortunate that one major thing has been forgotten by the citizens of Ontario; that is, the imposition of a 40 per cent increase in the retail sales tax rate.

The point which must be made, and it has been made before, is that in our opinion this tax increase is simply not necessary. This government has always underestimated its tax revenues. Last year alone the budgeted deficit of $800 million was reduced to about $470 million as a result of increases made in personal and corporate income tax revenues.

These are the tax revenues most responsive to economic activity in the province; and this government fails to be able to predict economic activity, particularly as it relates to gross provincial product, unemployment rates and consumer spending.

Obviously the province's ongoing battle with Ottawa makes it blind to federal initiatives which are meant to buoy the economy across the country and from which Ontario, as Canada's richest province, receives the greatest benefits. One would think that the Premier (Mr. Davis) sees himself as the Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa rather than as the Premier of this province. Perhaps he has his eye on that job and wants to prove his stuff; or maybe he just finds the present incumbent inadequate.

Again this year federal initiatives in reducing taxes will mean even greater economic activity in Ontario. Recent unemployment statistics show that unemployment across the country is now 5.9 per cent. It is expected to

decline to five per cent or less at the end of the year. Ontario's unemployment rate now stands at 3.9 per cent and should, hopefully, continue to fall. The Treasurer (Mr. White) has predicted an unemployment rate for 1973 of 4.4 per cent, which he relates to an 11 per cent increase in the gross provincial product.

Yet there is no reason, Mr. Speaker, to doubt that the actual unemployment rate will be four per cent or lower, so that we can expect an increase in the gross provincial product of something closer to 13 per cent.

Other statistics indicate dramatic increases in consumer consumption which should increase steadily throughout the year. Consequently, we believe that a sales tax rate of five per cent, combined with greater personal and corporate taxes, means that $3.15 billion, which the Treasurer estimates he needs from these three tax sources, can easily be achieved without the 40 per cent increase in retail sales tax.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer insists that he must increase taxes to finance the inefficiencies of this government and to attempt to reduce the public debt. This debt has almost doubled in the past two years under the presumed leadership of the Premier as he recklessly spent vast sums of the taxpayers' money, first for getting elected in 1971, and then for fulfilling his pre-election giveaway promises.

Given this fiscal nightmare—which is a phrase that we have heard in this Legislature before—and the decision to raise taxes, one wonders why the Treasurer chose to use a tax which is shown to be regressive and inflationary. I would recommend both to the Treasurer and the Premier, although the Premier seems reluctant to admit that he had anything to do with the budget—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Don't blame him.

Mr. Breithaupt: —the report prepared by a member of the Economic Council of Canada which has been referred to earlier by the member for York South. The gentleman's name is Mr. Allan Maslove and the report is entitled, "The Pattern of Taxation in Canada."

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The provincial Treasurer never read it, that's the problem.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, this report, Mr. Speaker, shows quite dramatically the regressive nature of the sales tax. And I would also suggest that, before it crumbles away into dust, he review the report of the Ontario Committee on Taxation which says that retail sales taxes are inflationary as consumer prices and wages increase as a result of them. I am sure that the minister would remember the words in that report because I think he had a great part in the writing of them.

The sales tax credit which the Treasurer has proposed is simply not adequate to cover the regressive nature of this tax. Surely the amount of the credit is insignificant when it's compared with the total tax burden of the citizens of our province.

So there you have it. We don't need a tax increase; we don't want a tax increase; but this government is determined to give us a tax increase. Should they be successful, it must be made quite clear that it is the wrong tax that has been increased.

For these reasons we cannot support the bill and that is the only reasonable conclusion which can be drawn. So if we assume rationale on the part of the government, and there is evidence to suggest that we are being unreasonable in this assumption, then why is the tax being increased?

Well, the tax was increased to build up revenues, of course. The revenues have been underestimated in order that the government may show what they term to be, and I quote, "a manageable deficit." If we were to return in one year to a position of a small deficit or even a balanced budget, one would have to question why we have been living with deficits of $500 million in the last two years.

In fact, I have stated before and I state again that when the results come in next year at this time, we will probably have a balanced budget. This is assuming, of course, that supplementary estimates, which we have come to expect every December, do not amount to $200 million or $300 million, and also assuming that the expenditures through orders-in-council which are not approved by the Legislature do not run much higher than the usual $100 million to $150 million.

The reason why revenues must be built up is obvious. We have seen it many times in the past. The pattern has always been that in the year prior to an election, the government spends large sums of money on giveaway programmes. During the election there are more expensive promises made, which must be financed in the following year. This is something the people of Ontario have looked forward to every four or five years over the past 30 years.

The difference this time is that the Premier finds himself on the horns of a dilemma. It has become obvious—it was obvious on March 15 and it was obvious during the public outcry of just last week over the imposition of the sales tax on energy — that people are getting sick and tired of government spending, and the consequent increase in tax. They feel they would like to do some of the spending of their own money themselves.

So the Premier must decide in 1974 whether he should increase spending or decrease taxes. It is now not clear which is the best alternative for presumably winning an election campaign. But given this need for increased taxes and thus revenues, the Premier and the Treasurer needed some way to introduce this whopping 40 per cent increase in the retail sales tax rate without causing an uprising.

I'm not suggesting for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that this government is devious or cynical. However, it doesn't strain the imagination too much to see good old Bill and good old John sitting down and trying to think of a way to increase the sales tax without anyone realizing it.

The Premier, of course, could say something like this: "John, let's tax energy, but we won't ease in two per cent this year and four per cent next, and finally bring it up to the level of the retail sales tax; let's hit them with the full seven per cent this year. They will be so concerned about that tax they won't notice that we have increased the retail sales tax by 40 per cent, and if we have to withdraw it, well, maybe we can do it the year before the election."

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The member gives them too much credit.

Mr. Breithaupt: "And if the outcry is really bad, we can even withdraw it completely. And don't worry, John, I'll tell them I've got complete confidence in you. We won't even listen to the calls for your resignation and it can't hurt you politically because, as you say, you are not going to run again."

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs): I think it is pretty decent of the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) to write this speech for the member.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, in any event, let's just presume that that hypothetical conversation might well have taken place.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The minister should remember his backbenchers have still got the Dalton Camp commission report to come in yet.

Mr. Breithaupt: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that we could be more charitable and suggest that the Treasurer simply made a gross error in judgement.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): No, he made a "Grossman" error.

Mr. Breithaupt: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, who make gross errors in judgement usually resign.

In any event he introduced the measure in his budget, and lo and behold, for the first time in living memory—and that goes back 30 years in this province—the House divided on the introduction of a bill. And, *mirabile dictu*, we even had the situation of one lone Conservative backbencher voting with the opposition.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He should be cited for bravery.

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes, it would appear that he has won prizes, awards, probably first place in a flower show, and various other things. I see he is shown in the pictures in newspapers as turning on lights and bringing both joy and jubilation to the people of the province. One would think, unfortunately, that that lone member was the sole cause of the situation that saw such a dramatic and great change in the tax programme which the Treasurer had introduced.

There are, I suppose, some of us on this side of the House who rather thought that our comments had been fairly clear on the matter. However, since the end result was one which was worthwhile, let us presume to give credit to the person who is prepared to take it.

I think that for the first time, the people of this province have had the opportunity of commenting and getting a quick response out of this government. That response may only be the result of some temporary belief in the ability of the people to actually have an input in the tax programmes of the province. There are those of us who hope that the result may be a longer-term one.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, we will be voting against this bill, and perhaps this time we won't have only one lone Tory backbencher who recognizes the inequity of this tax. During last week there were many who were quoted in the paper as wanting to talk

against it in caucus. There were many who said they would vote against it on the floor, and presumably their comments were based only with respect to the matter of energy tax.

But I think when this vote is called on this bill, it will be interesting to see how those backbenchers who opposed this kind of taxation as being regressive and inflationary, who opposed it as being harmful on the poorer citizens of the province and those living on fixed incomes, who opposed it because of the hundreds of letters they received from their own constituents, will stand up and be counted this time. In the imposition of this tax now, this government will be taking many more millions of dollars from the people who can ill afford to pay it, than they ever would have taken through the simple aspect of the energy tax—reprehensible and perhaps even abhorrent though that might be.

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Gisborn: Where's the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) now?

Mr. Breithaupt: I hope the press will record that the opposition is going to be voting against this bill, because it is going to be interesting to see how many others on the government side of this House will join with us. Hopefully, the people of this province will again try to influence their members, whether they are on the government side or on the opposition side, to assure that the kind of tax which is being imposed now will be dropped by the provincial Treasurer.

It may mean, of course, that we are going to have many more floods of letters and many more editorials and comments. If that is the case, so much to the good, because that kind of aroused public opinion is the kind of thing which may finally bring this government to its senses.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, having watched the member for London North (Mr. Walker) pilot Bill 96 through committee, and now the member for London South (Mr. White) pilot this bill through second reading, I can't forbear an irrelevant comment, namely, that I thought when John Robarts left we had broken up that London cabal but heaven help us, it is emerging there once again.

However, I was interested in the comment of the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) in regard to this mythical conversation that went on between old John and old Bill. As a matter of fact there are some fascinating rumours around Queen's Park these days as to what went on in the government to produce such a fantastic political goof as they did. One of the rumours is —maybe there is more truth in it than fiction—that the government put the tax on energy as a red herring to distract public attention from what they thought was the real concern and where the real storm would be, namely, the increase in the sales tax.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is much too clever for them.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): A Machiavellian decoy.

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, what we have to take note of is that we have got rid of the energy tax, but we have still to deal with what the government in the first instance was most fearful of, namely, the 40 per cent hike in the sales tax.

I just want to say, lest there be any doubt in the mind of the provincial Treasurer, that we are opposed to this and we are going to fight it on every stage throughout. Indeed, what I want to do—

Mr. Givens: Filibuster.

Mr. MacDonald: Not filibuster. I don't think you achieve anything by filibustering. We will try to deal with it in a substantive way. What I want to do by way of a leadoff on behalf of the New Democratic caucus is to present the broad parameters of our opposition. My colleagues will be filling in and dealing with certain details.

The first point that I think is of very great significance is that the sales tax is a regressive tax. When you have heard all of the arguments that the provincial Treasurer and some of the other rationalists who are now in support of sales taxes have put forward, the simple answer is that the government itself concedes that the sales tax is regressive and, therefore, it is moving toward tax credits as a means of reducing that regressivity to some extent. So let's not get hung up on the proposition as to whether or not the tax is regressive. It is a regressive tax. That brings me to what to my mind is really completely ludicrous. This government has now become involved in an exercise in which it is raising money from the sales tax, the most regressive tax at the provincial level, in order to finance tax credits to reduce the burden of

the property tax, which is the most regressive levy at the local level.

To call that whole exercise tax reform is really taxing one's credulity. Yet that is precisely the kind of beautiful little academic model that our provincial Treasurer is now obsessed with and introduced to the House. While part of it has been dismantled, let the public not be fooled for one moment. The main part of it is still there and he is proceeding with it. This tax was not needed. It wasn't needed and it wasn't necessary for two reasons.

The first one is that if the Treasurer was going to have tax reform and if he was going to raise revenue for purposes of tax credits that would counter the regressivity of taxes already in existence, then he had alternative areas to which he could have gone to raise money progressively. The Liberal spokesman made reference to the income tax and the corporation tax. Well, he illustrated it as another area to which you could go. I wasn't quite sure, as I listened to him, as to whether he was really recommending that, but certainly—

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, he said put up income taxes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Why recommend it when the government doesn't need the money? It doesn't need it.

Hon. Mr. White: He is nodding his head. Put up the income taxes, the man said.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Treasurer finished?

Mr. Foulds: Right on!

Mr. Breithaupt: Better look to mining taxes.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the Treasurer dribbled on to a stop, or is there more to come?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: More to come.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we have no doubt as to where our position is, and without going into detail, because I've already put it on the record in some detail for consideration of the House.

If the government had some sort of a commitment that it wasn't going to move into the income tax area, which the federal government had vacated in order to give something of a fillip to the economy at the present time, then fine, there are alternative sources. But this government steadfastly refuses to consider these alternative sources.

For example, it has reduced the succession duties until today we have only $59 million in revenue coming in from that source.

Mr. Martel: That is for the poor too!

Mr. MacDonald: As I detailed, the government could have anywhere from $115 million to $140 million from this source, and because it doesn't raise it there progressively in accordance with capacity to pay, it has no alternative but to raise it regressively—what the government is doing with the sales tax.

The second area of recourse is the whole vast area of resources, and particularly the mining industry. As I pointed out in my budget reply, if the government were to implement in the Province of Ontario the kind of proposals that Eric Kierans has suggested in the Province of Manitoba, it would have in the range of some $300 million.

Finally, in the capital gains tax, where this government—I can remember the provincial Treasurer's predecessor, Charlie MacNaughton, getting up and saying, "We raise taxes progressively. It's that group up in Ottawa that is always so regressive." And he cited the cutoff on the social security tax so it wouldn't go beyond $6,000. People earning $6,000 were paying as much of a social security tax as people earning $60,000.

Well, you know, there was a simple answer to it. If he really believed in a progressive tax structure, there was no reason why the Province of Ontario couldn't step in and pick up on the tax beyond the $6,000, and introduce an element of progressivity into it.

And so with the capital gains tax. If the federal government is going to approach the capital gains tax in such a mealy-mouthed way, it leaves this government with an area to move in and to pick up the half of the capital gains tax that the federal government hasn't got the intestinal fortitude to raise in a progressive fashion.

There are alternative sources where this government could raise revenue progressively and it could use that revenue when and if it was needed and in such quantity as it needed to provide services. And if you want to pursue this pet theme of the provincial Treasurer, of enriching the tax credit plan, then the government could use progressively raised revenue to reduce even more of the regressive features of the existing tax—the basic five per cent sales tax with which the

province has been burdened for quite some time.

There's a second reason, however, and this has been alluded to a number of times. I want to come back to it because the provincial Treasurer tends to dismiss it. And that is the calculated miscalculations with which this government frames a budget insofar as its revenues are concerned.

It is one thing to say the government can't, with certainty, predict exactly what the revenue is going to be, but it is another thing to ignore the pattern of miscalculation over the year and to deliberately live with that miscalculation.

I have documented prior to this budget and during my budget reply, that pattern of error, that error in fiscal marksmanship over the last 10 years is 5.3 per cent which, with this year's budget, amounts to $364 million. It's not chicken feed.

Indeed last year, as the budget figures gave us the up-to-date information, the error wasn't 5.3 per cent, it was 50 per cent worse—it was 7.8 per cent. And 7.8 per cent will give the government an extra revenue of $535 million.

Now I am not going to take the time to detail that that $535 million itself may even be low. Because there are a lot of factors, excluding inflated prices to which this government has given the fillip, and therefore a seven per cent sales tax, calculated on the basis of all of these inflated prices, is going to bring in far more revenue, even compared with the kind of underestimate the government has indulged in before.

In view of that, you've got a range of anywhere from $364 million, on the basis of the 5.3 per cent error and underestimate over the last 10 years, up to $535 million on the basis of last year's error of 7.8 per cent. And with that money the government could have done what it needed to do, in terms of larger municipal grants, in terms of enriching the tax credit plan without raising the sales tax. Mr. Speaker, this is a point that I think is worth drawing out and focusing attention on. The government poses as the champion of tax equity, and yet its whole instrument for achieving that, the tax credit in this budget, was designed to do nothing but relieve the regressivity in the increase in the sales tax; only the 2 per cent increase.

In short, what the government was saying is that the regressivity of that basic five per cent, was going to be built, in perpetuity, into our tax structure and sore of forgotten about, to be lived with.

Well that's not good enough!

Mr. Foulds: Absolutely shameful!

Mr. MacDonald: Let me turn now to another area in which I think the sales tax is open to serious criticism. It is undermining the fiscal stance the government would like to believe it is taking in the Province of Ontario; or more appropriately it is undermining the kind of fiscal stance the government should be taking in view of economic conditions in this country.

What the government has done, because of whatever kind of commitment the provincial Treasurer had with the federal finance minister, is to avoid moving into the income tax field which was vacated by the federal budget; but instead they have extracted sales tax to the extent of $340 million a year. That's $340 million even after the energy portion of it has gone down the drain!

Well, Mr. Speaker, $340 million in a full year, taken out of the purchasing power of the people in the Province of Ontario is going to have a very definite stifling effect on any stimulus of the economy, which was the whole objective and presumably the whole purpose of the federal budget.

And by doing that, the provincial Treasurer has destroyed Ontario's credibility vis-à-vis the federal government in some of the traditional arguments that it has been making over the last four or five years.

The long-standing plea of the provincial Treasurer, and his two or three predecessors, was that Ottawa should be engaging in even more imaginative stimulus of the economy. Because we didn't have an adequate stimulation of the economy we have had high levels of unemployment and lower revenues coming in. Not only was every government in this country suffering lower revenues, but they had these intolerable high levels of unemployment.

Well, we got an agreement in January. The provincial Treasurer succeeded in getting the support of finance ministers, of provincial Treasurers, in that conference that was held in Ottawa, that Ottawa's posture up until now had not been sufficiently expansionary; that something more should be done about it.

And yet what does the government do? When the federal budget came down—because, it argues, speciously, the federal budget was inadequately expansionary—what the provincial Treasurer does is to step in and

bolster that inadequacy, instead of support the efforts of the federal government, inadequate as he deems them to be, so that we would have a real stimulus of the economy and really get into clearing up the unemployment and providing the kind of real flow of revenues from which every provincial government would benefit. We have had the long-standing plea from this provincial government that Canada's fiscal policies have been characterized by what is described as a fiscal mismatch that the provincial policies weren't working in tandem, so to speak, with the federal policies. Yet after the Treasurer succeeded in Ottawa in getting unanimity and called upon the federal government for a more imaginative stimulus of the economy, he comes in with a budget that is a fiscal mismatch.

Instead of bolstering the position of the federal government, he takes a stance which in his own terms is fiscally neutral; in fact, it is likely a contractionary budget, because by the time all this money has come in, he is going to find that he will have a balanced budget unless, as the hon. member for Kitchener said, the Treasurer gets engaged in very heavy supplementary spending. A balanced budget or a surplus under the present conditions is not only misconceived, it is going to be a classic in fiscal mismatch.

Once again, what the Treasurer has done is to destroy his own credibility. He has destroyed his capacity to go in and argue with conviction with Ottawa in regard to the inadequacy of its stimulation of the economy and its lack of capacity to provide leadership in harmonizing fiscal policies all across the country.

Of course, just by way of a footnote to it all, what really emerged in January of this year in an informal way was something of a joint economic council to get some harmonization of fiscal policies in this year's budget. When the Treasurer got that agreement on the part of all of the provinces and when the federal government, now that it is so sensitive in its minority position, responded to the consensus of the provinces and came in with a more expansionary budget, what he had was a joint economic council, which he and his predecessors have been pleading for for years. It wasn't formally called as that, but in fact it was that. And what has he done? He has destroyed the credibility of a joint economic council because he, the champion of it for years, has now come back and brought in a budget which is a fiscal mismatch and is countering rather than bolstering the whole thrust of the federal budget.

Let me finally refer to another aspect of the whole policy that flows from this misguided approach to a sales tax, the withdrawing of $340 million from the purchasing power of the people, and therefore dampening down rather than stimulating the economy.

The provincial Treasurer in his budget speech was boasting for a moment that the unemployment rate in January or February was 4.2 per cent, that by March it had dropped to 4.1 per cent—but then he said the yearly average was going to be 4.4 per cent. Well, if the yearly average is going to be 4.4 per cent that means later this year our unemployment is going to climb up to 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 or 4.9 per cent to be able to get an average of 4.4 per cent. In short, Mr. Speaker, we are still going to be a great distance from that goal, to which this government at least is now paying lip-service, of no more than three per cent unemployed so that we can achieve so-called full employment.

The Treasurer's whole policies are pulling the rug out from that kind of a policy, because even with what he deemed to be an adequate expansionary thrust in the federal budget, he had an opportunity to bolster that and to create the kind of expansion in the Canadian economy which would have finally come to grips with this hard-core unemployment which has cursed us for the last four or five or six years, ever since an equally misconceived budget was brought in federally by Edgar Benson.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member find this a convenient time to break his remarks?

Mr. MacDonald: I will speak only about one minute more; I will finish and leave it at that, because my colleagues can pick up on it.

The final point I want to make is that the provincial Treasurer or some of his ghostwriters have a capacity for coming up with interesting new phrases. He says that all the province is now left with is the capacity of fiscal spurt. Isn't that lovely? A fiscal spurt capacity. The Treasurer has run these big deficits that Ottawa should have been bearing until now he has nothing but a spurt capacity left. Well, here comes the spurt. It is another misrepresentation of the situation.

Hon. Mr. White: I think I wrote spirit, actually.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact this government is willing to spurt fantastically before elections and then it rationalizes a nonspurt in the other end of the election cycle. That is what the Treasurer is doing now.

I want to point out to the provincial Treasurer that the Smith committee said that until our debt levels go to nine per cent of the gross domestic product our debts were completely manageable. Okay. The deficits of the last two or three years brought us up to 6.9 per cent, and in 1973-1974 the official prediction of the Treasurer's own ministry is that it is going to be seven per cent.

Now seven per cent is still two per cent below that nine per cent level at which point we begin to get debts that are unmanageable. In other words, he has a capacity to deal with the problem. He is not reduced to spurts but this was a spurt budget. I was almost going to say it was brought in by something which rhymes with spurt, but I won't say that.

In short, this is a tax which is unnecessary. It is inequitable. We are opposed to it. We will fight it on second reading. We will fight it in every clause where it can be done meaningfully. We will oppose it then and we will oppose it on third reading because we don't need it.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): This budget is going to finish the government.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Why doesn't the Treasurer withdraw it and resign?

Mr. MacDonald: John "Walter Gordon" White.

Mr. Lewis: Retreating in steps, but retreating.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 26, 1973

Extension of Don Valley Parkway, statement by Mr. Carton 1265

Great Lakes flood damage, statement by Mr. Snow 1265

Wild rice from northwestern Ontario, statement by Mr. Bernier 1266

Forest fires, statement by Mr. Bernier 1266

Consumer reporting Act, statement by Mr. Clement 1266

Extension of Don Valley Parkway, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis 1269

Great Lakes flood, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Singer, Mr. Spence, Mr. Timbrell, Mr. Deans, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. B. Newman 1270

North Pickering development, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Singer 1272

Mercury task force, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid 1272

Appointment of women to arbitration panel and labour relations board, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 1272

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Snow, Mr. Grossman and Mr. White: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald 1272

Toronto downtown housing, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis 1273

Flight over Escarpment, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Cassidy 1273

Postponement of sewer project, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Good 1274

Government automobile insurance, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Germa 1275

Arbour Day planting on legislative grounds, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Drea 1275

Parking of ministry cars on legislative sidewalks, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Roy .. 1275

School budgets, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Foulds, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Lewis 1276

Pre-clearance of customs, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Kennedy 1277

Elizabeth Gardens project, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Burr, Mr. B. Newman 1277

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 1278

Construction industry negotiations, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Reid 1279

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Taylor 1280

Presenting report, educational communications authority, Mr. McNie 1280

Motion to refer certain estimates to standing committees, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1280

Presenting report, Ministry of Labour, Mr. Snow 1281

Ontario Place Corp. Act, 1972, bill to amend, Mr. Bennett, first reading 1281

Assistance for the Rehabilitation and Protection of Property on or Adjacent to Shorelines Act, bill to provide for, Mr. Snow, first reading 1281

Storage and Supply of Personal Information for Rating Purposes Act, bill to control, Mr. Clement, first reading 1281

Consumer Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Burr, first reading 1281

Business Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roy, first reading 1282

Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act, third reading 1282

Income Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, second reading 1287

Income Tax Act, bill to amend, reported 1292

Retail Sales Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, on second reading 1304

Recess, 6 o'clock 1311

No. 30



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 26, 1973

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1973

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

RETAIL SALES TAX ACT
(*continued*)

Mr. Speaker: When we rose at 6 o'clock I believe we were on second reading of Bill 98, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act. The member for York Centre.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, are we going to continue without the minister (Mr. White)?

An hon. member: Here he is.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, while we are waiting for the minister to take his place, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House that a group of young Liberals from York Mills riding are in the gallery tonight to watch our debate.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The member can do better than that!

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, after the supper hour most of us are in very good humour, and I would like to start off tonight by complimenting the Treasurer (Mr. White) on one feature of his bill, that he is at last recognizing that there should be a refund of sales tax on bad debts. Perhaps he would bring this matter to the attention of other collectors of sales tax, namely the federal government, that it is really unfair for any government to tax sales when actually the retailer himself has never collected the money and therefore is taking money out of his own till. It should not be collected from him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Jessiman (Fort William): Especially that 12 per cent on building products.

Mr. Deacon: I would like to compliment the Treasurer on that, Mr. Speaker. I also think that he has made a good point insofar as the bulk-sale transactions are concerned. It's reasonable, it shows that in these matters the Treasurer has some understanding of the problem faced by those who have bulk sales. They don't have the money right there at the moment and yet in the past they have had to put up their money before the transaction has gone through.

But this 40 per cent increase in the sales tax which we are now seeing put before us tonight is absolutely intolerable. It is made necessary only because of the waste with which this government has plagued this province over the last many years. For example, if one walks a few hundred yards from here to a library that comes under the name of the John P. Robarts Library—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It's a great name.

Mr. Deacon: No question it's a great name. But, under the direction of the current Premier of this province (Mr. Davis), that library, which has cost far more than it originally was estimated to cost, is largely empty because it was, like many other buildings of the university, overbuilt. It was overbuilt because the university chose to follow the instructions of the government instead of the recommendations made over many years by the council of presidents that this government should not encourage building of vast new structures on our campuses because there would be a decline in the number of students after a period of years.

Yet this government has wasted these tax dollars, dollars that really cost the ordinary person a lot of the essentials of his life. Because of the waste of this government in universities we have this 40 per cent increase imposed upon us in this bill.

Look at the waste in Ontario Place—$14 million estimate, $27 million cost—built without any control whatsoever. That's just another example of the failure of this government to show any appreciation of the meaning of a dollar in their hands.

As another example, we are now expanding the space in Toronto for our burgeoning bureaucracy—for the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, for the Ministry of Education, for the Ministry of Natural Resources—to give them more office facilities. There is absolutely

no reason why this space should be built and provided in the highest cost area in North America.

If this government had any comprehension whatsoever of its responsibility to the taxpayers and to improved efficiency, it would see that these ministries had no need to be located in Toronto but would be located in other cities and towns of this province. That would save in the order of 50 per cent of the money being allocated in this budget for maintenance as they call it—the provision of space for departments.

Mr. Jessiman: Move the National Arts Centre to Barrie for $50 million!

Mr. Deacon: Yes, I think moving a lot of these government facilities to towns other than those that are suffering from inflation of land prices, as we are in this area, would certainly make sense to the taxpayers; and they wouldn't have to face the 40 per cent increase in this budget.

Another example is the failure of this government to provide services and the financing to municipalities that would enable them to avoid costly negotiations with the government and enable them, as well as the government—

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs): I think the member is speaking with a forked tongue.

Mr. Deacon: —to bring down costs that are far higher than necessary. This would happen if this government recognized that its job is to provide services to municipalities that they are not in a position to provide themselves, namely the wholesale provision of water services and sewage treatment. Instead of that, this government forces municipalities to enter into negotiations that are protracted over years and years and are absolutely unnecessary when it comes to actually raising the money for these facilities; and certainly they are not the most efficient means of getting them built.

North of Toronto, in the region of York, we have been waiting for years for a satisfactory means of handling the need for services of people who want to live in that area, but this government has stopped all sorts of development just because it has not used its own potential ability of providing services to the areas where there is need.

Then there's the cost of the bureaucracy that we've built up. In the 5½ years since I came into this House, we have seen an increase in civil servants from 45,000 to the figure of 70,000 today. That kind of an increase indicates the failure of this Treasurer and his colleagues to really study how government should serve the people of this province and give them value for their tax dollar.

We wouldn't be complaining about this 40 per cent increase today if it weren't for the waste; and perhaps I'm unfair in blaming the Treasurer for a lot of this waste, because from what I've seen in the past he's probably one who has given a lot of thought and has had some success in achieving more efficiency. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, he's had no success in persuading his colleagues to take a more careful look at a new thrust of the government to see that we don't have a bureaucracy dominating the people of this province and giving us no value for our tax dollar.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: His waist has always been a problem anyway.

Mr. Deacon: In the region of York about $10 million has been paid out over the last three years of regional government there; and yet surveys of the people in that area showed absolutely no appreciation of any improvement in service, because there hasn't been any improvement in service. It's just been $10 million used by this government to try to bribe the people into accepting a form of government that dominates local government in this province more effectively. Insofar as this 40 per cent increase is concerned there's no question that the increase is required because of the waste, the extravagance, the failure to provide efficient good government for the people.

I want the minister to give me an idea, in his remarks, of what has been the experience in Indiana with regard to the elimination of sales tax inequity. In that state, as I recall, they had a sales tax credit system in effect. I know that at the time the select committee studied the matter four or five years ago or whenever it was, we found that the inequity of the sales tax could be alleviated to some extent by means of the sales tax credit system.

It also had many difficulties in connection with it, such as a long delay in getting the credits and therefore people were having to put out money before they got the refund back. They were people who were in the poorest position to benefit from it.

I notice that the minister did take some cognizance of the sales tax credit idea with this initial gesture in this bill—not in this bill but providing it in the budget—

Hon. Mr. White: And in this bill.

Mr. Deacon: I guess it is in the bill, too. Basically, there's great inequity in the sales tax and certainly it is one that isn't nearly as fair as the income tax if we do have to go for additional sources of revenue.

I note that one of the points raised by the select committee was that the proportion of income spent on services tends to rise with income, and the inclusion of services in the tax base would therefore make the burden of tax more progressive. I wonder why it was that the minister ignored that and yet attempted to bring in a tax on an essential part—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): That's a good point, a very good point.

Mr. Deacon: —of our way of life, that is, our need for energy. Imagine the minister thinking that energy was any different from food, a basic essential to life, and trying to impose that tax.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He was going to tax that at one time.

Mr. Deacon: That's right.

Hon. Mr. White: Until the opposition members chickened out.

Mr. Deacon: He would have done that if he could have. Yet he's ignored that field which was studied by the select committee pointing out that services, if there is going to be an increase, should be one way of broadening the base and getting increased revenues.

As a matter of fact, if he was going to go after energy at all, a very popular form of energy tax, in my view, would have been one that, in effect, taxed wasted energy. For example, on automobiles powered with 450 hp engines and putting a very high tax on vehicles larger than what was considered necessary for a smaller car or a medium sized car. In this day and age when we don't want to waste energy, if he had introduced an energy tax that would have discouraged the waste of energy, it would have been one that, I think, would have been quite acceptable.

We see lights left on in buildings at all hours of the night with some sort of pretext that it saves money if one leaves them on instead of shutting them off; it is supposed to be more efficient. We all know that's a lot of nonsense. We all know that this past programme of Hydro to sell more power at all costs is not the programme we should be following today.

We know that energy is going to be an increasingly scarce commodity. We should be doing everything possible to bring in legislation or taxes which will encourage people to be much more careful of our energy resources and not waste them so they will not be available for future generations. This minister seems to have ignored those two possible areas of useful tax changes, I think.

One is recognizing that services are perhaps the most equitable area of sales tax, because those who have more of this world's goods tend to use more services than those who don't have them. They do their own work. Second, excess energy is something of which the public as a whole is becoming very aware. We must not abuse and we must not waste in the future. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this Treasurer has been playing tiddlywinks with the taxpayers when he brings in such exemptions as seeds, bulbs, flowers—cut and potted—shrubs, trees, plants, birds, fish and other household pets.

He treats this whole matter of sales tax as a joke. It is no joke to the taxpayer. There is the failure of the Treasurer to be consistent. For example, in connection with the whole area of sales tax it has been agreed that there should be exemption when it comes to purchases of machinery, equipment and other goods—that's in the Retail Sales Tax Act. Anything that has to do with producing goods should be exempt. We don't want to make it more difficult and more costly to manufacture things. Yet, for example, the revenue men from his department recently collected some $700 from a local grower—a greenhouse operator—who had bought his irrigation equipment considering it to be for agricultural purposes. He was growing tomatoes. He had radiator coils and fans and everything put in. When they saw that he had changed over from tomatoes to flowers, they then banged a $700 tax on the cost of that equipment.

It's completely inconsistent for his department or his legislation to differentiate between production when it has to do with tomatoes and production when it has to do with flowers, particularly now that the Treasurer has decided that flowers aren't even subject to retail sales tax.

These producers of flowers aren't worrying about the sales tax on the retail end. They are concerned about the cost of production, because they want to be competitive in their production costs with those outside this province as well as within the province. We want

them to be that way and I'm sure the Treasurer does. But he has failed in his review of the whole tax source picture to recognize the inconsistencies he now has.

I ask the Treasurer to look into that matter. There is absolutely no reason for him to exempt production machinery on one side of the piece and yet when it comes to those who are in the manufacturing of goods, who are going to be exempt now from retail sales tax, he taxes the production machinery that they require for the production of those flowers and shrubs and trees and the rest of it.

Mr. Speaker, these are the main points I wanted to bring to the Treasurer's attention. I think he should be consistent. It's been said of one man I know that he's the most even-tempered man I've ever met; he's always mad.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Who?

Mr. Deacon: I don't think we can say that of the Treasurer. We can think of another person.

Mr. Lewis: He's most inflammatory.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He's always mad.

Mr. Deacon: The one thing that we do say about him is the only consistent thing about this Treasurer we have, Mr. Speaker, is his inconsistency. He's always inconsistent. He should know better.

There are two or three improvements that I mentioned he has brought in in this legislation, but he's been inconsistent in the use of an inequitable form of tax to pay for the unconscionable ways of the government of this province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. White: That was a withering attack!

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Withered.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Well, wither now.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Whither Ontario?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): John, oh, John. When is he ever going to learn?

Mr. Renwick: One of the Treasurer's best friends, if not his only one.

Mr. Lawlor: If ever a man had been flayed and burned in the unsacred fires and would have learned the basic lesson—

Mr. Lewis: Without benefit of purging!

Mr. Lawlor: —which I learned only too well, when we sat so congenially on that committee throughout that unimaginable zero summer.

Mr. Breithaupt: Summer of 1968.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Rising star.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We will never recover from it.

Mr. Lawlor: It was rock-bottom. I won't mention what we did after the sittings were over in the evening because that would be reserved—

Mr. Renwick: But the member paid tax on it, whatever it was.

Mr. Lawlor: We've been paying ever since!

Mr. Breithaupt: Not alone.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: If it was overnight the member would snore, I'll tell him that.

Mr. Lawlor: The thing I wanted to mention to members, do they remember that we were fallacious and foolish enough to just whisper above the heads of the multitude that we might tax churches? Do they remember that? And do they remember how we reduced it so that it was a pinprick on the horizon with hardly any tax at all? And do members remember the holocaust that greeted us? I'll never forget it. I think Mr. Pilkey probably lost his seat over it.

Mr. Breithaupt: And the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) was burned in effigy.

Mr. Lawlor: The Treasurer was lucky to keep his seat. However, there aren't that many churches in London. They don't pray that often.

After that particular experience I thought the man's impregnable and he wouldn't make any stupid moves; he wouldn't go overboard. He had learned his lesson that there are certain things which are so sacred that they simply can't be taxed; for instance, transfers on the stock exchange. This minister goes from, on one side, the pathetic to the bathetic. The Treasurer, on the pathetic side, is subject, as Ruskin would say, to the pathetic fallacy. Oh, with rigour!

Mr. Lewis: Mortis.

Mr. Foulds: Rigor mortis.

Mr. Lawlor: A strange man indeed. There are certain things sacred for him, you know. The business, for instance, of household pets—goldfish can't be taxed by the Treasurer; or Amazonian piranha, those tender gentle creatures; or imported jaguars from Peru. There is no tax on such creatures. That would be putting household pets under surveillance. Then there is his solicitude, his deep feeling for growing things; everything except human beings falls into the category.

Mr. Good: I wonder if he owns a Christmas tree?

Mr. Lawlor: The tax comes off, the alleviation takes place.

Mr. Good: Does the Treasurer own a Christmas tree farm?

Mr. Lawlor: In another area on the committee this particular passion showed—books. The Treasurer is such a literate creature; books are so precious to him; his literary soul resonates so much with Leo Tolstoy's that he wouldn't permit even the thought or discussion of the taxation of books. Even Playboy was too sacred an object to be taxed.

Mr. Lewis: What does the member mean "even?"

Mr. Breithaupt: What about Penthouse?

Mr. Foulds: That's the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells).

Mr. Lawlor: And so we came out with the recommendation for a tax on what we called, in quotes, "literature."

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member is using that term loosely.

Mr. Lawlor: I would think that 99 per cent of the stuff, including "Xaviera!", our friend's friend, might be subject to a very considerable tax. I recommend 25 per cent.

The Treasurer may extract a few of the books—certain religious literature, which nobody reads any more anyhow, and the odd book on philosophy and put them on an exempt list.

Mr. Lewis: "Don Quixote."

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, "Don Quixote." But for the rest, this is pure sentimentality on the part of the Treasurer. He is full of oozing sentiments about things that don't really come down to earth, but when it comes to raising the five per cent tax to a seven per cent tax upon the lowest income brackets—the tax already being explicitly acknowledged by all authorities, all the boys who know anything about this—and he knows who they are; Maslove and John Dew and Musgrave, all the men that he likes to quote when he's in the smoker car.

Hon. Mr. White: Musgrave? He is not with John Dew. No, he is not.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I could produce texts by Musgrave, that tax is regressive, always has been; and where do you get—

Hon. Mr. White: Musgrave is better than John Dew.

Mr. Lawlor: John Dew is—I'll read the Treasurer John Dew in a few minutes just to refresh his—

Hon. Mr. White: My experts are better than the member's experts.

Mr. Lawlor: —laggard memory on this subject.

Mr. Foulds: We know what happened to Sergeant Musgrave.

Mr. Lawlor: There is no question about its regressiveness. And don't quote Smith at me because Smith's idea is based on a flat-rate proportion of income. He says it is proportional over various classes in the tax. He doesn't deny, though, that it is regressive with respect to the lowest brackets of that tax, taking the actual income and the percentage of income derivable therefrom for people under, say, $5,000. Has the Treasurer seen the figures?

Has he seen the figures, for instance, in Maslove's recent book, which says that in this province, and this is Ontario alone, with respect to personal income tax, people making under $2,000 pay the federal government $5 million and the provincial, $1.5 million. When it gets down to the sales tax, they pay the federal government $26 million and the provincial, $18,200,000. This is people with under $2,000 a year income.

One can follow the figures right through those tables and he will find where the weight really falls. I was reading figures the other day that appalled me and astonished me.

He prates; he prates, you know—the Treasurer and Benson and others. And now the Treasurer is in the same kind of seat which

I hope is sufficiently hot that it incubates for him.

Mr. Breithaupt: Procrustean bed.

Mr. Lawlor: Eighty-three per cent of all taxes are paid, in my opinion, by people making less than $10,000.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, every one of those would benefit from this budget.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It is the privilege of paying one's taxes, is that right?

Mr. Lewis: That is part of the Tory mythology. That is the Treasurer's old credit sleight of hand.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Pay a lot and get a little bit back.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, my friend John—

Mr. Lewis: We mourn his passing.

Mr. Lawlor: —the Treasurer knows as well as I do that the equity in a system depends on the mix, not upon where you lay any particular tax, but upon the total picture of all those taxes. I just want to remind him of what Carter had to say. At 11 of volume 1 and again at 245, he says:

> In the light of these criteria we believe that the present tax system is inequitable in many important respects. The combined effect of sales taxes, corporate income taxes, property taxes, and the present personal income tax rates and base, is such that low-income individuals and families pay higher taxes than is equitable when compared to middle- and upper-income individuals and families.

That was the beginning of the great revolution that never took place. There was no Bastille; there was only a bunch of bastards who stood against the cause. And the Treasurer's party was one of them—

Hon. Mr. White: As the member is now. Shameful!

Mr. Lawlor: —and it did more to undermine the pretensions and the various proposals put forward to make equity in the tax system, than any other single cause in this country because it carries more weight financially. It was Charlie MacNaughton and the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) at the end of the row who were the responsible people.

Can anybody lambaste you under this particular head and just alter you one iota in the direction of human decency, which you talk about all the time and which this budget doesn't contain? This particular tax falls very far short indeed.

We'll come to it—don't animadvert to me about the business of tax credits—we'll talk about tax credits in 2½ minutes.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox) We'll time the member.

Mr. Lawlor: Carter sets up the figures and illustrates it, to show that the total tax structure is regressive over the first three income classes up to income levels of $4,000. I won't go on because he gives them all the way along. The federal tax structure is slightly regressive over the first two brackets. The general sales tax, selective excise and import levies all exhibit regressiveness over the first two brackets—an erratic pattern that is neither clearly progressive nor regressive from an income level of $3,000, to $10,000, and regressive beyond $10,000.

The evidence seems to suggest, therefore, that while taxes on consumption are regressive over the lower and upper income brackets, there is no clear pattern of regressiveness or progressiveness over the middle income situation.

The minister tends, through you, Mr. Speaker, to use weasel words and to play with the language. I suppose that's why he is so fond of books and unwilling to tax them. They offer such a plenitude of masquerades for him to indulge himself with. In his budget statement—when he tried, as usual, to pull the wool over the eyes of this assembly—he said—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The proverbial sweater.

Mr. Lawlor: The Treasurer says at page 27, based on the last paragraph at the middle of that page:

> The total value of the retail sales tax credit is estimated to amount to approximately $90 million per year compared to total tax increases of $50 million from energy used for residential heating and lighting. Thus the new sales tax credit will offset the energy tax and the increased sales tax burden on half or more of our families. Budget paper B illustrates it.

And that has to be, by the way, Mr. Speaker, completely revised. I would ask the minister if it is possible, and I think it just may be,

before this debate is over—because it is not going to be over in a great hurry—to produce to us amended tables. Obviously the first tables have been discountenanced and pulled out under pressure.

And that surprised me about the Treasurer; I thought he had greater indocility than that—presumption, straight gall. I thought he would stand up to it; but no, no he wilted. Friday afternoon he was out doing his lawn and laying around and holding to the barricades, but by Tuesday morning the avalanche had set in and he caved under. That was a terrible disappointment for a man of his parts, I contend.

Mr. Stokes: Flexibility.

Mr. Lawlor: It wasn't flexibility in that particular case; it was an offhanded nonchalance. After all, what is $100 million, eh John?

Mr. Lewis: He knew he had it anyway.

Mr. Lawlor: This business—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I remind the hon. member that he is not supposed to be addressing the minister by his personal name.

Mr. Lewis: Well, that is a more courteous designation for that member than others.

Mr. Taylor: Not in the connotation that he is using.

Mr. Lewis: Oh come now!

Mr. Lawlor: I know the Treasurer a lot better than the member for Prince Edward-Lennox. I even know his strengths; all the member knows is his weaknesses.

Interjections by hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: The Treasurer has the effrontery on page 1 of his budget to use the same language again. He says:

> I would therefore ask the Legislature to increase certain provincial taxes substantially, permitting offsetting decreases in property taxes and permitting significant increases in tax credits as this mechanism evolves toward [Shades of Charles Darwin] a meaningful guaranteed annual income plan.

Two things are wrong with that. First of all, the Treasurer is offsetting. We will delay on that for a moment.

The second thing is the evolution that he is talking about. Is the Treasurer in any concert with, or does he have any ongoing conversation with the Minister of Community and Social Services of this government (Mr. Brunelle)? He is up in Ottawa at the present instant I suspect and he has disowned—has publicly stated that he is no longer interested in—guaranteed annual incomes.

Hon. Mr. White: No, that is not correct.

Mr. Lewis: It was clearcut last night—absolutely clear—he wants nothing to do with it.

Hon. Mr. White: No, that is not correct. In fact, the minister has overall responsibility in the various ministerial presentations.

Mr. Renwick: Oh, is the Treasurer disowning him?

Mr. Lewis: Well, the Treasurer had better speak to him about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: Don't worry; he is holding it.

An hon. member: And doing a pretty good job, too!

Hon. Mr. White: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Lawlor: The point about it is the word "offset," which is a euphemism that hides the real meaning. Mr. Treasurer, there are no offsets. There is a small offset, but the Treasurer announced it on the radio and elsewhere and he tended to mislead—and I think he even misled himself, so convinced is he of his own virtue in this particular regard—as to what the impact and effect of those credits are.

The simple way to put it to him, Mr. Speaker, is to say that he will tax somebody, for example, an extra $72 for the year, and he will turn around and will give them a tax credit which will be for $32. And he has the consummate lack of integrity to forget about the $40 in between. So somebody is out $72. But the Treasurer is saying to the world at large, "Oh, he has a tax credit," with the implication that the taxpayer is right back at the starting point.

Mr. Lewis: That's right. That's right.

Mr. Lawlor: As a matter of fact, he does it so well and so unctuously that sometimes one thinks he might be in a buck or two if that's what he means by negative income tax.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Watch it now!

Mr. Lawlor: But that's not the way it works. The guy who is making $75 a week is out $4 or $5 that week. That's the way it is.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. Lawlor: The Treasurer is going to come along at the end of the year and hand him back $15, $16, $28 or whatever it is. This is the full recompense for his devotion! This is what he calls a tax credit! We in the committee went along with the tax credit concept—

Hon. Mr. White: And the property tax.

Mr. Lawlor: —because the tax credit concept has validity. But the tax credit only has validity in context; the tax credit must be proportionate too. I suggest that in low income ranges it should be 100 per cent, or very close thereto, proportionate to the amount of the outlay of people in those low-income brackets; and it must be graduated up the scale. The Treasurer is not dong that. The gap between the two weighs much too heavily for him to prate about equity, about alleviating burdens, about making this wretched system fairer. It hasn't come to pass. The Treasurer is making it worse.

The burden on the individual taxpayer in the lower-income brackets grows immeasurably worse. His $40 is worth $1,000 to a wealthy man. He's under the same duress and the same responsibility with respect to his family, and this the Treasurer chooses to ignore. He does not pay any attention to this; he sloughs it off and speaks on all occasions in public as though the person who happens to be sitting opposite him is a total dunce. He overrides them with his superior intelligence, if that's what it is. What a browbeater he is! They all shrink before him. He comes on like Genghis Khan, and they haven't got a chance—the steamroller's over them—except the next morning he cancels all the taxes.

I wish the Treasurer would take that into consideration. We must lift our scale. We must give greater tax credits if we're going to be equitable with respect to whole ranges of lower-income people.

Hon. Mr. White: We are doing that.

Mr. Lawlor: If we don't do that, then we're only compounding the mischief; and to pretend otherwise would be a complete misnomer.

I want to read a word or two about this tax credit and the negative income tax. Prof. Douglas Hartle of the University of Toronto Institute for Quantitative Analysis of Social and Economic Policy summed up the tax credit position in relation to negative income tax succinctly in the Star—

Hon. Mr. White: Who? Who was that again?

Mr. Lawlor: Prof. Hartle. He wrote: "The negative income tax can be highly progressive or highly regressive, depending on the size of the credit. The right wingers"—I don't know where the Treasurer places himself these days—

Mr. Renwick: Slightly to the right of Genghis Khan.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Who's he?

Mr. Lawlor: Looking forward to retirement, I suspect, he considers himself above the fray; he's in no wing.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He is budgetarially neutral.

Mr. Lawlor: He is virtually wingless.

An hon. member: A political eunuch?

Hon. Mr. White: Let's get back to Freedman and Musgrave.

Mr. Lawlor: To continue: "The right wingers think of it as a way to get rid of every government welfare scheme by giving the poor a cash payment, while the left wingers see it as a means of transferring wealth from the rich to the poor."

Where does the Treasurer see it? Just where does it come in on his scheme of the universe?

Mr. Lewis: As a political device. That's where.

Mr. Lawlor: He, without any wings at all, is floating up in his own ozone—

Mr. Taylor: That's pretty heady stuff.

Mr. Lawlor: It is heady stuff. It would give an ordinary man delirium tremens, but the Treasurer only shakes a little now and then.

Mr. Lewis: Not to mention dementia praecox!

Mr. Lawlor: Those are the basic remarks I want to make on this particular measure. We can go into it with a nicety and a delicacy that this magnificent piece of legislation is worthy of, when we come to clause-by-clause, period-by-period, comma-by-comma,

phrase-by-phrase, asterisk-by-asterisk consideration in a few days. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. White: The hon. member has sold out to the moguls of the UAW and they are getting their Cadillacs.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, the aspects of this bill—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order. Could the member take a seat for a moment? We didn't properly appreciate our colleague's speech.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Neither did the minister.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Lakeshore will sleep better tonight now!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Thank you for the round of applause! Mr. Speaker, the aspects of this bill to which I would like to speak are quite personal, and I would speak of something else until the Treasurer gets back.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Tell us an Eddie Sargent joke.

Mr. Good: We all appreciate the fact that perhaps nothing has created more furore, both in and outside the Legislature, than this particular bill. I think when it was first announced during the budget, no one realized the acute implications and the effect that this taxation measure would have on each person in the province.

The Treasurer is asking for a 40 per cent increase in the retail sales tax, from five to seven per cent, which will net him an additional $360 million in retail sales tax revenue. This is not the total revenue; this is an increase in revenue. On top of that, this bill is asking for a tax on energy which would net the province this year $65 million, and in succeeding years, $100 million.

We have to talk about this because this is still in the bill, although the Premier (Mr. Davis) made his announcement that that part would be withdrawn. However, the bill before us tonight includes the seven per cent tax on energy. When we look at the budget paper dealing with the source of income of the Province of Ontario, it is almost unbelievable that the Treasurer, in his wisdom, has seen fit to derive as much money from retail sales tax—that is, 19 per cent of the provincial revenue—as he is deriving from personal income tax. The Treasurer is thereby saying that retail sales tax is as fair a form of taxation as is personal income tax.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's unfair.

Mr. Good: This is absolutely unacceptable. I am very greatly surprised that the Treasurer, who has had some experience with the Smith committee, having been chairman of a select committee studying it and the whole method of taxation and equity in taxation, would try to put upon the people of Ontario a budget which would derive as much income from retail sales tax as it would from personal income tax.

I don't care how wealthy a man is, how much income he has, what his political leanings are, or what his political philosophy is. I am sure that everyone will agree when it comes right down to it, deep inside, that personal income tax and income tax on corporations is still the fairest form of taxation. Our Treasurer is trying to tell us that retail sales tax is just as fair a form of taxation as is personal income tax. There isn't anyone who can buy this type of argument.

Every once in a while I get invited to a party where I may be out of my realm. You know, there are some wealthy people around; they back me into a corner, and they say, "Look, Good, you've got to do something about this terrible tax that we're bearing. We're the ones who are creating all the growth in the economy and the government is taxing us to death." I usually say, "Yes, yes, I know, we have to do something for these depressed areas and these people."

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Really whitewashing.

Mr. Good: And I end up by saying, "You know, really, if you come right down to it, you do believe, deep inside somewhere, that if you are paying the tax you must be making the money."

But that is not so with retail sales tax. It's not similar to income tax at all. People who are paying the large portions of income tax are doing so because they are making a large amount of money. It's as simple as that. But our Treasurer is trying to make us believe that the people who have to buy products and buy essentials, are to be expected to pay as much into the provincial coffers in the form of taxation as is derived from all forms of income tax. I think that this in the first

instance designates a very, very great lack of understanding on the part of the provincial Treasurer of what fairness and equity in taxation are all about.

With respect to this increase, it just has to be unconscionable that he would, first of all, increase the retail sales tax by 4 per cent in one year, and then add the energy tax besides. This to me offends all the guidelines and the controls suggested for and placed on the inflationary spiral which has taken us to a great height in our whole price and wage spiral.

I think that the government, when it adds this 40 per cent increase to the sales tax, must accept the responsibility for the increase in prices that will result from it, the increased demands for wages which will result from it, and the lack of money which people will have for spending. The disposable income will not buy as much because of the increase in the sales tax. The income which people would have had as a result of the reduction in federal income tax will not be there to purchase as much goods and commodities because of the increase in the sales tax. So the minister has personally to accept the responsibility for creating and causing increases in the inflationary spiral which has been one of the problems of our nation and our province in the last number of years.

The energy tax itself was supposed to have raised $65 million this year and $100 million next year and each succeeding year. We now have had a promise that it will be withdrawn. It is interesting to note how many people and how many organizations were so vehemently opposed to this energy tax. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture noted that it was greatly opposed to it. The unions spoke out against it. The Ontario Municipal—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What did the federation say about the tax reduction to the farmers?

Mr. Good: That is not in this bill. If the minister wants to talk about what's happening to the farmers, they are quite concerned about the two cents on the gallon that they are going to be charged by this budget on their gasoline and fuel.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, they are not.

Mr. Good: Yes, they are, two cents per gallon. They are quite concerned about that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why should they pay any tax on that any more than any other industrial firm pays tax on it?

Mr. Good: The farmers are the one class of people who are in the production of food who are going to be taxed even after the Treasurer withdraws his energy tax.

Getting back to what I was saying, under the pressure—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They are not being taxed. Did the member not listen to the Treasurer? Why doesn't he speak to the farm people in Waterloo North? There has never been a budget brought down in the history of the province that did as much for the farmers.

Mr. Good: All right. Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to notice that the Ontario Municipal Electric Association was very much opposed to the tax on energy. I have sometimes been critical of the OMEA, because I always felt that it was too much in the hip pocket of Ontario Hydro and whatever Ontario Hydro did the OMEA was not that much concerned about it. They just passed their increases in hydro on to the consumers without ever displaying any public objection to increases in hydro. This time the OMEA did come out and say the government had gone too far.

In the face of all this pressure, including the school boards and hospital boards, we have now had a promise that the tax on energy will be eliminated. Through all of this, the Treasurer wanted to raise as much in—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: None of the member's own party can stand to listen to that.

Mr. Good: If the minister wants to speak on the bill, he is as free to speak on it as I am.

Mr. Deacon: I only hope the minister has a little more common sense than what he has shown in saying what he has said right now.

Mr. Good: In spite of the Treasurer's wish to raise as much money by retail sales tax as he does by personal income tax, he seems to hang his whole case on the fact that there is going to be a sales tax credit. It is sheer, utter nonsense that the right people are going to benefit from the retail sales tax credit in proportion to the amount of tax they have paid.

First of all, the retail sales tax credit is geared to something which has absolutely no relationship to the two things which it should relate to—either the ability to pay, which has got to be the prime basis of taxation for the

general budget of the province, or the amount of retail sales tax paid.

The Treasurer happened to choose personal income tax exemption on which to base the retail sales tax credit. I ask him, Mr. Speaker: Where is there any relationship between the personal income tax exemption and one's ability to pay—and taxes have got to be related in one sense to ability to pay or service rendered—or secondly, where is there any relationship between personal income tax exemption and the amount of retail sales tax paid? It is simple to see that there is no relationship.

The Treasurer pulled out of the air a method whereby he could install another tax credit and abuse the word, because it has no relationship to the amount of credit that has been paid, and there is no way in which you can figure the amount—other than that we know people in the middle and lower income bracket are generally going to have to buy more goods and services than those in upper brackets in proportion to the amount of income.

Getting to the final point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, it is simply this.

Mr. Speaker, could we have a quorum before I proceed?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Two cabinet members. Where are all these Tories concerned over the sales tax increase?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member feel there is not a quorum?

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it is my responsibility to determine whether or not there is a quorum in the House.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to differ with the hon. member. It is not the responsibility of the Speaker to do so. If it is brought to my attention that there is not a quorum then I will cause the bells to ring. Is there not a quorum?

Mr. Good: I have asked whether there is a quorum. At the time I asked there was not a quorum. Is there now?

Mr. Taylor: Continue.

Hon. Mr. White: If the member continues there may not be.

Mr. Good: No, Mr. Speaker, there is not a quorum.

Mr. Speaker ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is apparent and admitted by government members that the confidentiality of the budget is most important. To accomplish this, I am told on good authority that the Premier and the Treasurer are the only members of government, other than the immediate advisers, who know what is going to be in the budget.

This is borne out and has been made quite apparent by the fact that the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) had not done any predetermination on what effect the energy tax would have on school costs. This brings us to the conclusion that the Treasurer and the Premier themselves must take utter and full responsibility for wishing, at the time of the budget release, to impose the seven per cent tax.

Hon. Mr. White: Speed it up! The member is losing all his audience.

Mr. Good: Just listen to what I have to say, because I feel it's very important.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Good: And the people of Ontario feel it's very important.

Mr. Deacon: All those things the Treasurer learned a few years ago he seems to have forgotten.

Mr. Good: All right! So the minister and the Premier must take full and ultimate responsibility for the fact a seven per cent tax on energy was brought into the budget. Then we find there has been such a bad error in judgement on the part of the provincial Treasurer that less than a week after he brings down his budget he must completely alter his direction, rescind it and say they will not introduce the tax.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is known as flexibility.

Mr. Good: When this happens Mr. Speaker, the bad judgement of the Treasurer and the Premier not only bring into question the credibility, but in my view they bring into question the integrity of the Treasurer. Not his personal honesty, let me hasten to add: no one is questioning his personal honesty. But I am questioning, Mr. Speaker, very much, the Premier's and the Treasurer's integrity as to filling those positions. No longer can

the people of Ontario trust the Treasurer to make adequate and proper decisions.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why doesn't the member tell us what Turner did to the cattlemen of Canada? What about his integrity? Why doesn't the member tell them all about that?

Mr. Good: Trust is associated with integrity, so consequently as an hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I feel the Treasurer has no alternative but to resign as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Good: Now, in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why doesn't the member tell why the feds took off the duty on cattle? Take off the duty on beef! Why doesn't the member tell them what Turner did?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Turner lowered the taxes!

Mr. Good: —an error in judgement of that magnitude renders his service to the Province of Ontario questionable, and as an hon. gentleman he should resign.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Hon. Mr. White: Now the Liberals can leave again; it's okay, away they go!

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Treasurer no doubt is still wondering just what happened to him over this past week. I'm not sure he's recovered his poise completely. He is able to smile, that's a good sign, but behind that smile we're not just sure what exists.

Mr. Martel: It is called a lost weekend.

An hon. member: It's future shock, phase three!

Mr. Young: Yes, future shock; that is right.

Just what happened, I suppose we'll never know entirely, Mr. Speaker. Certainly what the hon. member who just spoke said is true. Obviously only about two men were in on these decisions, although I'm not absolutely certain of that.

Certainly the Premier and the Treasurer were in there. And the strange thing is that the Premier had the unmitigated gall to stand up in this place and say: "I am asking the Treasurer to review this decision," as if he had had nothing to do with it.

Now that's too much. Certainly the Premier of this province must have known; that's his job, to know these things.

Mr. Martel: "Billy the Kid."

Mr. Young: Now whether others were in on it or not we don't know. We certainly saw that the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education were shocked almost speechless. I find it difficult to believe the Minister of Agriculture and Food was in on this, although members know he was able to get some real concessions for his people.

Mr. Renwick: Of course he would be, because they got off scot free.

Mr. Young: So it looked as if there may have been some real bargaining there before the decision was made; we have a real horse trader in the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

But the question in my mind is if he was so concerned about his own people on the farms, why wasn't he just as concerned with the other people in the cities or in the villages across this province?

Mr. Renwick: They're buying the food!

Mr. Young: Certainly the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) was not in on this decision at all, because—he shakes his head and verifies that.

Mr. Renwick: I mean after all he is in the fuel oil business.

Mr. Young: Yes; close as he is to the working people of this province, he would have hit the roof if he had known.

Mr. Renwick: What percentage of the vote did the minister get again?

Mr. Young: As a matter of fact, I watched him during the announcement and certainly he was one of those who reacted violently when the decision was made, or when the announcement was made rather, that we were going to have not only the energy tax but the increase of 40 per cent on the sales tax.

Mr. Martel: That's going to hit the Cornwall area rather hard!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Also, there is no question, certainly, the minister from Scarborough (Mrs. Birch) was not in on this decision, because

she knows how the housewives would have taken this, and right in cabinet she would have raised an objection par excellence to this whole concept, so we exonerate her.

That leaves us with only two or three.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): What about the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett)?

Mr. Young: Certainly the member from Ottawa didn't know, because he burst forth in rhetoric in the newspapers within a day or two, lambasting the Treasurer and saying what he was going to do about this whole operation.

Mr. Breithaupt: So did transport!

Mr. Young: So did transport; and we had a lot of revolt in the lines.

Mr. Renwick: And the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes)!

Mr. Young: And the member for Sault Ste. Marie! All of these! It was very obvious—

Mr. Renwick: He was right in there; and the whip, the whip is yawning up in the corner now.

Mr. Young: Yes; and as far as the rump was concerned, back here we saw wild revolution!

Mr. Martel: They all voted for the bill.

Mr. Young: When I came into the parking lot last Tuesday morning, about 9:30 last Tuesday morning—I had heard that there was going to be something happening that day, the newspapers were reporting it—for the first time in the 10 years I've been in this House I couldn't find a parking spot around the whole perimeter of this building. Every Tory was in here expecting a caucus meeting.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Solidarity, that is what it is.

Mr. Young: But what happened? They sat and they twiddled their thumbs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: And they waited. And they said, "What's happening?"

Interjections by hon. members:

Mr. Young: Yes, the rump simply sat there and waited obediently to know what was going to happen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: But while they waited, they talked.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: The member for York West (Mr. MacBeth) was really going to speak his mind in caucus.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please! Maybe the hon. member will get back to the principle of this bill.

Mr. Young: The more they talked the more the revolution grew.

Mr. Lewis: That's right. There were 76 spokesmen that weekend—76 different spokesmen.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not speaking to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I must lay a bit of background for this bit of wisdom I'm going to give. That day a decision was made. A decision finally was made at the cabinet level that the energy tax had to go because of the revolution among the rump and other members.

Mr. McIlveen: It wasn't that. We got a free meal.

Mr. Young: They got a free meal. All right. Well, we know now.

An hon. member: That was the member's participation.

Mr. Cassidy: No, they got $4; is that right?

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. G. Nixon) said it was cheese and crackers and it was good.

Mr. Young: The Premier came into the caucus room and the boys were all waiting with great expectations.

An hon. member: And waiting for orders.

Mr. Lewis: At 1:15.

Mr. Young: At 1:15.

Mr. Lewis: They wouldn't let them in too soon. The House opens at 2 o'clock.

Mr. Young: Just time to say to them, "Boys, you win; we are going to withdraw. We have decided that the Treasurer is going to eat humble pie. The Premier will make the announcement and say what great confidence we have in him. We're going to withdraw the energy tax. But boys, remember this—"

Mr. Renwick: And the Premier is here showing his confidence tonight.

Mr. Young: "—you'll pound the table in absolute confidence in the Treasurer, yes, but more than that—"

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: If the man of the cloth says hell freezes over, hell freezes over.

Mr. Young: "—in return for knuckling under and abolishing the energy tax, you fellows will stick till hell freezes over on the 40 per cent increase in the sales tax."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: The Tory members were told. No arguments, none whatever; they were told.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: And so not one of them dares speak against the 40 per cent increase in the sales tax.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): The member is all wrong!

Mr. Renwick: And the member for Hamilton Mountain is nowhere to be seen.

Mr. Young: There's going to be no revolt over this one.

Mr. Lewis: There is a bargain extracted here.

Mr. Renwick: A pound of flesh.

Mr. Young: A pound of flesh, yes.

Mr. Stokes: The cabinet bought the backbenchers' silence.

Mr. Lewis: They had to support this bill or the member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson) becomes Treasurer.

Mr. Young: And a threat like that could only make them realize it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: The maple sugar king.

An hon. member: That's burning a bridge.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, that decision having been made, the hon. Treasurer was chuckling, realizing that he didn't have to have that money anyway. He could afford this kind of a compromise but he was going to keep that sales tax increase.

Mr. Renwick: A $65 million shellout.

Mr. Cassidy: And it may be back again next year.

Mr. Young: Yes, it was very easy. This morning's Globe and Mail—the paper that's published, I believe, in Toronto—points out this, "The seasonally adjusted real domestic product in February rose for the sixth consecutive month up a sharp 1.4 per cent from January, Statistics Canada reports."

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Did the member read Monday's editorial?

Mr. Lewis: That's the crux.

Mr. Young: It says, "The real domestic product was, in December, 183.3; in January, 184.9; in February 187.5."

In other words, aside from the government's miscalculations in the budgets over the past 10 years, the increase in the productivity of this country and in this province—because the productivity in Ontario is higher than the average across the country—is going to give the Treasurer the extra that he needs without the 40 per cent sales tax increase.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): That's a very good government.

Mr. Lewis: That's the member's view on it.

Mr. Young: Without it. And the Treasurer knows it.

Mr. Lewis: And he knows that.

Mr. Renwick: The Treasurer fuelled the fires of inflation at the same time.

Hon. Mr. White: Ontario leads the country.

Mr. Young: For a Tory paper like the Globe and Mail to give us that information this morning is really something.

Hon. Mr. White: Is there any place members would rather be?

Mr. Renwick: It is gouging the people.

Mr. McIlveen: We might be able to send him someplace.

Mr. Young: It would be so much better if the Treasurer had used a little milk of human kindness, a little common sense and a little bit of understanding in setting the tax rates.

The hon. Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, told us that this is a budget for the poor of Ontario. That's what he said.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Maybe we should have our income tax as high as Manitoba's.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He's making a lot of people poorer with it!

Mr. Young: Already, we've heard some suggestions as to how we might improve it. It is a budget for the poor and so he removes the succession duties, so that the poor may will all their poverty to their children.

Mr. Renwick: That really helps the poor people.

Mr. Young: That is going to help a lot. That will help tremendously.

Mr. Renwick: Makes them double exempt.

Mr. Young: And of course he refused to touch the corporate profits in this province, which are growing by leaps and bounds. I have a few figures I'd like to put on the record for the education of the hon. Treasurer. These come from a very reputable publication, the Financial Post Survey of Mines for 1973 And the latest figures—

Mr. Maeck: Oh, we already have the latest figures.

Mr. Young: Most of the latest figures are for 1971. Just to give the Treasurer a few things here on these pages: Denison Mines profit in 1971—$10.188 million; Falconbridge —$17.5 million;—

Mr. Martel: They are starving.

Mr. Young: Yes. Hollinger Mines—$12.194 million; Inco—that poor starving enterprise up in Sudbury, I understand—$110 million in 1972.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: And the first quarter of 1973 brings $36 million, which looks as if this year is going to be a record. Kerr Addison—almost $4 million; Preston Mines—$4.6 million; Rio Algom—$9.6 million; Matagami Lake Mines, in 1972—$12.4 million; and Noranda in 1972—$64 million.

Mr. Renwick: And we must not increase the tax burden on those companies.

Mr. Martel: That's what Leo the Lollypop said.

Mr. Young: These companies use the resources which are owned by the people of Ontario, and we hardly touch them—and the Treasurer has refused to increase the tax.

Mr. Martel: Courageous lion of the north.

Mr. Young: As a matter of fact, most of these figures I gave are 1971.

Again, the Globe and Mail of March 22 tells us that the after-tax profit of Canadian corporations for 1972 rose more than 24 per cent above 1971.

Mr. Renwick: That's right.

Mr. Young: It says—

Mr. Martel: A lousy $16 million.

Mr. Young: —the greatest improvement was registered in the paper and forestry group, where profits rose 160 per cent from 1971.

Mr. Renwick: That's the group to which we are going to consider giving incentives.

Mr. Young: That's right! That's the group that needs incentives. Construction and materials—profits up 53.7 per cent. Food processing—food processing, mark you—37.7 per cent.

Mr. Renwick: Where is the Minister of Agriculture and Food now?

Mr. Young: General manufacturing—35 per cent. And for industrial mines, this group had an increase of profit last year of 77.6 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, with this kind of prosperity at that level in that sector it's incredible that the minister should choose not only to leave the burden the same, but to lighten it slightly—and at the same time put a 40 per cent increase in the sales tax upon the purchasers in this province.

Mr. Martel: A lousy $16 million from the mining industry last year.

Mr. Young: Right!

Mr. Martel: You know, the government should be ashamed of itself.

Mr. Young: The minister has heard a great deal, as we all have, from people across this province who have objected to this tax. I hope after this debate is over that those who led the revolt before will not listen to the orders they got and will exert some independence.

Mr. Gisborn: They have half a mind—they haven't got a whole one.

Mr. Young: Here are a couple of communications. One is from an anti-poverty coalition. It is a wire to the hon. William Davis, Premier, Queen's Park.

THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT'S WITHDRAWAL OF THE PROPOSED TAX ON HOME LIGHTING AND ENERGY APPRECIATED.

That's a pat on the back.

HOWEVER, THE ONTARIO ANTI-POVERTY COALITION REITERATES ITS DEMAND THAT THE PROPOSED TWO PER CENT INCREASE IN THE PROVINCIAL SALES TAX BE ALSO WITHDRAWN.

They are just a little out in their percentage. It's two points—40 per cent.

THIS INCREASED REGRESSIVE SALES TAX WILL BE A BURDEN ON THOSE LEAST ABLE TO BEAR IT.

Among the many letters which I received from my constituents is this one. I want to read a couple of paragraphs.

> I am writing to protest the two per cent sales tax increase, not on energy alone, but on any item. I do not believe that the government needs this extra revenue. This tax at three per cent was only a temporary measure when introduced, and subsequently this only-temporarily-invoked measure rose to five per cent. Now it's to be seven per cent, and just how long before it's 10 or 15 per cent?
>
> Mr. White's ridiculous statement, that the tax on energy was to help conserve these precious resources and that we should lower our heat and wear sweaters in our homes, indicates his frivolous attitude toward his responsibilities.
>
> When questioned as to the reason for this tax, Mr. White's stock answer is, "You don't understand." Do government officials have so little regard for the intelligence of the average taxpayer? Perhaps a more effective method of conserving these resources might be to slow the export on energies to the United States.

Mr. Martel: It's a possibility.

Mr. Young: Then the final paragraph states:

> Mr. Stanfield has been advocating price and wage controls. Perhaps Mr. Davis has not heard this, or perhaps he does not feel it applies to government spending—roads that have a beginning but no end, buildings erected but not opened, schools that are overequipped and do not really prepare students for the working force. Ontario has long been a Conservative stronghold; too long, it now seems.
>
> Yours very truly.

I phoned the lady to acknowledge the letter. She said, "I voted Tory all my life, but this last time is the last Tory vote I'll ever cast."

Mr. Martel: There are many like her.

Mr. Good: One more Liberal seat.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: There are many like her across this province.

Mr. Renwick: The member should have been down in Stormont.

Mr. Young: In adding my voice to the protest against this tax, it's beyond my comprehension how with the resources we have in this province to bear the burden of taxation this government can stick to its resolve, or the resolve of the Premier and the Treasurer and whoever else was in on this terrible decision, to tax the people in this ruthless and unwarranted manner.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: I don't think we should wait until the minister returns.

Mr. Lewis: I think we should wait for the minister.

Mr. Renwick: Let's move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Lewis: No, no.

Mr. Martel: Move the adjournment.

Mr. Good: Where is the minister? It's his turn now.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Move the adjournment. We'll support it. Let's get the minister in here; it's his bill.

Mr. Ruston: Certainly he wants to hear my remarks.

Mr. Renwick: Where's the minister?

Mr. Lewis: I admit that the member for London North can handle it more competently, but it's the Treasurer's bill.

Mr. Good: It's their turn. Come on, I say to the member for Carleton (Mr. Handleman).

Mr. Martel: Just move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Renwick: Move the adjournment. Come on.

Mr. Good: Come on, the member for Brantford (Mr. Beckett) should speak.

Mr. Martel: Go ahead.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to go ahead on the bill before us, to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act without the Treasurer here.

Mr. Lewis: No, not a surrogate, the Treasurer.

Mr. Young: There are only 18 Tories here anyway, so if the rest of us go out there'd be no quorum left.

Mr. Renwick: Just move the adjournment.

Mr. Martel: Would the member move the adjournment?

Mr. Ruston: I am sure that he would want to listen to my brief words of wisdom, however brief they may be.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: I feel it is too bad that he has to vacate the chamber at this time.

Mr. Renwick: Just move the adjournment.

Mr. Martel: The member for Brantford should move the adjournment.

Mr. Cassidy: Go ahead. We'll support the member.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak just briefly with regard to the introduction of the bill on first reading. It was probably one of the key things in the famous weekend, the Easter weekend, that the Conservative Party in Ontario will long remember, when the bill was presented for first reading on Wednesday afternoon prior to the Easter break. On the insistence of the Liberal Party caucus to see that a vote was called on the first reading; it put the onus on all those to stand up and be counted. And of course, as we all know now, the member for Hamilton Mountain had the courage and fortitude to stand up.

Mr. Renwick: Where is he tonight, for the second time? There he is. Come on, take your seat and stand up and be counted.

Mr. Ruston: I heard one of the other Conservative members say out in the hallway that the member stood up to oppose it, and he said, "Well, I found it much harder to stand up and vote for it," but yet he did. So, it's interesting to hear their comment on that. I am sure that the publicity the member for Hamilton Mountain obtained from it was probably the key thing in the defeat of the energy tax. Probably the opposition didn't get the credit that it should have for actually forcing the vote, which in turn caused a revolt of the Conservative backbenchers. However, we are happy, whatever way it was done, that that was removed.

This tax is, of course, being swept in now with the 40 per cent increase in the sales tax. As someone said, maybe the seven per cent energy tax was put in facetiously in order to slide through the seven per cent sales tax, the regular tax; but I don't think they are smart enough for that. I think it was just a goof by the Premier and the Treasurer in putting that tax on in the first place.

Mr. Good: It wasn't a goof, it's the way those people think.

Mr. Ruston: It's an interesting thing, when you look at the way the economy is going now. Just take the automobile industry, for instance, where they have sold more cars in the last year than I think any time in Canada. I was talking to three dealers in my own area who sell approximately a thousand cars a year. With the 40 per cent increase in the sales tax this will mean an increase of about $75,000 a year to the Province of Ontario from three dealers in a rural area in my locality. So you can just imagine what that's going to mean throughout the province.

With the amount of sales that were going on, with the increase in sales, we certainly didn't need this increase. People were buying, people were working, and the economy was starting to move, but when you have an increase such as this in sales tax you are increasing the spiral of inflation greatly, because governments do not produce money, they get it from other people. If a person is working to make a dollar that's fine, that is putting something in the economy. Taxes are not; they are taking it out of the economy. So then the worker or someone else has to produce more in order for him to have enough to exist on.

An interesting point: driving down Highway 401 not too long ago I stopped to get some gas in my car, and I carry the plates that are identifiable, and when I was having some gas put in the attendant said, "Well, how are things in Toronto?" That was on Wednesday evening about 7 or 8 o'clock, I guess, on my way home for the weekend, and I said, "Well, they're just not too good right now, with the new energy tax being proposed and an increase in the sales tax." "Well," he said, "it's certainly going to be terrible on me. I'm making $2.35 an hour pumping gas here in the service centre. I have three children and they expect us to live on that, and they increase taxes at the same time."

There are a couple of things wrong there that we will have to take up at another time. No one should be working for $2.35 an hour for a company that is leasing space from the Ontario government. However, we will look into that later. But that is an idea of what this tax will do to people on low incomes. It is just putting them down that much lower all the time.

Someone mentioned a while ago about the federal tax of 12 per cent. If you figure the 12 per cent federal tax on manufactured goods, figure the markup and the handling charges, you have about what is equal to seven per cent on the retail level. So we now have the provincial government taking the same amount of money out of goods as the federal government is in its sales tax. It may even figure out in some cases where the province will be obtaining more from that article than the federal government will be, on 12 per cent and then seven per cent on the retail level.

An interesting point: Not too long ago Bell Telephone applied for an increase in its rates of five cents a month and the provincial government was objecting to it. But it so happens that with the new sales tax I am going to be paying 14 cents a month more on one phone and about 35 cents a month more on the other one, and yet Bell was going to raise it only five cents. The government has raised it about three times what Bell itself had asked for.

Mr. Good: Without any hearings.

Mr. Ruston: With no hearings whatsoever. However, there will be a hearing of this government and its actions in 1975, we are quite sure of that, and we are quite sure the people will remember. In the past they have had a habit of forgetting, but I think that they are going to remember in the future some of the things that this government has failed to do.

I think that is about all I have to say now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill 98, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, what I have to say may not seem very profound, and less important than what has been said before, but I do think it is important and will be profound to the many people across this province.

In regard to the subject of the budget that has been the topic of interest in the last few days, I feel that the Treasurer should be in his seat with other cabinet members, and therefore I move the adjournment of the debate and refuse to talk on this.

Mr. Deans: Bring the Treasurer back in to listen. He shows nothing but contempt for the House.

Mr. Gisborn moves the adjournment of the debate.

The House divided on the motion by Mr. Gisborn, which was negatived on the following vote.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 30, the "nays" 52.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The hon. member for Hamilton East may continue the debate.

Mr. Renwick: He has a good crowd.

An hon. member: At least he got the Premier to listen to him.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, in rising about 35 minutes ago to oppose Bill 98, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax, I moved the adjournment of the debate; and this party does not subscribe to the habit of delaying the proceedings of this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: But I would think the issue before us is important enough to many people. The issue before us might not be one that would affect, on the surface, any member in this House.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Just a minute, the member's leader is heckling.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, it may be that the issue before us is not important enough to interest and affect the members of this House, because I don't think the imposition of the extra two per cent on the sales tax will affect any member of this House. They have—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: —as well as have many thousands of others in this province, an amount of disposable income that can be used for the things they desire. But everyone should understand that the imposition of this retail

sales tax on low-income groups and those with large families will create an impact beyond what we would ever comprehend.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: I have been in this House 18 years now, and I've learned to understand the complexities and the problems that a government has in administering the growth of the economy in this province. But I can't understand the fiscal policy of this government at this day and age in 1973.

Mr. Maeck: If the member doesn't understand it, he shouldn't be speaking about it.

An hon. member: It passeth all understanding.

Mr. Gisborn: I first started to realize that I had to pay attention to the economy of this province in the 1920s, when I first went into a factory. I started to ask questions on why commodity goods were so scarce and the cost was so high.

Mr. Foulds: And the cats were so fat.

Mr. Gisborn: I never did get the answer to that. And I went through the Thirties, as many did here, and never got the answer to many of my questions during the 1930s as to why we had just as much land, there was just as much machinery around, just as many factories, and we couldn't produce the things that people needed. I began to understand a few things when the war broke out in September, 1939.

At the end of the Second World War, we all understood what was needed—rationing, tax increases, a change in the approach to the economy, the reduction of many of the restrictions that were placed upon people during the war years. We have now gone 28 years since the end of that war.

An hon. member: With the same government.

Mr. Gisborn: In the last three or four years the ills of our country have been blamed on the fiscal policies of another level of government. They were blamed on the retraction in our economy, the high unemployment, and mainly on the people who were unemployed and on those who were receiving welfare and assistance. They were made the scapegoats for our economic ills of the last three or four years.

What do we find today in this budget? In the economic summary of the budget, on page 60, we are told that we had 140,000 new jobs in 1972. We find that the employment rate declined by 4.8 per cent in 1972 from 5.2 per cent in 1971. I understand now that the figure has further declined to something like 3.9. In 1973, we are told that the employment growth rate is expected to continue, with close to 140,000 new jobs anticipated. The unemployment rate is expected to decline to 4.4. I am repeating myself—I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order.

Mr. Gisborn: The main point in the summary on the economy, is that the gross provincial product is expected to rise by 11 per cent in 1973; six per cent in real terms. Personal incomes are projected to rise 12.6 per cent in 1973, corporate profits should continue to grow strongly, with an anticipated gain of 12 per cent in 1973.

That sort of explains to me what the name of the game is, that with a wealthy province, those people who—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

There are about seven or eight private conversations going on. Perhaps we could have some silence in the House.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is mostly the House leader, Mr. Speaker, as he reconnoitres his way through trying to arrange to sit beyond 10:30; and let us tell him now that's a mistake!

Mr. Gisborn: Those figures tell me there should be a different direction in our fiscal policy at this point in 1973. Rather than putting the load back on those people who have carried it for the last 40 years, in this province and in this country, instead of the regressive tax system we are using we should listen, not just to the members of this party or of the official opposition, but to many of the economists across the country who study the situation and tell us it's a time to end the regressive tax system and go to a progressive tax system. Take the money from where it is and from where no one will be hurt.

With all of the tax incentives and the handouts and the sympathy for the industries and the businesses in this province, I have never heard them scream yet. I have never heard them even complain strongly. I think it's the government's responsibility to take the money from those who have it until they start to scream a little bit.

They make the people scream when they tax them, as has been evident in the last three or four days.

Not being an economist or a mathematician, I would think this is the direction in which we should be going now.

I want to deal specifically with part of the budget, and it is only a major part. In the explanatory note on page 98—or it's Bill 98, rather! Under the explanatory note referring to subsection 6, in its second sentence it says this: "It enacts an exemption for liquor, beer or wine sold under a special occasion permit."

In the budget the provincial Treasurer tells us—and I read from page 37, special occasions permit levy: "Holders of special occasion permits will not be required to collect retail sales tax on their sales, but will continue to pay the tax on their purchases. In lieu of retail sales tax on their sales"—mind you, in lieu of retail sales tax on their sales, "they will be required to pay a special levy in addition to the normal licence fee."

Now, as we understand it, when one obtains a special occasion permit he goes to the liquor store and buys his liquor and pays five per cent tax on it. Then they were expected—and I don't know what's happened to the administration mish-mash of the Liquor Control Board or the government, there must have been some failures in extracting that tax—but what are they going to do in lieu of that tax? They tell us that on spirits in bottles up to 30 oz the levy will be $1, that's $1 on a 25-oz bottle. That tells me that that's about a 20 per cent tax on that $5.25 bottle of liquor.

Bottles over 30 oz the levy is $1.50; so we move from a five per cent tax that this government did not provide methods to extract, to a 20 per cent tax on the same item.

That's one thing. And the Treasurer raises $3 million by that change; $3 million he raises by that change. I will say a word about that again later.

But what does this mean to the people who have been able to enjoy the use of special occasion banquet licences to gather together in social functions to keep themselves out of the high-price cocktail bars? I wonder what kind of lobbying pressure the cocktail bar operators have put on this government to get that tax change in regard to special banquet licences. It means that people now will not be able to afford to have special social functions unless they extract from themselves a high admission fee at the door, something like $3 per person, unless they cut down on the hiring of three- or four-piece bands to a jukebox sort of affair, and unless they cut down on the food they can provide, because no longer will they be able to make a little profit out of the sale of the liquor at the bar, which is the purpose of those kinds of functions.

I think that is one of the devastating parts of this budget. It is not the profound one that I spoke about, but it points up the book-cooking of this government. And this follows all through the budget if one has time to analyse many of these things.

What about the abolition of the tolls on the Burlington Bay Skyway and the Garden City Skyway? When those tolls were introduced, this party strongly opposed the principle of taxing our highways and bridges. It was a principle that we believed in, that we should have free access to our highways and bridges. The government said, "Nonsense, we are going to have to pay for these bridges. We are going to have to soak the users." And many of the people who lived in Burlington and the other side of the bay and who worked in Hamilton were soaked with those charges.

I wonder how much lobbying the trucking industry did to have that tax taken off. The trucking industry took over from the insurance companies as the strongest lobby in this province. Once the prepaid medical and hospital programme became a fait accompli and they were no longer in that lucrative business, then the strongest lobby became the trucking industry. We know how they fought against the tolls on the bridges. It wasn't principle with them; it was the dollar sign.

Now we are going to take those tolls off, and the trucking industry is very happy. They could have been left on until we had completed paying for those bridges, because they are not yet paid for; and that $3 million would have been fixed and would have taken care of this other imposition upon a group of people who are seeking enjoyment.

I'd urge those members of the Conservative Party who felt so strongly and had guts enough to oppose the sales tax being placed upon energy in this province, to use their strength again with the cabinet in having this sales tax reduced—not by the two per cent that has been added, but to three per cent. And let's start on the road to a progressive tax system.

It can be done in the way that was outlined by the critic for this party, the hon. member for York South—by extracting more money from the wealth tax, more money from the resources tax, and more money from the corporation tax. That's where the money should come from. It's about time the government had strength enough to put forward a

policy of that nature, which would settle everyone down in this province so we would know where we were going in the future; and we wouldn't have such a mish-mash, cooked-up budget as is before us tonight.

I wonder where the member for Hamilton Mountain is tonight. I commend him greatly, as have many, for the courage he showed in taking the position he has taken. I understand he was handed today a plaque of courage by WASP, Women Against Soaring Prices. That's something to be proud of, and I am sure he will be re-elected in Hamilton Mountain on that basis with a greater majority if this government changes the tax system.

But I am afraid if they continue the kind of fiscal policies that they have started on in this session, his seat is not going to be safe even with the action he has taken.

The chips are down. The name of the game is changing the approach of this government in the coming years or it is going to have to face it when an election rolls around. Two years won't be very long away.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I'd say the government is flying to disaster.

Mr. Gisborn: I hope there are other speakers who will cover other issues. I'm sorry I had to take the action I took, but I felt that there should be attention paid to this particular bill—

Mr. Foulds: They should apologize. The member shouldn't.

Mr. Gisborn: —the highlight of this session. Something had to be done to make members pay attention. I hope those who were out to functions enjoyed the part that they were able to attend before they were brought away by the bells, and I hope it doesn't happen too often.

Hon. Mr. White: The member is never in here. He shouldn't be such a hypocrite.

An hon. member: They look so nice.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, if anybody wants to talk about being a hypocrite, all the Treasurer has to do is analyse his own statements.

Mr. Ferrier: How would the minister know? He is never here.

Mr. Lewis: The member has served time in this place a lot longer than the minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: All the provincial Treasurer has to do to find out whether he was a doubletalker and a hypocrite, is to go back over his statements in this House flowing from the Smith committee; and other statements he theorized on in regard to a guaranteed wage for the people of this province.

Mr. Deans: When is the government bringing the member for Chatham-Kent back?

Mr. Gisborn: He doesn't just know where he's going; I think the only thing he's sure of is the statement he made not long ago that he wouldn't be running again after the 1971 election.

Mr. Foulds: He's running now.

Mr. Gisborn: I repeat that I hope that those who were called back enjoyed the time they had at whatever function they were at! We hope we don't have to hold up the proceedings of this House on such an important issue again.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, with 2½ minutes left on the clock, I would like to adjourn the House. I would like to say that tomorrow we will return to the debate on the same bill. I would like to remind the leader of the NDP (Mr. Lewis) that I gave a commitment to the House earlier today in his presence which he knows quite well.

Mr. Cassidy: But the House leader has broken so many in the past.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: He breaks them more often than he keeps them.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't like those little front-running episodes that he created tonight and that temper which he can't control.

Mr. MacDonald: Talking about temper, that is a nice display.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 26, 1973

Retail Sales Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, on second reading 1317

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1337

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1337

No. 31



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, April 27, 1973

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1973



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1973

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning we will be having as guests in the west gallery students from Blind River District High School of Blind River and Streetsville Secondary School of Streetsville. There will also be guests, in both galleries, from Woodlands School of Mississauga.

A little later in the morning there will be students from St. Lawrence High School of Cornwall and also the YMCA of Lockport, NY. In the Speaker's gallery we will be favoured by a group of Rotary study exchange team people from Australia.

Statements by the ministry.

PARKS AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATION STUDY

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the hon. members of the House that I am initiating immediately an intensive study of the administration of parks and recreation in Ontario.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about Quetico?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I thought that started four years ago.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What about the select committee of 1961 which reviewed parks administration?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Just listen and get educated!

As the hon. members are well aware, the parks and recreational programmes of the government of Ontario have become increasingly complex and costly. While I believe I am quite justifiably very proud of my ministry's programmes in this area, I am most convinced the time has come to take a close look at our programmes and determine what policies and programmes and administrative structures are required to ensure efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness to the people of Ontario both now and in the years ahead.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I think every minister should get up and say: "I am going to intensively study my department."

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I need not remind the members of the phenomenal growth in outdoor recreation in the past two decades. Our present-day provincial parks programme which can boast the finest park programme system in Canada really got under way as recently as 1956. It has grown spectacularly since then.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Why is the minister looking at it then?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The recent government reorganization brought within the purview of the Ministry of Natural Resources the equally important and successful outdoor recreational programmes of the Niagara Parks Commission, the St. Lawrence Parks Commission, the St. Clair Parkway Commission and the conservation authorities as well. Also we have the historical programmes.

We now want to stand back and take a look at our programmes and the other related programmes to determine how we can do our job even better. To indicate to members the importance the government attaches to this study—

Mr. Singer: These are defeated Tory candidates they have to give jobs to.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —I am pleased to inform the House that my very able parliamentary assistant, the member for Sault St. Marie (Mr. Rhodes), will be the chairman of the study committee. He will be assisted by members of the committee—the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), who is chairman of the Niagara Parks Commission; Mr. J. F. Bauer, chairman of the Grand River Conservation Authority; Mr. J. A. Dulude, retired commissioner of parks and recreation for the city of Ottawa; and J. W. Keenan, executive director of the division of parks for the Ministry of Natural Resources.

As further evidence of the importance of this study, I am pleased to announce that I have appointed Mr. D. M. Peacock, general manager of the St. Lawrence Parks Commis-

sion, to the position of full-time executive director of the study, reporting to the member for Sault Ste. Marie. Mr. Peacock's replacement at the St. Lawrence Parks Commission will be announced in the very near future.

Mr. Lewis: The government would not want any women to look at parks in Ontario. I mean, God forbid that should be allowed!

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): What about Quetico and Algonquin?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Has the member for Scarborough West got a thing about women?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have, and the government will have to buckle into it one day.

MERCURY TASK FORCE.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I wish today to announce initiatives being undertaken by the Ministry of Natural Resources in response to certain recommendations contained in the fourth report of the interdepartmental task force on mercury. As you know, Mr. Speaker, few problems—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That was on the CBC an hour ago.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —have been more vexing to the residents of northwestern Ontario, particularly those whose livelihoods depend on the fishing in the Wabigoon and English River systems. In particular, the government has had a great concern for the health and the well-being of the native people of this part of Ontario—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That's a discovery.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —particularly those of the Grassy Narrows and the Whitedog bands, and action on this matter has already been announced by my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter).

In compiling this report, members of the task force heard briefs from several groups representing the Indian people of northwestern Ontario, including Grand Council Treaty No. 3, and the Grassy Narrows band. In their briefs, the Indians requested the assistance of the government in establishing a broad, comprehensive programme of social and economic incentives to replace losses sustained by the bands as a result of mercury pollution.

In addition to assistance already provided during the past two years by the Ontario government, the Indians have requested that the government undertake with them an intensive analysis of key problems to assist in the re-establishment of their communities. The underlying request to the government is that the Indian bands themselves be permitted to take the leadership in determining which social, economic and cultural programmes would be of greatest benefit to them and that the Ministry of Natural Resources co-operate closely with the chiefs and councillors of the bands concerned.

The matters raised by the Indians cover a broad spectrum of existing government programmes at both the federal and provincial levels.

Their goal is to create a stable social environment and, with the assistance of governments, establish a firm foundation for positive economic progress in the years ahead.

The bands have already indicated their preference not to accept an invitation already extended to them by the government of Ontario for new lands to replace those they now occupy. The government accepts their decision in this regard, and the Ministry of Natural Resources is prepared to accept many of the suggestions put forward by the bands for economic development programmes which will result in improved economic opportunities in the years ahead and an alternative food source.

A committee composed of officials of the Ministry of Natural Resources has already been formed to undertake initial planning of ministry programmes to benefit the bands and to co-operate closely with the officials of the Indian community development branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. This committee will work closely with the bands and meetings to begin long-range planning and short-term objectives will be held in the near future.

The committee will also work closely with consultants from other ministries of the government including economists and community planners as requested by the bands.

The Ministry of Natural Resources will also be prepared to take such initiatives as are necessary to work closely with the federal government's Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whose special responsibility it is to provide for the administration and economic well-being of Indian reserves.

The Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission has indicated its willingness to em-

bark on a programme to clear flood-damaged timber from Umfreville Lake and arrangements have been made to increase the supply of pulpwood from band sources to the Ontario Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co. at Kenora.

A resources development manager is in the Kenora area and will assist the bands in a variety of short-term projects. These include such traditional employment opportunities as tree planting, firefighting, increased trapping, pulpwood operations, crafts and other programmes that will not require the Indians to travel any great distances from their reservations.

Our aim will not only be to restore past losses experienced by the bands but to strengthen the community life of the reservations and the strong family ties which are so important to our native people. In addition, my ministry will ensure that access is available to other lakes in the immediate area of the reserves to ensure that alternate food supplies are available.

These programmes will ensure that the immediate and long-term needs of both Indian bands will be met, and they will avoid economic hardship to Indians as a result of mercury pollution of these waters.

Mr. Lewis: What did all that mean?

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I should say. I should say.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Why doesn't the hon. member act like a leader?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: His apprenticeship is over.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that a couple of questions asked yesterday by the hon. member for High Park led even Canada's leading newspaper to publish on its front page a story in which—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Esau?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —the words "accused" and "charges" and "$300 to save 15 minutes". Mr. Speaker, I consider that as a smear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is joking. He is an accomplished joke and doesn't know it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The member for York South did it for years—

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the minister act like an adult?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The member for York South did it for years, and the leader of the NDP is doing it himself.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is making a fool of himself and he doesn't know it.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He found the only way to make the front page of the Globe, and he's going to milk it for everything it's worth.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member earlier this week asked me questions about how many times during 1972 I had used a government plane—

Mr. MacDonald: Why didn't the minister answer him?

Mr. Shulman: He didn't mention Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I gave him the answer that I had used the plane once to go to Aylmer to address the police college there. Having taken my seat, a few minutes later I got up to ensure that I was as correct as possible and indicated that to my recollection I had also flown to St. Catharines.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Oh that's tough.

Mr. Shulman: He didn't mention Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Upon reviewing the matter I have discovered that flight was not in 1972, since it's so difficult to recall everything that one does in a busy political life.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That flight occurred on April 23, 1971.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is determined to make a major political fiasco of this airplane issue.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The minister has the logbooks, has he?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My timetable on April 23, 1971, is as follows—

Mr. Lewis: We hang on every word.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let's clear up the smear. Let's clear up the smear.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): We've got a point of privilege already.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): There is no point of privilege.

Mr. MacDonald: Is it a point of privilege that anybody should get up for such a specious reason and document his daily schedule in April 1971?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many issues of the Globe and Mail were published, but I read it and that is enough for me; and I'm going to clear that story up.

Mr. MacDonald: Hold a press conference.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On April 23, 1971, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order; order please! So far I have not heard any indication as to what point of privilege there might be.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. minister will indicate clearly to the House what the breach of privilege might have been, I'll be pleased to listen to it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, by virtue of his questions and by virtue of reports, has led the people of this province and of this city to believe that I improperly used a government plane. That is my point of privilege. And some 400,000—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, sir, surely you can use the prerogatives of your office to clear up this mess and just indicate clearly that until the logbooks are tabled there is nothing more we can do about it; these ministers are going to protest that they're being smeared. Let's have the facts!

Mr. Lewis: I'm sure the Premier (Mr. Davis) would have wished this plane to have remained on the ground!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, from 3 to 4 p.m. on Friday, April 23 I was at 399 Adelaide St. W.—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: What did the minister have for breakfast?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —participating in the opening of the Indian Crafts of Ontario, to which we had donated some $200,000 when I was the minister. At 5 o'clock I was expected to be turning a sod for Heidehof—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Did the minister have tea?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I only hope that those associated with the Heidehof Home for Aged could be here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I was turning the sod—

Mr. Lewis: He was turning the sod.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —for the Heidehof Home for the Aged—

Mr. Lewis: When was that? In April? What date was that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: April 23, 1971.

Mr. Lewis: What time of the day was that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That was at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, in St. Catharines.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I'm still not certain what the point of privilege might be. I presume there is one there and I will read the Hansard report and see if there is any action necessary.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: At this point I simply don't know what the point of privilege is.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Have you made a ruling, Mr. Speaker?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: He is asking the minister to sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. minister completed his submission through the Chair to the House as to what privilege has been breached?

Mr. Lewis: The Premier has become a red Tory.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the member for High Park, by his innuendos, has implied that I have misused a government plane. I am clearing the record.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Ask a question. Ask a question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And I'm quite prepared to have the people of Indian Crafts of Ontario and the people of the Heidehof Home for the Aged pass judgement. I had to be, in one evening, in three different places in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Who did he take with him?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of privilege. I will give you $10 for every minute if he will produce the logbooks to substantiate what he said. I will be only too glad to make that $100 for every minute.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Because of the emerging circumstances and controversy over the use of government aircraft by cabinet ministers and others, will he now consider at least withdrawing from his former position that this information is privileged and, in fact, make it available to the House and to the public?

Mr. Lewis: Just another little strategic withdrawal.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think it was indicated yesterday when one of my colleagues, the Treasurer (Mr. White), was discussing this matter of public accounts; I would think, Mr. Speaker, that this would be the appropriate legislative committee to discuss this matter.

Mr. MacDonald: One by one?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Surely it won't be necessary for each individual minister to be called before the committee unless the committee sees fit? Why would not the Premier, with his responsibility for all of the ministries, simply put the information on the table and the committee on public accounts can deal with it as it sees fit?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a decision the committee on public accounts can and should properly make.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Doesn't the Premier think that it would make more sense to table the logbooks and clear the air, rather than have this another government fiasco, week by week, as one after another the ministers report what then appear to be indiscretions, perhaps real, perhaps alleged? Doesn't it now make sense to him just to table the logbooks and get it over with?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): We're trying to help.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I say, with respect, this matter was raised by the Provincial Auditor where he made the observation as to the accounting procedure and the question of policy. The question of policy as it related to the use of government aircraft we think has been made quite clear, and I think this is properly a matter for the public accounts committee to discuss in the company of the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is it clear that the Premier is not going to undertake to use his majority on the public accounts committee to continue suppressing information?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been no indication that any government majority on the public accounts committee has been attempting to suppress anything.

An hon. member: Never, ever, ever.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier should give us his undertaking as head of the government and head of the Progressive Conservative Party that such will not be the case, and that the information will be made totally available to the public accounts committee.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the Premier going to respond?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say to the Premier that we have no assurance; we do not have the logbooks.

Mr. Speaker: This is the question period. Is this a question?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, when the ministers appear before the committee we have no assurance that we are getting the facts as outlined by the logbooks, and I would ask the Premier if he is aware that doctoring logbooks is a federal offence?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The member knows all about it.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Premier why he will not say yes or no. Will he furnish the logbooks?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Premier shouldn't have to answer that.

Mr. Sargent: He has not answered my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: He doesn't have to answer it.

Mr. Sargent: Are you aware, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I want to understand the Premier. Is the Premier saying that he sees fit for the public accounts committee to call every cabinet minister, one by one, and presumably others it may see fit, to bear witness to their trips in 1972, or 1971, or 1970, and that that is the way he thinks it most appropriate to proceed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am just saying this, that I have never directed any committee of this government—

Mr. Lewis: I know that, but I am asking him for an opinion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —nor should I, and that this is a matter that really should be at the discretion of public accounts. If public accounts is satisfied, after discussing it with X number of ministers, that obviously the public interest has been served, I think this is the determination it should make. I have always maintained the position here—and I continue to maintain it—that the head of government should not direct any legislative committee.

Surely this is what is at issue here?

Mr. Singer: Could the Premier tell us the basis for his unique theory that a committee of this House is more important, or is able to make more valid and binding decisions, than is this House?

And why, by the same token, when information is asked in this House, does the Premier say that only the committee can elicit that information? Surely the House is paramount and why doesn't the Premier recognize that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have never said the House is not paramount. But as I understand the traditions and structures in the parliamentary system and the system as we practise it here, legislative committees are emanations of this House; they report to this House. I think if one goes back to some of the discussions we have had in this House over a number of years as to the functioning of the committees, the route that is being suggested—that public accounts deals with this matter—is really quite consistent with observations that have been made by members opposite on a number of occasions that do not relate to this specific issue.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In this case it is an evasion by the Premier.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, of a very specific kind, just out of curiosity: Does the Premier know anything about what is affectionately termed the "William Davis champagne flight" to Atlanta, Ga., for the Masters tournament? Does he know anything about that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I don't. I do know that some two years ago, along with whatever number a DC-9 holds—and I can't give the leader of the New Democratic Party that information—

Mr. Lewis: I don't know either.

Mr. Stokes: About 90.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I, along with whatever number that particular aircraft—and I think it was a DC-9—hold, went to Atlanta, Ga., and spent a day—and I believe it was a Saturday—a very pleasant day, watching the Masters golf tournament. I received an invitation again last year and was unable to go, and I received an invitation to go again this year and I had planned to go, but unfortunately other matters came up and I was not able to go. It turned out to be relatively fortuitous because—

Mr. Reid: Bill Kelly wanted him somewhere else.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was also a Saturday, if memory serves me correctly. And while I'm not a great follower of golf I must confess I enjoyed my trip there two years ago, but because I wasn't able to go this year I didn't miss a great deal because I think that was the day that the Masters was rained out, and those who did go—while I'm sure they had a very pleasant time—didn't see a great deal of golf, because it wasn't played.

Mr. Lewis: Who invited the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the invitation came to a number of people and had nothing whatsoever to do with the government. This is the first occasion—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well it didn't; nothing whatsoever to do with the government. This is the first I had heard that it was called the "Bill Davis champagne flight" to Atlanta.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is probably the first time it was called that.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But, Mr. Speaker, if it was called that—

Mr. Shulman: Who paid for the Premier's ticket?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I didn't do it; I had nothing whatsoever to do with it—

Mr. Shulman: That's how they sell the additional tickets. It's an attraction.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is the promotional gimmick.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I am sure that the leader of the New Democratic Party fully appreciates that this had nothing whatsoever to do with the government.

Mr. Lewis: Who was the host?

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I assume once again that it was a DC-9, but I am not sure of this; I think it was a DC-9, in that I don't think Air Canada is using Viscounts or Vanguards to any great extent.

Mr. Lewis: Who was the host? Who was the host of that flight?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't know who the host was—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We have heard reports. The Premier knows who the host was.

Mr. Lewis: Who invited the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but my recollection is that the people who go pay whatever the tariff is, and it is arranged by a group of people who by and large are avid golf fans.

Mr. Lewis: Golf enthusiasts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right, which I think is really quite appropriate—

An hon. member: And that's the way it is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I was just interested.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I just want to make it clear that I had every intention of going, but due to certain matters I couldn't; as I say, it turned out well from the standpoint that there was no golf played on that particular occasion.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier's answer is almost as long as the Solicitor General's.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Well, the members opposite asked for it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, over the past two or three months we have been trying to crystallize where we stand at this point to get a clearer picture of the misuse of government aircraft. Does the Premier not feel that if he furnished the logbooks, if he had the guts to furnish the logbooks, that we would get a better picture of misuse than asking ministers about times and places where they were? We must have the logbooks to prove whether the Premier is right or wrong.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): The auditor is right.

Mr. MacDonald: This is repetitious.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If the hon. member stayed here all week, he would know what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With respect, I would say that question has already been answered; and once again, with respect, there was nothing in the auditor's report, as I read it, that indicated misuse. The auditor's report, I think, made three points, if memory serves me correctly—

Mr. Sargent: Families went along—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —firstly, that the accounting procedure should be altered, and that the ministry should be charged for the use of government aircraft as it relates to a particular function of that ministry. There was one other recommendation, as I recall it, that related to the charge for the general servicing or maintenance of government aircraft—and I hope I am right in my recollection—that this should be charged to the Ministry of Government Services.

Mr. Sargent: Then what is the Premier afraid of?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh, sit down! Sit down!

Hon. Mr. Davis: The government suggests —and we think this is right—

Mr. Sargent: What is he afraid of?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that this should still be maintained within the Ministry of Natural Resources. The other point the auditor's report made was that there should be some policy definition, and that policy definition has now been provided to members of this House and to the Provincial Auditor. Those were the three points that he made.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member was away.

Mr. Sargent: I'd say the Premier is chicken.

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, he is; he's chicken.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'd hate to tell the House what we think—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: We are forgetting an important part of that report.

ALGONQUIN PARK PLAN

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the Minister of Natural Resources recall the establishment of an advisory group on Algonquin Park in September 1969, I believe? Has he not received recommendations on an overall plan for Algonquin Park in the interim period? And if that is so, why did he not include a statement of the government policy on an overall plan for Algonquin Park at the same time that he announced the establishment of yet another committee of review, examination and recommendation for the Ontario parks system in general?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to say to the Leader of the Opposition that the items are not related at all. The new committee that I've established under my very able parliamentary assistant, the member for Sault Ste. Marie—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that the same fellow we know?

Mr. MacDonald: The last time a minister was praised like that was after the provincial Treasurer goofed.

Mr. Lewis: They spend a lot of time expressing confidence in each other these days.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —will look at the administration and the efficiency of the present operations, such as the St. Lawrence Parks Commission, the Niagara Parks Commission and the St. Clair Parks Commission to bring some uniformity and a co-ordinated approach to this problem. It has nothing to do with and is not related to the Algonquin Park situation at all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary then: Why doesn't the minister clear up the feeling within the community of the whole of the Province of Ontario, particularly among the conservationists who are independent of the minister and the friends in whom he has so much confidence, that the lack of government policy concerned with Algonquin Park amounts to complete irresponsibility; that in fact that government has been provided with recommendations from the advisory committee that have not been acceded to, even in part; and that the minister is continuing to allow other uses of Algonquin Park that would not be permitted under any rational plan?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot agree with the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in the way that the committee has been handling—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Algonquin Wildlands League feels that way about it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, that is one group, Mr. Speaker. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that we are dealing with the first report of the Algonquin Park advisory committee—it is before the resources development policy field now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister has been dealing with that for two years.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And if he is aware of the situation, he knows we reappointed a further committee looking into other aspects of problems involved in the Algonquin Park situation.

Mr. Lewis: We know about the minister's committees.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And when we have its further report we will consider that too. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that I will be able to make a statement in connection with the Algonquin Park report in the not too distant future.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: With due regard to his policy on parks, why has the minister not taken any action on the Quetico advisory report which he has had since last August? Since the minister hasn't taken any action up to this point, I gather that none of those recommendations will be put into force for this coming summer?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, just to review briefly the results of the Quetico Park advisory committee, it was handed to me last fall and I said at that time that I would ask for a further public input by the end of the year. This input has been received and is being completely reviewed and digested within my ministry. This has been completed and the matter is now before the resources development policy field and we have dealt with it up to a point. We are proceeding with it, and I am hopeful here again that I will be able to make a firm statement in the not too distant future.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the announcement made this morning by the minister mean that it is possible that any action taken to preserve Quetico may be delayed for another couple of years—or is it completely independent of either Algonquin or Quetico Park?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the last part of the comment by the member for Thunder Bay is correct—it is completely independent of Quetico and Algonquin. It just deals with the structure of the parks system that we have in the province right at the moment.

Mr. Stokes: A last supplementary: Since the minister has had a comprehensive report on Quetico, and one that was widely accepted throughout the province, is it reasonable to assume that we will hear about government action to preserve it as a wilderness area in the very near future?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I think I can assure the member of that; and I also want to take the opportunity again to compliment the members of the Quetico advisory committee on the excellent recommendations they presented to my ministry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary and curiosity, Mr. Speaker, are the members of the minister's new committee, chaired by his very able parliamentary assistant, paid a per diem for the work they do?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes they are, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Does that extend to the parliamentary assistant and to the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan)?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It extends to the member for Haldimand-Norfolk, but I understand it does not extend to the chairman.

Mr. Lewis: What are the per diems the minister is paying for that committee and for the member for Haldimand-Norfolk?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, Management Board has a formula established on an escalating scale as related to the number of meetings that are held over the year. Right at the present time I am not aware of the number of meetings that will be held, so therefore I can't relate that to the per diem rate.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary: Does the minister mean that he is paying to civil servants who are drawing annual salaries per diem allowances over and above those annual salaries?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker, not the civil servants; those individuals and those private people on the committee.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister not think it is not correct that the member for Halidmand-Norfolk should also be receiving a per diem, besides his member's salary and his Niagara Parks Commission salary?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think this acceptable, Mr. Speaker. The member will be doing some work beyond his normal duties, so quite understandably he should be compensated.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Although all of us are kind of fond of the member for Haldimand-Norfolk, doesn't he think this dispensing of backbench patronage

is just going overboard a bit in this case? I mean he has already had enough parks commissions.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Haldimand-Norfolk has a tremendous amount of input for this particular committee.

Mr. Lewis: I cannot disagree, but he is a full-time member of the House.

Mr. Reid: He is being paid twice already!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He is a chairman of the Niagara Parks Commission and he was selected because of his knowledge and his ability to provide a tremendous input.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

SOIL SAMPLE PROCESSING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment.

Can he explain why in his ministry there is such a long delay in the processing of soil samples associated with applications for lot severance in subdivision planning, when, in the case of an application by Multi-Malls in Chatham township, his ministry was able to provide the official go-ahead as far as soil samples are concerned three days after the original application?

An hon. member: A 24-hour service.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, in the first place, we have not yet proclaimed any part of the province under part 7 of the Act, where the ministry would be responsible for the approval of private waste systems. We do act on the request of health units to give them additional information where there is a severance and they want our expertise, if they feel that there is a problem that their own staff can't handle. In fact, in my own riding I'm just trying to find out why there have been some delays, because apparently the health units have been handing them all over to our people, and we just don't have the staff to do it all.

Hon. R. F. Nixon: How about in Chatham?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As far as Chatham is concerned, my understanding is that the approval to Multi-Malls was given by the local health unit.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Was that not based on the recommendation from the Ministry of the Environment, pertaining specifically to soil samples which will permit this Multi-Malls development to go ahead on septic tanks and drilled wells?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The minister's department approved it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, there was an informal inquiry made of our man in the area on the basis of whether the soil in that area was suitable for septic tanks for what we understood to be about six residences. We subsequently learned that they were proposing a townhouse or an apartment development.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: An $8-million development.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We indicated to them that they would have to have a private system and that it would be in an entirely different class than two or three houses.

I can't tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition at the moment where their proposal stands, but we did indicate two things. One is that if they were drawing more than 10,000 gallons a day from the well to service both the shopping centre and whatever residential complex they planned they would have to get a permit from us and that it would be conditional on ensuring that the wells of the farmers and other residents in the area were not affected. This could only be established after extensive testing.

We also indicated that if there was a large development there it could not be served by septic tanks. There would have to be some sort of a private waste system.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary: Does the minister's statement then mean that the development of the original Multi-Malls proposal has been stopped because every indication is that it's going forward?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I really can't say, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, there are two proposals. One is a shopping centre complex by Multi-Malls. The other, I believe, may be by a different firm. It is for, or was supposed to be for, some residential accommodation. Where that stands, I don't know.

I understand that the township gave the building permits. Subsequently, the Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs put a minister's order, as I understand it, on the township to prevent—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Anything further.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —anything further, but it was too late—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But it had previously been approved.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —to do anything because the township council had issued the building permit.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

PARKS AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATION STUDY

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. I'm sorry to pursue this, but just to clear it in my mind, is he saying that the additional per diems that are being paid to this new committee to look at parks extend only to the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), or do they extend also to the civil servants whom he has appointed, the head of the parks branch, etc.?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker. I said it did not extend to the civil servants who are on the committee.

Mr. Lewis: Just the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No. The chairman of the conservation authority and the gentleman we appointed from Ottawa, Mr. Dubiel, I think.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Dulude.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Dulude. And the other fellow's name? Does the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development have the list there?

Mr. Lewis: I see.

Mr. Good: The minister should know his friend's name without looking at a sheet of paper.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's Mr. Bauer, who is the chairman of the Grand River Conservation Authority, and Mr. Dulude, who is the commissioner of parks and recreation for the city of Ottawa.

Mr. Lewis: Okay, thank you.

INTEREST PAYMENTS ON GERMAN LOANS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the provincial Treasurer how much more money will we now be paying by way of interest rates, as a result of the successive revaluations of the German mark, to handle our rather extensive foreign loans with that country?

Hon. J. White (Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

ONTARIO POSITION ON PENSIONS AT 60

Mr. Lewis: Right; thank you.

Another question of the provincial Treasurer: Why is Ontario's position at the federal-provincial meeting of social welfare ministers in opposition to full pension at age 60? Why is Ontario opposing that principle?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, we're not, I think, opposing it, so much as suggesting that, as with all other pension plans, it should be available to the recipient at age 65 whether or not he is working, in the same way that a corporation pension or a union pension plan is available to a man at retirement age, whether or not he continues to be in the work force.

Secondly, we have recommended that pensions be available at an earlier age, reduced on an actuarial basis.

Now that's the position we took into the conference. Whether or not my colleague has modified that in the light of federal government's proposition or proposals I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: Well that, with respect, was my question, as I understand it.

Why would the Treasurer want to actuarily lower the pension? Why has he not accepted the principle that age 60 is now a legitimate retirement age for full pension?

Hon. Mr. White: I think it is just a matter of money, Mr. Speaker. These funds are flowing in; for a period of time there are very considerable surpluses which are being utilized by the provinces.

The history of the social security system in the United States indicates that it is very tempting for the politicians to utilize those surplus funds to build up benefits for people coming into the social security system, with the result that sometime later the payments then become very high; I think in the US

they are up to something like 11 per cent of the payroll.

Now it's tempting for politicians here in Canada to say let's enrich these pensions, using these reserve funds which have been established, and let somebody else pay for it later. But—well, the member shouldn't shake his head, because the pattern in the United States has just been horrendous—I think it is most unwise for us to incur these costs, to be saddled on those people paying into the pension plan two years to 10 years from now; and gearing it back on an actuarial basis does minimize the payout.

Mr. Renwick: There is nothing comparable here to the US situation.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, of course it minimizes the payout. It reduces it.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Could I ask the Treasurer if he is aware that in this province there are special provisions in various areas where it is mandatory that women retire at 60, whereas men are permitted to continue to work until 65? Is that part of the consideration in determining the policy of the government of Ontario, as it is related in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is. I am glad to have the opportunity to respond. We have made our legislation flow both ways in this jurisdiction.

For instance, when I was the Minister of Revenue we extended interspousal exemptions both ways in a way that hadn't been the case before. I venture to say that in a dozen or more statutes we have given women full rights and full responsibilities with men. Our position in Ottawa is that the spouse, whether male or female, has equal rights under the federal legislation. So that's exactly what we are doing.

Mrs. Campbell: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I don't think, with respect, the Treasurer understood the question. It is not a matter of the spouse, its a matter of the person in the work force. In municipal government, for example, women are required to retire from their jobs at age 60. Men are permitted to continue until age 65. It always seems to end up as a matter of spouses and I am pointing out that this is a matter of concern with the philosophy that is being espoused by this government and Ottawa. I would like clarification or whether it is understood.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we have attempted in recent years to make men and women fully co-equal with respect to rights and responsibilities. This philosophy is enshrined in a number of statutes and—I am getting into an area here which is not my specialty—it is embedded, if I am not mistaken, in the Human Rights legislation. Now if there are provisions like this for a group of municipal employees or in a corporation, I should think that the women thereby affected would have some course of action.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Doesn't the minister recognize that the saving in terms of the amounts of jobs that might be made available and the saving in terms of unemployment insurance benefits which will not have to be paid to those at the younger end of the work spectrum would be sufficient to offset the additional costs of reducing the pensionable age from 65 to 60?

Hon. Mr. White: No, sir.

WOMEN'S CONFERENCE ON WORLD CONDITIONS

Mr. Lewis: My last question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. What inspired this conference "Designed to Enlighten Women on World Conditions"? I draw the minister's attention to the phrase from his ministry, "a conference designed to enlighten women on world conditions and how they can contribute to the province's well-being." Who inspired this and who puts out this trash?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am not aware of the particular piece of literature that the leader of the NDP has in his hand, but I would be glad to look at it. I am not even—

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, since the minister is one of the featured speakers at the conference designed to enlighten women on world conditions, which I gather is occurring—

Mr. Ruston: Better give him a programme.

Mr. Lewis: —at the Royal York Hotel in May—the minister recalls it now, does he? He had, perhaps, forgotten the enlightenment that would be dispensed. Can he tell us how all of this originates and when he is going to stop this nonsense?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but in the original question I wasn't quite

aware of the conference to which the leader of the NDP is referring.

It is organized by the women's committee from the ministry which has been in operation since about 1964. There has been a women's advisory committee, Mr. Speaker, and we think it has produced some excellent results for this province.

It has kept women in this province—about whom the NDP leader seems to be much concerned in recent days—well informed of the government's position on policies we are establishing. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the challenge these ladies will be offered this year is to design these programmes—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am sure that the challenge of this government is considerably better than it would be from some other quarters of the House. I say to you that, while I don't consider it a cheap party, I consider it a responsibility of this government to see that the women of this province are informed on a first-hand basis exactly what we are doing to improve their position in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I might say, in closing, that we are looking forward to a very successful conference. I am sure that with speakers such as the Minister without Portfolio (Mrs. Birch) and others, it will produce great results for the women of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: What is this special relationship between this ministry and Morrison Lamothe Frozen Foods?

Mr. Cassidy: They are big Tories.

Mr. Lewis: The director of the company's consumer services will speak at this conference; another one of its senior spokeswomen spoke at the previous conference which I raised in the House, and the only woman the Premier is taking to the United Kingdom with him on that delegation to seek trade is also associated with Morrison Lamothe Frozen Foods. What is this special relationship?

As a second supplementary, has Morrison Lamothe Frozen Foods contributed to the Progressive Conservative Party in the past and, if so, in what amount?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, first of all the selection of Mrs. Hale, who was with Morrison Lamothe, was because we believe her to be an extremely well-qualified person to speak on affairs that relate to developments in the woman's world. Let me say that Mrs. Hale, Mr. Speaker, has been recognized for her outstanding talent not only by people in the Province of Ontario but throughout North America.

Mr. Lewis: There are other women.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: We think she has great talent and she will be able to leave a message with the women who will attend our conference on May 2. May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that Morrison Lamothe is located in an excellent part of the Province of Ontario, eastern Ontario. I am delighted that the Premier has invited the president of that particular organization to go with us to the UK later on in the month of May.

As far as the outstanding bakery from Ottawa, Morrison Lamothe, is concerned—and they do produce other products in this city, Toronto, under the name of Farmhouse products, Mr. Speaker—their relationship to the Conservative Party is well known. As far as their political contribution, I would not be aware of any of their participation in that field.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: What does the minister mean "their relationship to the Conservative Party is well known"? I am sorry, I am one of those who doesn't know it. Can he tell me?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I would suggest that the leader of the NDP consult with the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: We may not be able to find out what the relationship of the company is, but would the minister not agree that this conference and particularly the other conferences that have been taking place around the province are basically a programme for political propagandizing with public funds? They are heavily subsidized from this ministry, and it has been one of Bob Macaulay's original ideas which turned out very, very badly indeed. It's a waste of public funds.

Mr. Lewis: It is worse than that. It depreciates women's role in this province.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Liberal Party, first of all, if he wishes to talk about them being a source of propaganda, Mr. Speaker, the people who are invited to participate in the conferences do not represent a particular organization or party in this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who do they represent and who invited them? Who gets the invitation?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Let me say they cut across the line. We invite those who represent political organizations, whether it be the Conservative Party of Ontario, or Liberal organizations or NDP, as well as people from church groups and other associations right across the province. We do not, Mr. Speaker, as some would lead us to believe, try to sell a programme of this government on a singular and partial basis. But we do try to inform the people, the women of this province, what this government is doing to improve their position in this province.

Mr. Lewis: I don't think so.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister inherited this hocus-pocus, this political tool here, is it true that he is setting up a council for men in the same way?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I would think that the member for Grey-Bruce is likely aware of the fact that we do, as the male race, participate much more—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The opposition rests its case!

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that they will appreciate that we, as the male group in this particular society, have a little more to do with the affairs of the day and so they have not given consideration to this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I have a little trouble trying to decide whether some of those in the House really belong to that side of the race.

Mr. Lewis: No wonder the minister is still a bachelor!

OTTAWA FAMILIES' HOUSING PROBLEM

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the member for Ottawa South.

However, I have been trying to talk to the Premier for more than a week in this House. Last Tuesday I sent the Premier a letter asking him if he would intervene personally in the cases of seven families in my riding who cannot find housing, who are being evicted or bankrupted by high rents, and for whom neither my office, myself nor anybody else in Ottawa can do anything. Can the Premier intervene?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I received the letter from the hon. member and we are taking a look at it.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary: What will the Premier do to prevent similar situations arising, and to solve the problems of many other families who don't even come to his attention like this?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: There is no answer. I think that should go on the record, Mr. Speaker. There is no answer from the Premier.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Let the record show that the member for Ottawa Centre can't do his job.

Mr. Cassidy: What are the government members doing? They are supporting the speculators and taking money from the people, that is what they do. We try to help them every day but we can't with the government's lousy policies.

Mr. Lewis: Does the Premier feel his government collapsing around him?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

SERVICE STATION OPERATING HOURS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Is the minister aware that Texaco Canada Ltd. is cancelling the lease of an operator of one of its stations in the Windsor area who refuses to operate on a 24-hour basis? He presently operates from 7:30 a.m. until 11 p.m. and the company insists that he continue to operate in spite of the fact that he is losing money on his operations from 11 o'clock until 7:30 in the morning. If the minister is not aware of it, will he make himself aware of the situation and act expeditiously, as the contract or the lease is being cancelled as of April 30?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of this particular matter referred to by the hon. member. I'm invited to act expeditiously, and I would request some advice from the hon. member if he can tell me what authority we have to act.

Mr. B. Newman: Under the franchising legislation that the minister intends to—or that he may have today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister, when is he going to introduce legislation which will prevent this type of abuse?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Why don't the members get together over there?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition parties are aware, as I hope my own people are too, that there has been a franchising study completed.

I question very seriously how government can interfere with contractual relationships between a landlord and a tenant on a lease deal relating to the gasoline outlets in this province. If hon. members have any suggestions as to how we might assist both parties, they would be more than welcome to discuss them with me. But it is a difficult thing, and when government starts to interfere with very singular and individual contracts relating to gasoline vendors and their lessees, I don't know just how one would approach it unless one took over the whole industry.

Mr. Deacon: Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister examine the legislation introduced in Alberta where a bill of rights between tenants and oil companies has been in force and is apparently working quite successfully and will he also examine the private member's bill under my name with regard to the pricing of gasoline products?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to look at both of the documents referred to by the hon. member for York Centre and I'm advised that the situation in Alberta, contrary to what he has stated, is not working as well as they had anticipated.

It is somewhat interesting to note that there is only a small number of independent lessee dealers in Ontario today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

CHARGES FOR USE OF CROWN LANDS

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the kite flying that he's been doing in recent months concerning the possibility of imposing a fee for the use of Crown lands, particularly for nonresidents, does he propose to bring in legislation during this term to deal with that particular subject, and if so, will he exempt Ontario residents from those Crown dues?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, if I may just review for a moment the problems related with the Crown land situation—particularly in northern Ontario where we have a number of nonresidents and residents using the Crown lands and desecrating the countryside in the various areas—we made a suggestion, at least I made one to the Northwestern Ontario Associated Chambers of Commerce, whereby we would zone specific areas at the local level and the suggestion was that there be a resident fee and a nonresident fee.

We asked for public participation and we invited the members of the Legislature, of course, to give us their input. That input is now before us. We're studying it, and I can assure the member for Thunder Bay that it's not my intention, after listening to the general public, as responsive as we are on this side of the government, not to impose a resident fee. We are still examining the possibility of zoning and the imposition of a fee to the nonresidents, but that decision has not been reached as yet.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Foulds: Out of curiosity, does the government need legislation to introduce such a fee, or can it do that through regulation?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, we can do that through regulation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

MERCURY TASK FORCE

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the fact that the task force on mercury pollution recommended providing an alternate food source to the Indians on the two reserves affected; and in view of the fact that another task force, or study group that he set up for short-term and long-term planning, is obviously going to take some time before it's operative; does the minister not feel that his

ministry, or some ministry of the government, should be providing the Indians with an alternate source of food until some long range plan can be drawn up that will solve the problem?

I might ask a second question while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister not feel that the tourist camps in the area that are operating on the polluted waters should be shut down, especially in view of the fact they are advertising to their American guests that really there isn't much of a mercury problem and that the fish are edible?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker: dealing with the first part of the member's question, I would say to him that we're going to enter some very serious discussions with the federal government. As he is aware, I'm sure, this is a federal reserve and has a certain federal jurisdiction. In my statement I made a point of mentioning that we would make available, and would provide access to, other lakes that are not polluted in the adjacent areas of the reserves.

Mr. Reid: The minister knows that's not going to work.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, where they can go and fish; they can go and get their resource there.

Mr. Reid: The minister has lived in the north long enough to know that is idiotic.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm sure this will be acceptable. If the federal government wants to contribute and enter into a food bank, which the member is suggesting, then certainly we would be glad to sit down and talk with them.

In connection with closing down the tourist camps, my colleague, the Minister of Health, made it clear in his statement that the course he was following, and which the government was going to follow, would be to notify the residents of that immediate area and all the tourists coming into the area that it was not right that they should eat fish from the area and that it may be hazardous to their health. It's not the intention of the government to close down tourist camps.

MEMO ON ELECTRICIANS IN PROPERTY MANAGEMENT BRANCH

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker. Why did the minister take no action in connection with the confidential memorandum, prepared by his property management branch on March 27, 1973, informing him that all the electricians were resigning because, quote: "It is apparent that the rates of pay paid to this trade are not sufficiently attractive to enable us to retain staff"?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of such a confidential memorandum.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Typed in the member's own office again, eh?

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Who is the memo from?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked me to obtain further information with respect to the Hydro building. I have a letter here, which I wish to table, from the chairman of Hydro.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has it got copies of the other bids?

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Clement presented the annual report of the office of the Registrar General for the year ending Dec. 31, 1972; and the annual report of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario for the year ending March 31, 1972.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 96, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor is standing by for Royal assent.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has,

at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 73, An Act to amend the Trustee Act.

Bill 74, An Act to amend the Fatal Accidents Act.

Bill 75, An Act to amend the Commissioners for taking Affidavits Act.

Bill 82, An Act to amend the Devolution of Estates Act.

Bill 83, An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill 93, An Act to amend the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act.

Bill 96, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Bill Pr1, An Act respecting Aradco Management Ltd. and Oak Stamping Ltd.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the East York Foundation.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Simcoe and Erie General Insurance Co.

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Reliable Life Insurance Co.

Bill Pr. 8, An Act respecting Constitution Insurance Co. of Canada.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Town of Orangeville.

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Village of Glencoe.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Bill Pr.14, An Act respecting the Town of Espanola.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting Bridge St. United Church Foundation.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the Tillson Spur Line Railway Co.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the County of Bruce.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 98, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

RETAIL SALES TAX ACT
(*continued*)

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Bill 98, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

There really is very little one could say concerning this legislation that has not been said by other speakers. However, because of the import of the legislation I think that on this side of the House we have to keep emphasizing to the government and to the people of Ontario that simply because the government did retreat from the imposition of the energy tax portion of this bill, that that was simply a smokescreen; that the taxes by means of the sales tax are not being increased by two percentage points but by 40 per cent.

It is an increase from five cents to seven cents, which is a 40 per cent increase in taxes. The public have not been made aware of this to the extent that they should have been, as a result of the proposed sales tax on energy.

However, one thought, Mr. Speaker, is that when Prometheus gave fire to man from the heights of Mount Olympus, man would at least have energy that he would not be taxed on. However, this government saw fit to impose this seven per cent sales tax on energy and only withdrew that tax as sort of a deathbed repentance.

However, the bill as presented in front of us does include that portion on the energy tax; and as a result I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that we are at liberty to make a few comments on it.

Mr. Speaker, the 40 per cent increase in the sales tax makes one wonder whether it is the philosophy of the Conservative Party over there, because of the numbers of people on family benefits and receiving welfare, from whom it is not able to collect any type of income tax, to look on the tax as a source of revenue by which the government can minimize or lessen the amount of disposable income to these unfortunate people who have to accept welfare benefits and have to accept different family benefits; that the imposition of a sales tax is another avenue by which it could get funds from these people, lower their standard of living, and—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is it possible to do that? It is so low now.

Mr. B. Newman: —increase the extent of poverty they are presently suffering.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): That is their thinking over there.

Mr. B. Newman: Practically everyone who has spoken prior to my comments has made mention of the regressive nature of the imposition of a sales tax. You know, one per cent is enough, two per cent is twice as bad and five per cent is five times as bad—but when we jump from a five per cent to a seven per cent, Mr. Speaker, one wonders what the thinking really was of the party that has the responsibility of governing this province. A 40 per cent increase in sales tax in one jump is absolutely uncalled for.

The incentives given by the federal government and the improvement in our economy—certainly, Mr. Speaker, shown by all economic analyses—indicates that there was absolutely no need for an imposition of a seven per cent sales tax. With the present buoyant economy the taxes received on a five per cent tax would provide the government with sufficient funds so that there would be no deficit whatsoever. Now, with a seven per cent sales tax, even though the provincial Treasurer (Mr. White) does indicate a deficit for the fiscal year, you can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that because of his inability to forecast revenues in the past, we will end up with a surplus in the 1973-1974 fiscal year.

There isn't one of us in the House who hasn't received myriads of letters from constituents concerning not only the imposition of the energy tax but also the increase in the sales tax. One only has to look at the letters to the editors in practically any paper throughout the Province of Ontario to see how repugnant in the eyes of the public the 40 per cent increase in the sales tax is to them.

The local council of women in the city of Windsor registered very strong opposition; and we know, Mr. Speaker, that when a council of women does act we generally get some type of reaction on the part of government. They probably were one of the organizations that spearheaded the request for the removal of the energy tax. Were it not for organizations such as theirs and the opposition in this Legislature, I doubt that the government would have acted and withdrawn the seven per cent energy tax.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to read into the record the very short comments of a Mr. and Mrs. Russell Warwick, in my riding, who state in their communication to me:

> One would expect the government to do its bit to combat inflation, but tax increases are inflationary. The unions with muscle will ask for higher wages and the spiral will continue. Government sneaked an inflationary move in on us with the uncalled-for increase in car licence plates. Mr. White has never heard about thrift or economy.

One can see the reaction of one individual, who happens to be living on a retirement allowance, to the imposition of the seven per cent sales tax.

Another letter from a Mr. James W. Barlow in my riding says:

> Anything you can do to protest the sales tax. It's about time a halt takes place in the ever-expanding expenditures of our government. I am looking forward to the day when I can decide to spend my money in those areas I find the need, without some other agency doing it for me.

The anti-poverty organizations, in their original protests and in the wires they sent around to all members of the Legislature, did not specifically mention the extension of the tax to energy, but the first line in their telegram addressed to the Premier was:

> THE PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE RETAIL SALES TAX FROM FIVE PER CENT TO SEVEN PER CENT AND THE EXTENSION OF THE TAX TO HOME LIGHTING AND HEATING ARE VIGOROUSLY CONDEMNED BY THE ONTARIO ANTI-POVERTY COALITION.

Mr. Speaker, they do know the effect of taxes on the bare funds that they have at their disposal. And as we all know, sales tax is an additional bar and an additional impediment when it comes to the amount of disposable income that an individual has. There's two per cent less now at the disposal of those who are in the poverty or near-poverty bracket.

One of the previous speakers did mention the big lobby conducted by the Automotive Transport Association of Ontario. Their comments certainly indicate that we will be in an inflationary spiral as a result of the increase in the sales tax from five per cent to seven per cent. I am going to read only one small paragraph, from the communication dated April 12, 1973, which I assume was sent to all members of the Legislature.

> The increase of the sales tax on automotive parts and equipment and the imposition of new levies on electricity and fuel used in terminal operations may affect

the cost of goods transportation. Our vehicles depreciate rapidly through constant use and high annual mileage. Their purchase and maintenance absorb a big increase of the revenue dollar in this highly capital-intensive industry.

Members can see that as a result of the additional sales tax, the cost of shipping is going to increase. As soon as the cost of shipping increases, we are going to have the individual wanting salary and wage increases. Those will be given, especially to the unions and organizations which have a lot of muscle and, as a result, the inflationary spiral goes one step higher.

Mr. Speaker, there are more comments I would like to make concerning the imposition of the sales tax. One I would like to bring to the attention of the minister—and I would assume it has been brought to his attention by even his own backbenchers—is that as a result of this imposition of the sales tax, he is going to find that, with many labour contracts coming up for negotiation this year, there will be an increase approximately of two per cent in their requests for additional indemnities. Wage increase requests will be two per cent more than otherwise.

These wage increase requests—and they are going to be successful—are going to lead to price increases. The price increases are going to lead to additional wage increases. This is all well and good for the individuals who are in some fairly strong organization. It will not affect us but think of the many senior citizens who are living on an extremely fixed income—on minimal incomes in many cases—who now will have to pay two per cent more for everything they purchase other than food.

Mr. Speaker, to show the hunger of this government for funds, even the crippled, the incapacitated, those who have to wear various types of prostheses, are taxed. The five per cent tax now goes to seven per cent. I mentioned to one of the ministers by communication that the prosthesis required for an individual who has a mastectomy operation will be taxable at the seven per cent level, increased from the five per cent level. Surely in cases like this the sales tax could be eliminated completely.

Living as I do in a border town, until this time the difference between the sales taxes in the State of Michigan and the Province of Ontario was only one per cent. It is four per cent in the State of Michigan; it is five per cent in the Province of Ontario. Now we will increase that spread to three per cent—from four per cent in Michigan to seven per cent in Ontario.

Hon. J. White (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Isn't that the least happy place to live—downtown Detroit?

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): It's a good place!

Mr. B. Newman: I am going to suggest to the minister that now Canadians will be going over to the State of Michigan—

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): They will have to pay Detroit sales tax.

Mr. B. Newman: —who, before, may have hesitated to make any types of purchases there because there was only the one per cent difference; now they may not hesitate as much. There is a saving of three per cent to them, and if it's an article that could be up to $100 in value—

Mr. Walker: What about the Detroit sales tax?

Mr. B. Newman: I beg the member's pardon?

Mr. Walker: What about the Detroit sales tax?

Mr. B. Newman: It's only four per cent, that's all.

Mr. Walker: But that's on top of the Michigan tax.

Mr. B. Newman: No, not at all. Not at all.

Hon. Mr. White: Maybe the member had better go over that.

Mr. B. Newman: And the Canadian dollar is discounted. Even with its discount over there at times—occasionally it is at par—the Treasurer is indirectly asking the Ontario resident or the Canadian resident not to hesitate to make his purchases in the State of Michigan because it is to his financial advantage to buy there.

Hon. Mr. White: I have looked at the Detroit model personally and I have decided that there are better models around than Detroit's.

Mr. Spence: He should go over there.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, if he doesn't go to Detroit he should go outside Detroit to one of the shopping malls; or he may go somewhere else in the State of Michigan. All I am trying to point out to the minister is that he

has increased the advantage to the individual who wishes to shop in the State of Michigan. Now he has a three per cent advantage in shopping over there.

Hon. Mr. White: I heard on the radio that they are all coming over to Windsor to pay 79 cents for hamburger instead of $1.19.

Mr. B. Newman: We would like to see them all over shopping in the Windsor area, but not everybody does that. There are still sufficient numbers who cross over into the United States and the minister knows that full well. If he doesn't know that, then he is putting his head in the sand.

Hon. Mr. White: I heard on the radio a week ago that all of the Detroiters are coming over to buy 79 cent hamburger in Windsor instead of paying $1.19 in Detroit. My budget is going to bring down ever further the relative price of hamburger in Windsor by transferring resources to the rural sector.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville has the floor; proceed.

Mr. B. Newman: What the minister did mention is true to a certain degree only. That is only food. That's only meat. The minister doesn't talk about electronic equipment that is cheaper over there generally than back home, and about cigarettes, tobacco, and other miscellaneous items that an individual would have to purchase in his normal course of operating a home. All he has done is increase the advantage and the incentive to the Canadian who wishes to go over there.

Mr. Spence: They make such great hamburger over there.

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member doesn't want to misinform the House. Under section 5, subsection 30 of the Retail Sales Tax Act, artificial limbs, orthopaedic appliances, and equipment designed for the use of blind persons, crippled or chronic invalids have been exempt for years.

Mr. B. Newman: Does that include prostheses for mastectomies?

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): No.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, there you are. This is why I have pointed it out to the minister.

Mrs. Campbell: That's why none are made.

An hon. member: The minister is trying to mislead the House.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the minister may go over and ask his specialists out there and find out if I am right or am I wrong.

Hon. Mr. White: I don't think one wears a prostheses with a vasectomy.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is not what he said.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the minister's mind is at the present time, but I am very serious in my comments on prostheses for mastectomies. If the minister thinks I am wrong in saying there is a sales tax imposed on them, I will be glad to withdraw my comments. My information is that unless it is under a doctor's prescription, and I may even be wrong with that comment, there is the sales tax. It is only this last week that I requested of the minister's department the information on that. The minister is telling us in this House now that there is no sales tax on these prostheses for mastectomies.

Hon. Mr. White: I thought the member said vasectomies.

Mr. B. Newman: Even though I am looking at the fellows over there, I am not interested in that type of a comment.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): They don't need a vasectomy over there. They are working so hard.

Mr. B. Newman: I'll drop the topic, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: Good for the member.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, all I was trying to point out to the minister is that, by increasing the sales tax to seven per cent, he has induced Canadians who wish to shop in the States to go over there and shop, because there's an advantage of three per cent in doing this. I am not saying they will do it but there is the added incentive for doing it.

Mr. Speaker, this government is supposed to have been a government that listens. If it listened to the people on the seven per cent energy tax, now listen to the people also on the seven per cent sales tax. Reduce the sales tax to five per cent. Just as the government said it was a victory for democracy when it eliminated the energy tax, now let it be a second victory for democracy by eliminating

that additional two cents on the dollar on the sales tax and keeping it at least at the five per cent level. With a five per cent sales tax the Treasurer will still raise sufficient funds to keep the Province of Ontario in a non-deficit position. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate on this particular bill, like everyone else who has spoken before me, I can only suggest that the government has flipped its lid. I don't want to give him credit where credit isn't due, but I don't think that the Treasurer, or anyone else over there, thought they could impose a retail sales tax on energy and then withdraw it really to cover up the two per cent they were trying to put on the retail sales tax itself on goods and commodities. I don't give the government that much credit. It was a goof. If the Treasurer could have got away with it he would have reaped those benefits as well and had a balanced budget.

I am disappointed in the Tory backbenchers, Mr. Speaker, because they accepted some pressure from their constituents, and justifiably so, on the retail sales tax on energy. That will be less, or would have been less, in dollar terms per household than the two per cent tax that the government is going to increase now on retail sales tax. Every Tory knows it, and there is not one who has the courage to get up and say it. They can sit there and squirm and wriggle in their seats, but they all know that the two per cent sales tax is much greater to the individual householder than was the seven per cent on gasoline, oil, and so on. They are bought off rather cheaply. They are bought off very, very cheaply.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): We weren't bought off at all.

Mr. Martel: When they are willing to accept that little bit of crumb for the people they represent, then in fact the principle wasn't very high. I can't help but oppose a tax credit on this basis on the two per cent, or any tax, because those people on fixed incomes—and I am going to show members some of their incomes in a moment—are the people who can least afford it. A one-day feast a year and the rest a famine in reality is what they have got.

What does a person do on family benefits, or a single person, crippled, mentally retarded, or blind, whose income per month is $78, plus a maximum of $57 for a room? Under the new rates as of January of this year that is a total of $135 a month. Who in God's name is going to be more affected in the Province of Ontario than the blind, the physically disabled and the handicapped? In the first place, they cannot get a room for $57 a month anywhere, so they are into that $78 very quickly just to cover their rent. Over and above that they will now be paying seven per cent tax for clothes. They just don't have the money left for clothing.

There isn't one of the government members who will have the courage to get up and say it. Let's say there are two people, with the husband disabled, in the Province of Ontario, the land of opportunity, the place of the brave, or any other nonsense you want to add.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): The land of Tories.

Mr. Martel: They are allowed $125 a month if the husband happens to be crippled or blind—$125 a month and they will be paying the seven per cent. That's the group that's going to be affected. Where are all the courageous Tories today? I'm not sure if any of them sleep very comfortably at night. I would suspect it doesn't bother most of them because they are not in that position.

Mr. Germa: They've got thick skins.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): And skulls.

Mr. Martel: They're not in that position. And neither are the people who helped draft the budget. I guess when you look in the public accounts at some of their salaries they won't feel it either. But $125 with $90 rental allowance—how are they going to make it; and what good is the tax credit to them come next year? They have to eat every day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: And the Treasurer once again has bowed out of the picture. I think I should just adjourn the debate at this time, Mr. Speaker, until the Treasurer returns.

I'm moving the adjournment of the debate until we see the face of the Treasurer. Oh, he's come back. Well fine, we won't move the adjournment of the debate. I just don't feel like making my comments without him.

I want to elicit some replies from the minister on the crippled and the mentally retarded, based on the $125 a month given by the Province of Ontario. What good is the tax credit on $125 to them come next year?

Hon. Mr. White: They will be getting a tax credit this month or next.

Mr. Martel: That is for last year, on their housing.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Martel: Right!

Hon. Mr. White: One hundred dollars each and next year it will be $240.

Mr. Martel: That's if they don't starve first. That's if they don't starve in the process. Is the Treasurer aware of what a single person in Ontario gets? Let him tell me! What does a single, crippled person in Ontario get today?

Hon. Mr. White: I am not going to debate in the field of the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle).

Mr. Martel: Oh, don't bring the red herring into it.

I was here last night when the Treasurer said he knew everything that was going on this past week in Ottawa. So he must know it. He gets $78, Mr. Speaker, $78; and he gets $57 for a room. How does he live when he's the first one hit with the seven per cent?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That will be a sizable credit.

Mr. Martel: What good is a credit going to do him next year?

Hon. Mr. White: He will be getting a credit this month.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The Treasurer makes that much in a day.

Mr. Martel: How much? He gets $2 a day to live on—or $2.50. And every article he buys is seven per cent. And where does he get accommodation? He's allowed $57 a month rent. Where does he get accommodation for $57? He's into that $78. The Treasurer knows it and I know it—and he's lucky if he's got $60 a month left to live on. He is going to pay, or she is going to pay, seven per cent; and the Treasurer has got no way to overcome it.

Hon. Mr. White: For every nickel he pays he gets a dollar. Tell the truth: For every nickel a poor man pays he gets a dollar. Of course, his consumption of taxable goods is very small—

Mr. Lewis: What does the Treasurer mean?

Mr. Martel: He has nothing left.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Let them eat cake—that's the Treasurer's attitude.

Hon. Mr. White: Much of what he buys is exempt from sales tax.

Mr. Martel: He has nothing to buy; isn't that what the Treasurer is saying?

Mr. Lewis: Those were cooked up tables—$700 a year for families—

Hon. Mr. White: The misrepresentation in this debate is just astonishing.

Mr. Lewis: We haven't got to the Treasurer yet. We will continue at it.

Mr. Martel: You can go to a family of four living under the great largess in this province and see if they aren't suffering. And they can wait for the tax credit, can't they?

An hon. member: They don't eat.

Mr. Martel: They don't eat either. They don't need clothes for their kids. With an Ontario family of let's say three children, there is $168 if there is one parent, $209 with two parents—plus $100 rent. Now what's left? What good is a tax credit to them?

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order! The hon. member is now debating the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Renwick: No he isn't.

Mr. Cassidy: No he is not.

Hon. Mr. White: The reason for the meetings taking place in Ottawa between the ministers of welfare is because of dissatisfaction about the existing schedules. I think it is not helpful for him to debate this matter in the absence of the responsible minister.

Mr. Lewis: The member is saying that people live from day to day.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order then, Mr. Speaker. As I hear the member, what he is saying is that people in this province live and function from day to day and can't wait for the Treasurer's blessed tax pittance credit once a year. That's what the member for Sudbury East is saying.

Mr. Martel: That is precisely what I said. If the Treasurer had been here when I started instead of taking one of his—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Well, I didn't understand it until the leader explained it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East is wandering from the subject.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all. The Treasurer doesn't like to hear this kind of stuff.

Mr. Speaker: If he relates it back to Bill 98, we will let him proceed.

Mr. Stokes: Don't be so hard.

Mr. Martel: I did not wander one iota, Mr. Speaker. With the greatest of respect, you sat and listened and you knew full well what I was talking about. The minister wasn't even in his place. This is nothing unusual. He can't even face this bill. He's had to run and hide in a corner many times.

Hon. Mr. White: I took an urgent call from northern Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: I gather he did.

Mr. Martel: We'll talk about northern Ontario; I'm coming to that too.

Mr. Lewis: We are not going to accept anything in this bill.

Mr. Martel: I just want to set out what this government is doing as well as the fact that there isn't one of its backbenchers who wants to accept the fact that people in this province eat daily, need clothes daily and need the benefits of life daily, and that a tax credit at the end of the year is immaterial.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. Martel: Many of them will die in the process.

An hon. member: There are only seven backbenchers here.

Mr. Martel: My friend, the vice-chairman of Hydro, sits smiling at the back as we make those comments. I challenge him to go out and live for—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member for Sudbury East is out of order. Now get back to Bill 98.

Mr. Martel: I'm right on.

Mr. Lewis: He is not out of order. He is pointing out that we pay more—

Mr. Martel: I'm right on the bill. I'm talking about how this two per cent will affect those poor people who are not in a position to meet this added expense—and the minister knows it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows he is not speaking to the bill.

Hon. Mr. White: For every nickel they pay they will get a dollar.

Mr. Martel: Yes, if they live between now and then.

Hon. Mr. White. The NDP have copped out. They get nothing from the union bosses.

Mr. Martel: Talk about generosity! The blind, the handicapped and those who are over age 60 are hit by this extra two per cent —more so even than we hear his friend in Ottawa prating about.

Mr. Lewis: What is that stuff about a nickel and a dollar?

Mr. Martel: He prates about needing more for the senior citizens—and I'm not disputing that for a moment—but they get $35 to $40 more than those in Ontario who are 60 years of age or over and can't work. And the government sits there. They should be proud of themselves.

It just boggles the mind to try to suggest that people can exist until they get these tax credits. Maybe if the government gave it to them ahead of time it might work; then they could allot two cents every time they went out to buy something. They could take two cents out of a jar and add it to it if we gave it to them in advance.

And why this tax anyway? I want to refer to page 31 of the Treasurer's budget statement, where he is talking about future policy on taxation of resource industries. He says we've got to "maintain the total tax burden on the mining industry approximately at its present level." What is its present level?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Be sure to include everything.

Mr. Martel: "Leo the Lion" made the same statement in a speech recently too. He said: "Nor can we in Ontario assume, as some have suggested, that we can continue to load the mining industry with tax and other basic costs of refining." What a lot of prattle!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Look what's going to happen in British Columbia. They had it.

Mr. Martel: Without a doubt, the members of this government are not for real. They're

just not for real. They've never looked at it, have they? Has the minister looked at the annual reports of the Ministry of Natural Resources to find out what the production is in mining and what the tax is in mining in this province? The public accounts for 1972 show that the then Department of Mines and Northern Affairs had general revenue of $16 million. That's $16 million in provincial tax. And what was produced—$1,521,415,000 worth of mineral production. And we got $16 million in provincial tax!

Hon. Mr. White: Better add the corporation tax and the income tax.

Mr. Martel: I'll come to that. Just wait. I'm going to come to that one.

That's what the provincial tax was on $1,521,415,000 worth of production. And the provincial tax was $16 million!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): And the Treasurer assured them the other day, "Not a dime more, gentlemen."

Hon. Mr. White: "Not a dime less," was the assurance.

Mr. Martel: Is the Treasurer aware that if one calculates what we got from provincial mining tax last year on his predecessor's budget, it represents one-third of one per cent of the Ontario budget for last year?

Hon. Mr. White: Plus corporation taxes, plus capital gains tax—

Mr. Martel: No. I'll come to the—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: I'm going to come to the corporation tax. Don't get excited.

Mr. Lawlor: Precious little on that too with their depletion allowances, depreciation allowance and the various types of allowances he gives them gratis.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Maybe the members would let the member for Sudbury East speak—that's including the minister too.

Mr. Lewis: He's doing fine. He doesn't mind a little interrupting.

Mr. Martel: One-third of one per cent. That's what he builds an economy on, is it? That's what he builds an industrial nation on? One-third of one per cent of the budget? For the goods and services that we need in the north and so on—one-third of one per cent of the budget is financed through natural resources, the mining industry.

Hon. Mr. White: Look at our unemployment rate in Ontario compared to Manitoba.

Mr. Martel: I can tell the Treasurer what the unemployment rate is in Sudbury. That's a red herring.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That is not the same.

Mr. Stokes: I can show him many areas in northern Ontario where the unemployment rate is 90 per cent!

Mr. Martel: I can show him Cornwall. I can show him—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Martel: I can show him areas of the province where unemployment is 20 per cent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) will tell the Treasurer that. He's got 20 per cent and has had for 3½ years.

Worry about Ontario? I'm talking about money—

Hon. Mr. White: Where is the standard of living the highest in the world?

Mr. Martel: Yes?

Hon. Mr. White: Right here in Ontario.

Mr. Martel: They tell me—

Hon. Mr. White: According to one of the economists.

Mr. Martel: Well, they tell me it's fifth in the world.

Mr. Stokes: What is the unemployment rate at Sandy Lake or Sachigo?

Mr. Cassidy: That's not a high standard of living.

Mr. Martel: The latest I've read said that we rank No. 5. But that's all a red herring. The minister doesn't want to listen.

Mr. Lawlor: The standard of living in Zurich is terribly high. I don't think we reach it.

Hon. Mr. White: The highest standard of living in the world is right here in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: That is typical of the economists.

Mr. Lawlor: Is he in the Treasurer's pay, this particular guy? They will say anything if you pay them enough.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, in 1972, as I indicated, we got $16 million, or one per cent of the value of mineral production. We had that type of income for years and we've got the statements by "Leo the lollipop" and the Treasurer—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Okay, Gomer Pyle.

Mr. Martel: —saying that they in fact don't want to tax them too much. In fact, I know why he says that. He is afraid of industry. For example, Henry S. Wingate recently made a statement about Manitoba. By the way, they are now paying about 2.4 cents on the dollar in Manitoba, as was reported in the Toronto Star just recently; 2.3 cents it is, on the value of mineral production on the dollar. That's a great amount, isn't it?

Mr. Renwick: How much does Henry Wingate make a year now?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: Yes. It says here in a recent editorial of the Toronto Star: "Assuming the return in Ontario is roughly the same, a reasonable assumption given the similar pattern of fees and taxes, Ontario last year got back $28 million total." In other words, the federal income tax—and we want to come to that one; where this government has been screaming it has no room to move—returns less to this province on its 12 points than the province gets from the provincial tax. Less.

In 1968, on a total value of mineral production, Ontario's share was in the neighborhood of $16,334,000 and from the federal government we got back $14 million.

If the government wants room to move that's the place to move into. But it won't. That indicates a total return to Ontario of 2.26 cents for every dollar of mineral production in the Province of Ontario. That's what came back to us in total tax revenues from the mining industry.

That's very similar to Manitoba where they get 2.3. But we have had better years. We have had better years. In fact, in 1967 we got 0.89—not even one per cent—and that was the banner year, the first year we broke the $1 billion mark.

Mr. Lawlor: The mining industry has been working toward that ever since. That was the peak.

Mr. Martel: They broke the $1 billion mark and they had a rocket on the front of their book. We finally broke the $1 billion mark, and that year, on $1,192,000, we got $10 million tax in the province, or 0.89 per cent.

Mr. Lawlor: It's scandalous!

Mr. Martel: Point-eight-nine per cent.

Mr. Renwick: Those mine assessors are really terrific.

Mr. Martel: Yes. They should fire that whole crappy department.

Mr. Lawlor: They really work overtime, those fellows.

Mr. Martel: Point-eight-nine, Mr. Minister. If we want to go down through the years very quickly on provincial tax alone in the mining area, from 1966 on—I bothered to look it up—$14,800,000 in 1966, on almost $1 billion dollars of production; 1967, as I said, the banner year when they finally broke the $1 billion mark. It was seen in the magazine or the annual report.

Hon. Mr. White: No thanks to the member.

Mr. Martel: No. What did Ontario get on $1.192 billion of mineral production? Our share, in provincial tax was $10,640,000 or 0.89 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, boy!

Mr. Stokes: The government actually pays them to take it away.

Mr. Martel: Why not just close it down?

Mr. Lawlor: Of course the minister has nothing to say.

Mr. Martel: The Treasurer can go back and take a 40 per cent increase on every citizen of this province, but he won't go back here and get a chunk of the action, will he? No way.

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Lawlor: He's only the Treasurer. Don't bother him. That's in the Minister of Natural Resources' hands; he's got control of that. He wouldn't let the Treasurer touch it.

Mr. Martel: Right.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There are pretty wild statements coming from that side of the House.

Mr. Renwick: That is a concrete factual statement. The minister wouldn't recognize it.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, the figures I have are right from the last seven years of the mining report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Take the blinkers off and see what is happening in the mining industry.

An hon. member: The member for Sudbury East keeps saying the same thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Sure, because it doesn't sink in.

An hon. member: The same old record always there; he never stops.

Mr. Renwick: Now the government is going to give in to the pulp and paper industry.

Mr. Foulds: It is a restatement for the Tory backbenchers who condescend to show up.

Mr. Renwick: It is the right story and they know it.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the highest the government ever extracted in provincial tax from the industry was 1.5 per cent. That was 1971.

An hon. member: That was for all the fruits of their industry.

Mr. Martel: Then it dropped to 1.05 per cent last year on mineral production.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Somebody has to be responsible.

Mr. Martel: I know what the minister is going to say. What about the other tax? I only have 1968 and some figures from Eric Kierans. But 1968 provincial and federal—the whole bag—we got about $30 million. That represented 2.26 per cent on every dollar of production. That's what is going on in Manitoba; that's why the Eric Kierans report. In Manitoba, they now get 2.3 cents for every dollar of mineral production.

That's the whole total tax picture. That's what it is in Ontario. The government is afraid to look at it, because it is afraid of people like Henry S. Wingate.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, no!

Mr. Martel: When he was chastising Manitoba for increasing it, Henry S. Wingate made the following statement:

> Regrettably, the Manitoba government during the year made effective increased income tax rates and enacted an increase in its mining royalty tax. This means that individuals and industry in Manitoba are paying the highest income taxes and that effective mining royalty taxes are amongst the highest in Canada.

That wouldn't be hard to beat, to be higher than anything in Canada. He said:

> Such high taxation can only deter new mining investment and expansion in the province.

That is the big threat. They hold a big club over the government. Rather than tax them, the government says, "Go ahead, boys, holler out. We don't mind a one per cent return."

But the government can turn around and it can put two per cent on the people right across the board—the poor, the near-poor and the middle income. It can put two per cent on them, or a 40 per cent increase, and it won't even look at it. By the way, do members know what Henry S. Wingate's salary was in 1970? It was $360,000.

Mr. Renwick: What's his pension now that he's kicked out?

Mr. Martel: It's kind of tough for him to struggle.

Mr. Lawlor: He has a right to talk!

Hon. Mr. White: What tax does he pay?

Mr. Martel: He used to take it in stock options.

Mr. Renwick: He spends most of it in New York.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: He is a little overpaid.

Mr. Renwick: He spends most of it in New York because he runs a company down there.

Mr. Foulds: Plus his expense account.

Mr. Renwick: He gets paid in United States dollars for selling out the ore body of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: How much retail sales tax does he pay?

Mr. Foulds: He doesn't buy anything.

Mr. Martel: What does he buy?

We talked about where the Treasurer can move in. I just want to quote one figure.

Mr. Lawlor: He also spends a good deal of time in the Bahamas.

Mr. Martel: The minister has always stated –and I have listened and I've read his speeches, both his and his predecessors–that they went to Ottawa–

Mr. Renwick: Where does the president of Inco live that the Premier is taking with him.

Mr. Martel: –and they had no room to move. I'm just going to quote one figure, and this will show the Treasurer where he has room to move in the Natural Resources field. Nearly $500 million of the profits of metal mining companies and nearly $400 million of the profits of oil and gas producers were untouched by federal income tax in 1969.

Mr. Foulds: Untouched!

Mr. Martel: Untouched! This was not an unusual year for these two sectors. For the four years 1965-1968 the corporations paid taxes on 13 per cent–that is the mining–and 5.7 per cent–that is oil–13 per cent on minerals–of their profits respectively.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Was that federal?

Mr. Martel: Federal. That gives this province the right to move in on that area and if the government doesn't want to do it, as Kierans eventually gets around to saying, it is afraid to take the companies on. The last figure: Leaving approximately $1,500 million of mining profits and $750 million of oil and gas profits free from corporate income tax from 1965 to 1968; and the same goes on.

Mr. Rhodes: Are those national figures?

Mr. Martel: Those are national figures.

Mr. Rhodes: Make that clear.

Mr. Martel: I don't want to mislead anyone. I am saying that in four years there is $1.5 billion of profit in metal mining, and there was no tax on that amount of profit. If this province and if this Treasurer were sincere in wanting to move in a tax area to have room–and I have heard him say he needed room to move–there is the area to move in on. It is not on the residents of Ontario but it is on those beggars who have never paid, and the minister can use all the red herring he wants.

In fact, it is interesting–I go back to one of my favourite companies; I have a lot of love for them–in 1971, I hope the Treasurer hears this because it shows who pays the share of tax, Inco made $210 million and $94 million of it was clear profit. When it came to paying income tax the government declined and said, "Don't pay us; we will pay you."

On a clear profit of $94 million not a single cent was collected in income tax while the government in 1971 gave Inco a tax credit of $2,800,000.

By comparison, the non-corporate citizens of Sudbury–the people the Treasurer is taxing today–in that year he will recall, were earning an average $7,530 per worker. They paid income taxes at the rate of 25 per cent of taxable income. The mining industry paid nothing in that area and our total tax in the province for 1971 from mining was $25 million.

Out of that, Inco didn't pay any to Ontario because it didn't pay any corporation tax in the federal field. We have a return to the province of 1.5 per cent.

I suggest to the minister in winding up, Mr. Speaker, that if he needs revenue–and he claims he does; I am not sure; I am not going to argue that point with him–where to go to get those revenues is from those people who aren't paying. He doesn't go back to the citizens.

I say to the Treasurer, "Have a look to see if, in fact, companies are paying their fair share." I want to know before this debate is over if he thinks $16 million last year is a fair share? I don't think it is. Let him have a look at it and have his tax experts work on it for the whole weekend. They worked all last weekend apparently, or the Treasurer did, in that lost weekend. Let him have a look and if he needs tax dollars then that's where he moves.

I might just indicate how much I think he might be able to extract from those beggars if he had a little bit of courage. They'll threaten to move out; there's no doubt about it.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): How can they move out the ore bodies and smelters?

Mr. Martel: I have no illusions about them not threatening to move out, but–

Mr. Young: They can't take ore bodies with them.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Natural Resources might give them a big cable and they could drag the mines to the States with them. Or when they're finished with that, they'll open up the ones in Guatemala and in New Caledonia and use our capital to do it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They could leave it in the ground.

Mr. Martel: Yes, leave it! With what they're getting, it might be worthwhile.

Mr. Germa: It's better in the ground.

Mr. Martel: We got one-third of one per cent of last year's budget and one per cent a year.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Let's leave it in the ground.

Mr. Martel: We might include a 15 per cent tax on the value of production, a 10 per cent per ton levy on reserves and a doubling of the present acreage taxes.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Let's leave it in the ground.

Mr. Martel: The minister is so far in the hip pocket of the companies it's not even funny! He hasn't even got the courage to look at it. That whole ministry of his is filled with ex-company flunkies.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Table that speech and say it again six years from now.

Mr. Martel: That's right, the whole ministry.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, it is unfortunate that he has to give it over and over again.

Mr. Martel: That whole ministry of his—

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the minister listen and do something about it?

Mr. Germa: Why doesn't the minister correct it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member just isn't making sense.

Mr. Martel: If I'm not making sense I challenge the Minister of Natural Resources—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The NDP's friends in Manitoba did it and where did it get them?

Mr. Martel: I challenge the Minister of Natural Resources to establish an independent committee of economists, free of the flunkies in his ministry, to find out if we're getting our fair share. He hasn't got the guts to do it! Let him put his money where his mouth is.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Look at the member's friends in Manitoba—what did they do in Manitoba?

Mr. Martel: Let him put his money where his mouth is! He is the man who has the power to do it. Let him put his money where his mouth is.

An hon. member: Bring in Eric Kierans.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member for Sudbury East get back to Bill 98 again, please?

Mr. Martel: Well, he provokes me! He provokes me no end because he is so far in the hip pockets—so is that government—of the mining barons. They're robber barons.

Let him establish a committee—if he has the courage—an independent committee of economists to find out if we're getting our fair share. The government just hasn't got the courage to do it, least of all the minister responsible for it.

That's why I think the Treasurer might take that over and get it to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) because it doesn't belong in that department. I beg the minister to reconsider. I ask him to get the money from the source that isn't taxed and relieve the burden on those people who can ill-afford more taxation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my objections to the increase in the sales tax in Bill 98.

Hon. Mr. White: Is the member in favour of the farm package we put in that budget?

Mr. Spence: Will the Treasurer just wait till I get through?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Well, it's improved a little bit since he retracted on the energy tax.

Mr. Spence: That's right. It's been talked about for years and nothing has been done until now; but that was an improvement to the budget. But this sales tax that has been announced in the budget! The tax on energy and fuel created a furore across the province and, Mr. Speaker, with the criticism of my

leader and of our financial critic, and the criticism of the NDP and the furore of the people across the province, the Treasurer withdrew that tax, which was a step in the right direction.

Now under Bill 98, he is increasing the sales tax from five to seven per cent, which is a regressive tax. It is an inflationary tax that falls on the rich as well as the low-income people and creates a greater hardship on those who are in the low-income group than it does on the higher-income people. I think it's unfair to the low-income people in this province, and I think there can be and should be other methods or other ways to collect taxes if the government needs them. I think that the sales tax is just a little unfair to those in the low-income bracket.

Mr. Speaker, at the criticism of my leader and our financial critic and the NDP, the minister withdrew the tax on fuel or energy. With this criticism which has been offered on Bill 98, I expect that the Treasurer will withdraw this increase in the sales tax in this province. We hope so anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to re-echo the criticism that has been offered by my colleagues yesterday and today, but there are some points that I would like to bring to the Treasurer's attention—that this sales tax is inflationary and affects the prices of the food that the people of this province eat. I don't think this has been brought out as yet, Mr. Speaker, to this Legislature.

For instance, there is the canning industry in this province. I come from an area where there are tremendous amounts of tomatoes grown, and the farmers enter into a contract with these canning companies to produce tomatoes. The canning companies supply the farmers with hampers. Now, a five per cent sales tax has been paid on these hampers in the past, and also on the cans that are bought by the canning company to be used in the canning of tomatoes.

And also, Mr. Speaker, there is a label which goes on the can, which is another five per cent. So naturally the canning companies add that extra five per cent on the supplies that are needed in the canning industry, and the consumer has to pay it.

Mr. Speaker, I might say too that a few weeks ago we had the ladies of the Province of Ontario protesting the increased price of food. As a small illustration, there is the paper that is used by the butcher to wrap the meat; there was another five per cent sales tax put on that. The butcher, naturally, adds that on the the selling price. And so when you increase the sales tax, naturally it is put on the price to the consumer—and the consumer has to pay it.

So, I think raising the sales tax is very inflationary in the way it affects the people of the Province of Ontario. I think myself that a graduated income tax is a fairer way, if the government is in great need of more revenue. And it falls on those who are most able to pay.

I was very disappointed to understand in this Bill 98—and I didn't read anything about it—that the government is asking the businessmen of this province to collect a sales tax for the government of the Province of Ontario.

Now, we have big businesses who can do that without too much harm. But the small businessman in this province is struggling for existence. And so he has to buy cash registers, he has to give his time in order to create this service for the government of the Province of Ontario.

I think that these small businessmen, or the businessmen of this province, should receive some remuneration for carrying out this service for the government of Ontario. In this day and age, nobody can work for nothing.

I would hope the minister would reconsider, Mr. Speaker, and see that some of the small businessmen be given some remuneration for their work and their efforts in collecting this sales tax, if it goes into force.

I might say that clothing has been taxed in this province. I think that's a hardship. It is hard for me to believe that the government would tax clothing. I would like to see it, if this Act goes into force, exempt clothing; because clothing is as much a need as food, as much a need as heat. I would ask the provincial Treasurer, if he has any heart at all, that clothing for adults in this province be exempted.

Now, there are many other things that I could say in regard to this, but I think the Treasurer should reconsider this. It is an unfair tax. It falls on the little man with greater force than it does on the man in the high income bracket and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer will reconsider this. He did reconsider the tax on energy and fuel and I would expect, after hearing the criticism from every party in this House, that he will do the same thing as he did with the fuel and the energy tax.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I think that we should adjourn the debate. I move the ad-

journment until the Treasurer comes back. Perhaps he is lurking in the corridors. In that case he might wish to appear before we take the vote on it. I would so move, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Cassidy moves the adjournment of the debate. All in favour of the—

Mr. Cassidy: I am willing to withdraw it if that spectre coming in is the minister. Yes. I would withdraw my motion then, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Drea: Saved by my hand!

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, that's right, I appreciate that, yes, and somebody swiftly running out in order to call in the minister.

Hon. Mr. White: I would like to inform the members that I had to leave the room for a very important purpose.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, if that is the minister's problem, we wonder that he absents himself so often.

Mr. Speaker, a number of members have spoken on this side. I want to take up the question of regressivity in the budget, because I don't think that the minister is at all aware of the impact of his budget. He is either ill-advised or else he is showing duplicity to this House in the kind of comments that he has brought before us.

Mr. Speaker, the minister had a number of choices in the budget. He could have raised the income tax if he had to, if he felt that his expenditure and revenue estimates had to be met. We disagree on that.

Mr. Martel: That would have been the fairest place.

Mr. Cassidy: That's correct. It would have been the fairest place and Ontario in fact now has got the lowest rate of income tax in the country.

Mr. Martel: It would hit his financial friends more.

Mr. Cassidy: As the member for Sudbury East mentioned, he could have raised the resources tax. He could have touched the sacred area of corporation tax. But no, Mr. Speaker, he chose once again to hit the ordinary taxpayers of the province.

He hit them with a $340 million sales tax increase and then proceeded to try to explain his way out of it. He is trying to explain that somehow it's not really going to hurt at all, that somehow between the municipal tax credits, the payments to municipalities and the tax credit for sales tax which is being given, that people will be better off than before.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to do some basic arithmetic with the minister. There are about seven million people in this province. His tax will raise $340 million in a full year. That's $50 per person on average of $200 on average for a family of four and that will be paid by individual taxpayers and will not be followed through other parts of the tax system. If he wants to work it out in terms of the population over the age of 15, which accounts for most of the consumption and excludes children, then it is something like $70 to $75 for each and every Ontario resident over the age of 15.

Mr. Speaker, how then does a $28 or a $36 tax credit allowed to families of four or three compensate just for the increase in tax, or just for the tax? How does it even account for the increase? I have some figures here which suggest it will not even do that.

The minister says that sales tax is more progressive than income tax. He said it in the House the other day. I hate to throw Mr. Maslove's book at him again but I have been looking at it with some interest, because frankly the minister is cockeyed and his advisers are cockeyed if they keep on telling him that he can say that kind of thing. The studies which have been done indicate that the sales tax is a regressive tax, that it is a proportionate tax at certain income levels, but then when you get into the levels of income of over $10,000, it is decidedly regressive. In other words, it takes proportionately less from the rich than it does from people on middle incomes, and when you go down below middle incomes you find the incidence of sales tax is the greatest at the very poorest level.

Mr. Speaker, the average incidence of the Ontario sales tax at the present rate, prior to May 1, is about 2.4 per cent. But people earning over $10,000 universally pay less than 2.4 per cent, while people earning under $10,000 universally pay more than that amount. In fact, at $3,000 the sales tax incidence is three per cent of that very small income. By the time we get up to $12,000 it is down to 2.4 per cent, and by the time we get to $15,000 it is 1.8 per cent. Now that is not a progressive tax.

On the other hand, if we look at the income tax, at the lowest income I have just quoted, the tax is about five per cent of

income, while up at the highest level it is about 16 per cent. That's not a very progressive tax either, Mr. Speaker, but it is an awful lot better than the tax which takes proportionately more from the poor than it takes from the rich.

I made a calculation here to see what people actually pay. At $3,000 income, they now pay $90 in sales tax, and they will pay approximately $36 more as a result of the 40 per cent tax increase the minister has brought in. A family of three or four just might get enough back to compensate for the increase in sales tax but nothing to compensate for the regressivity of the original tax.

When we get up to the $9,000 level, which isn't a very high level of income in cities like Toronto or Ottawa—one can't afford to buy a house or even to pay the rents being charged in many parts of these cities on that income; it is very difficult to keep family together on that income—but at the $9,000 level people will pay about $234 at the present rate of tax, and they will have another $92 to pay because of the minister's increase.

The minister is pulling out the figures that he passed around to the press; and, Mr. Speaker, those figures are phoney. They make no sense at all. Those figures do not stack up against any other studies that have been done about the amounts that people pay. The minister is asking us to believe that a family with $10,000 of income spends only $1,400 a year on taxable commodities. Now that is very hard to believe. In fact, it is incredible to believe that it would be that little.

The minister ignores that shelter costs include an element of sales tax. Home maintenance costs include an element of sales tax. Grocery store purchases include a substantial element of sales tax on things like soap, cleaning materials, mops and brooms, soda pop for the kids, chocolate bars and all sorts of other items bought at the grocery store. These figures just don't make any sense at all, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just say in connection with tax credits that, according to Maslove's figures, the incidence of sales tax on people in the $3,000 range will go down to 1.8 per cent. And the tax is infinitesimally progressive if we go up to the $6,000, $9,000 and $12,000 ranges, because at those levels about 2.2 per cent of income will be paid on the provincial sales tax at the new rate, including the tax credit. But that is a very mild form of progressivity.

What about the one-third of Ontario families who have incomes of over $12,000? When we come to them we find that the incidence of sales tax on them is only 1.6 per cent with the tax credits and the new rates. And if you recall, Mr. Speaker, 1.6 per cent incidence is a lower rate of tax than is being charged on people earning $3,000 a year. That is ridiculous.

It is a completely regressive tax, Mr. Speaker, and it indicates to us, if I can get beyond these figures, that the minister simply doesn't know the kind of lives that the bulk of the people in the province are leading. The minister says Ontario has the highest standard of living in the world. Well, some Ontarians have a very high standard of living, granted.

Mr. Martel: He is one of them.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is beguiling himself with averages. There are two or 2½ million Ontarians, Mr. Speaker, who have a very low standard of living, many of whom live at below a subsistance level; many of whom are going steadily into debt; many of whom cannot afford to give to their children an adequate diet, adequate clothing or other essentials in order to help their healthy development.

That's what's happening in this supposedly affluent province. If you go to other countries which in theory have a lower standard of living, Mr. Speaker, you will find that they treat their children in their poorest income groups an awful lot better than we do in this supposedly rich province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the minister said in his budget he wanted to enrich the tax credit system to ensure that the burden of the tax increase will fall on our more prosperous taxpayers. Now when he replies in this debate I wish that he would explain how it is that ensuring the burden of the tax would fall on more prosperous taxpayers entails charging a higher rate of tax to people earning under $10,000 a year, with the sales tax, than the people earning over $10,000 a year. That just doesn't ring true.

The minister also had a rather specious argument in the debate just recently. He said; "For every nickel that low-income families pay, they get a dollar back."

Well, I worked this one out. I took a single taxpayer, with $2,000 income; he'll get $16 back from the minister's tax credit—$16. If they are going to pay a nickel for every dollar they get back, that means that they will pay 80 cents in extra tax to the minister. That

means in turn, Mr. Speaker, that that taxpayer earning $2,000 is so close to the subsistence line that he can afford 80 cents a week or $40 a year to buy untaxable items. Taxable items such as soap and toilet paper, suds to do his washing with— there are a number of things in the minister's tax, Mr. Speaker, which are essentials and which are not luxuries and which cannot be avoided and 80 cents a week is all that the minister would allow to be spent on that.

Mr. Martel: Maybe they can eat goldfish.

Mr. Cassidy: Or the other explanation is this. That the minister, dealing in hyperbole, has reckoned that for every dollar of welfare or social assistance a low-income family receives, it will pay a nickel's worth of tax. Maybe that is what he meant.

In that case he was completely irrelevant to the argument being made on this side. He was completely misleading and the minister has been misleading, Mr. Speaker, right through this piece.

Hon. Mr. White: The member has.

Mr. Lewis: Is that what he meant by the dollar-nickel analogy?

Mr. Cassidy: Is that what he meant?

Mr. Lewis: What did he mean by the nickel-dollar reference?

Hon. Mr. White: I will deal with it when my turn comes.

An hon. member: The Treasurer will work on it over the weekend.

Mr. Cassidy: He'll deal with it—okay. Well, the minister puts out erroneous figures which are not to be trusted. The minister launches specious remarks in the House. The minister, against the evidence of Maslove, against the evidence of Orland Nelson in the Canadian Tax Journal and other experts, tries to tell us that the sales tax is more progressive than the income tax. The minister simply does not understand the tax system over which he is—

Hon. Mr. White: I didn't say that.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, he did. Yes, he did.

Mr. Cassidy: It is in Hansard of a couple of days ago.

Hon. Mr. White: Not more progressive—no I didn't. Give me the reference.

Mr. Cassidy: My leader will find the reference; we have treasured it, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to diverge for a minute to ask who benefits from this, because the minister will undoubtedly get up in the House in a few days when this debate is ending to tell us about the wonderful things he is doing with the revenues being raised by the sales tax.

Mr. Martel: I think he's selling sweaters.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. One of the things he is doing is he is giving only half of that revenue back to the municipalities in an effort to reduce their tax rates by about six per cent.

Here we are. Page 1073 of Hansard, April 17, 1973. The minister interjected:

> Oh, come now; the sales tax is not as regressive as a personal income tax.

And that is a direct quote from the minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, at no time, in any place, have I ever said the retail sales tax was more progressive than the income tax, because I know it is not. If this interjection of mine has been improperly recorded, I set the record straight now.

What I did say was that the retail sales tax, with the credits, is much more progressive than it was; while the personal income tax, thanks to Mr. Turner's changes, is less progressive than it was—therefore, they now have a comparable degree of progressivity.

Mr. Lewis: It was better the first time. The Treasurer must have said that the first time.

Hon. Mr. White. Look at the budget!

Mr. Lewis: Well, the Treasurer certainly didn't say it in the interjection before.

Mr. Cassidy: So, the minister is saying that the new sales tax is just as progressive as Finance Minister Turner's income tax.

Hon. Mr. White: It's more progressive.

Mr. Cassidy: It's what?

Hon. Mr. White: Our credits make it more progressive; and Mr. Turner's changes in the income tax make it less progressive.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): So, the Treasurer was quoted right in Hansard on the changes?

Mr. Cassidy: The Treasurer is saying that it is more progressive than Mr. Turner's income tax. Those are the words the minister used, I believe. Well, I guess he'll stand on the record on that, Mr. Speaker. It isn't true and,

in fact, the federal income tax changes—which were greatly influenced, I might say, by the New Democratic Party—had created much more progressivity in that tax system than has ever existed before—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: —because the benefits of the tax reductions there were directed almost exclusively to people in the income ranges of under $10,000 a year. I just don't know who is advising the minister.

If I can return, let's look at where that $180 million, which is the chief—

Mr. Martel: Is the minister slipping lately?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, he is.

Where is the $180 million for municipalities actually going to wind up? The minister's tables erroneously state that that money is going to go to the homeowner—$15, $25, $70 in property tax reductions.

The implication is that people will get back on the swings what they lose on the roundabouts; that what they pay in extra sales tax they will get in substance, or in large part, back through the property tax; that the device in using a regressive tax increase to combat a regressive tax at the municipal level is justifiable in this province.

Well, I don't know if the minister realizes it, but out of that $180 million benefit to municipalities, and assuming that that was all passed back to the municipalities, more than 40 per cent wouldn't go to homeowners and tenants at all. It would go to businesses and corporations who pay that proportion of the municipal tax.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. Cassidy: And it staggers us that the minister could not have on the precedents of previous holders of his office ensured that all of the benefit of that $180 million went to tenants and to owners and it was not passed back to corporations; that is that a differential tax rate be further introduced from what exists right now.

Then, the second thing is—I don't think the minister is aware of the way in which the rental market works in major cities like Toronto and like Ottawa. In Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, 50 per cent of the people are tenants. I believe the figure is higher here in Toronto. There is not a word in the budget to ensure that the benefit of any municipal tax reductions is passed on to tenants by their landlords. There is not a single word there to ensure that they see the benefit. So, who will get the benefit of that?

An hon. member: Ottawa.

Mr. Cassidy: Who will get the benefit of approximately 50 per cent of what remains from the $180 million the minister is giving municipalities? It will go to the landlords, to the corporate landlords who now dominate the rental market in large cities like Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa. Not only that, but who then will suffer most because tenants will not see any benefit if municipalities decide to cut the tax rates?

Well, the minister may not be aware of it but, in fact, low-income people tend to be tenants; higher-income people tend to be homeowners. High-income people, therefore, will see any benefit of tax reductions passed on by municpalities; lower-income people won't, because they are tenants. And in the tight housing markets that prevail in the major cities of the province, there is absolutely no way that they can compel or persuade their landlords to pass back that $15 or $20 or $25 tax reduction.

Mr. Young: But the landlords will raise rents because of the two per cent.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. We have fortunately avoided the perverse situation where landlords would have raised rents because of the energy tax, while ignoring the fact that they were getting a comparable reduction through the municipal tax cuts if any had actually occurred. We have avoided that kind of perverse situation.

But I can assure the minister that in three or four months time, despite a possible tax cut in Ottawa, I will have people coming to me in my riding telling me that their rent has gone up by $10 a month and that the landlord told them he did it because of the property tax increase, even when none actually existed.

In my riding, Mr. Speaker, just to let the minister know the way in which these differences take place, in the area where I actually live, 84 per cent of the people are tenants and, therefore, won't benefit from any tax cuts created by the money he is generating from this sales tax increase. Next door, across the road, 97 per cent of the people are tenants. This is the centre of the city and it is essentially a low-income area. In other areas, also low-income, the proportions run 68 per cent and 84 per cent.

When you go to the affluent areas around Island Park Dr. and the Civic Hospital in

my riding, you find that almost everybody owns his own home, that 70 per cent of the people own their own homes. When you go to the suburbs of the west end of Ottawa, where people's incomes are in the $10,000 and $15,000 category, you find that 75 and 80 per cent of the people who live there own their own homes.

The money being generated by this sales tax, which is a regressive tax on poor people, when it comes out in the wash will mainly benefit homeowners who will feel the effects directly. Therefore, you have a transfer of tax from poor people to people who are better off. We just can't accept that. We just don't understand that at all.

Mr. Speaker, another point is that this tax is inflationary. I only need to point for the minister's benefit to what happened in Quebec in 1966 to 1967 when the Quebec government raised its sales tax from six to eight per cent. The inflation in Quebec that flowed from that tax increase was one of the direct reasons for the enormous bout of inflation that this country had during the late 1960s.

Is the minister so unaware of economics that he doesn't think that his inflationary tax increase will affect collective bargaining agreements? Does he think the unions will simply stand by and accept that they should be penalized by an added increase in the cost of living, which is already going up by five per cent, without raising any demand to their employers? Does he think that executives, for that matter, won't negotiate also in order to get higher salaries because of the increase in the cost of their inflated standard of living, arising out of the sales tax increase? It's going to happen. One other area, Mr. Speaker, where it's going to happen very specifically and where one can put a very specific cost on the minister's proposals, is in the field of housing that people buy or want to buy. The cost of a new home last year in Toronto was $32,000, according to the National Housing Act statistics. It was a good deal higher than that on an average because many homes were not financed by CMHC. The cost of homes in Ottawa, Hamilton, Windsor and Thunder Bay was also in the range from $29,000 to $31,000. At least $10,000 worth of building materials goes into each of those new homes. It may even be higher. The increase in tax that the minister is imposing amounts to $200 on that $10,000 worth of materials. He is contributing directly to the inflation in housing costs that is such a scandal in this province right today.

Mr. Speaker, people who face that extra cost will have to borrow the money in order to finance it. They will have to borrow that money at current mortgage rates of 9.25 per cent. They will be paying over 20 or 25 years in principal and interest something like an extra $25 a year on their shelter costs in order to accommodate the minister's increase in sales tax. And that, Mr. Speaker, is enough to wipe out any sales tax credit which small families may get from the minister's tax credit.

One wonders if the minister ever talks to his federal leader, whether he even acknowledges that Mr. Stanfield is his federal leader, whether he ever talks to other federal Conservatives. Didn't the minister hear Mr. Stanfield, in ringing tones through the campaign of 1972, promise that a Conservative government would repeal the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials in order to bring down the cost of housing? Didn't he hear the Conservative candidate in his own riding in London promise the same thing? Didn't he see it in the leaflets distributed by his party?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Maybe he didn't allow it.

Mr. Cassidy: How does the minister justify this schizophrenia between the provincial and federal levels of his party? The seven per cent tax that he is imposing on building materials comes on top of an 11 per cent federal tax for a total of 19 per cent of the cost of the materials going into a new home.

Mr. Speaker, that is something like $2,000 to $2,500 going into the cost of a new home, and adding to the housing inflation that we suffer right now. We suggest that it shows absolutely no concern about housing on the minister's part, and that it also reveals that the divisions that are within the Ontario Conservative Party are also matched by the divisions between this Conservative Party and its federal counterparts.

Mr. Martel: Hear, hear. Right on!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the minister might come back and say he agrees, he thinks that there should be an exemption for building materials, or for building materials up to a certain value for moderate-income housing. He might also come back and realize that children's clothing above the certain sizes now specified in the Act should be tax-free if it is designated for kids of under the age of 14 or 16, whatever the cutoff age is.

He might also agree that household necessities, such as soap and cleanser and so on, ought to be exempted. But by that time he will have riddled the tax full of holes if he makes all those exemptions, that's what the minister will say. The exemptions are necessary because it is such a regressive tax and because it is being put to such a high level. That is why we suggest that there are other more equitable means of taxing which the minister should use, rather than homing in on individual consumers, particularly in the lower-income ranges with the kind of taxes he has imposed.

The minister suggested when he had his energy tax that all we needed to do to avoid its incidence was to put on a sweater and turn down the thermostat.

Hon. Mr. White: I didn't say that either.

Mr. Cassidy: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. White: I didn't say that either.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, the minister is rather labelled with it.

Mr. Lewis: It will live with him forever.

Mr. Cassidy: It will, yes. I am just wondering whether he is telling the people of this province that they should put away the soap and wash only once a week, that they should wash their sheets once a month—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: —that they should stop using toilet paper and use green rhubarb leaves.

Mr. Foulds: Or the Reader's Digest.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of attitude the minister has to the necessities that people have.

Hon. Mr. White: There's no tax on haircuts.

Mr. Cassidy: Okay, that's not a problem for him because his isn't growing any more.

Hon. Mr. White: What's the member's excuse?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the minister doesn't really know where the people of the province are at. The people I know in my riding may buy the occasional goldfish, and the two-cent saving that the minister gives them by exempting pets, when they go down to Woolworth's to buy a goldfish, may tickle their fancy, but they don't buy dogs for $50, or pedigreed cats for $150. It's the kind of people the minister consorts with who, in fact, will benefit substantially from his repeal of the sales tax on pets.

I, for one, am quite willing to see the sales tax on pets go back, because as far as I am concerned it is a very highly progressive tax; it hits people in upper-income levels and the ones who want to buy jaguars and other things like that, and it doesn't really hit—

Mr. Foulds: Ocelots.

Mr. Cassidy: —the kids and their parents in low-income groups—

Mr. Renwick: They pick them up at the Humane Society.

Mr. Cassidy: —who will get a stray from the Humane Society and are more concerned that an animal be available than to have a pedigree as long as your arm. So we'll support putting that back, if we have to.

But we do suggest that it reveals the minister doesn't really understand where the ordinary people of the province are at. They don't buy these pets, Mr. Speaker. They do buy a number of necessities, they have to buy necessities, and they have to pay this savage tax. It is not fair, and he ought to withdraw it.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I had prepared to speak on this bill in two aspects—the philosophy of those opposing it and the terms themselves. I must say, however, that I was thrown a bit of a curve this morning when I found that one of our bright young Tories apparently has now enunciated for the party two philosophies which may explain in some part why this bill is before us: 1. Women belong in another world; and 2. They are not of the same race as men.

I think we should really have a very full debate on this matter, because I am not sure which of the two was regarded to be of the human race, and I think the minister ought perhaps to explain it.

I am also indebted deeply to my friend from Lakeshore who advised this House as to just what the minister was doing on the weekend; he was, in fact, cutting grass. That explained to me something of the reasoning in this proposed Act, whereby his love of growing things didn't seem to extend to sod, which produced grass and he perhaps has to cut.

If I may, before I get into my opposition in this matter, I do have one element of

commendation; it relates, of course, to the amendments with reference to restaurant meals. This is an important factor in a city such as Toronto, and in Metropolitan Toronto, and I commend the government for giving consideration to what has been an inequity for those who must eat all their meals in restaurants because of a lack of adequate housing.

I would like to look at the matter of the way in which the budget itself was produced and this particular aspect of it. It was explained to us by the Treasurer that it is important to keep these matters very confidential until they can get before this House, because one does not want any portion of the public to be able to take unfair advantage of these pronounced policies. Yet it is interesting that in the processing of this particular bill, those who can afford to evade it, at least for a time, have been given ample opportunity to go on their buying sprees. But again those who haven't the funds or the credit to do so are going to be stuck with paying the tax whether they can afford it or not.

I would also like to point out one small factor. It has been my experience in other government areas that the costs of administering such rebates or credits, as has been referred to, can sometimes pretty well erode the whole effect. The Treasurer, in answer to my question in the House, advised me that there would be no costs attached. However, I have taken the opportunity to speak with those in authority in Ottawa, and they advise that this sort of administrative cost is provided for by agreement, and of course there will be charges back for any administrative costs which may flow from it. I point that out because I think it has just a bit of a bearing on whether or not one has adequately considered all of the ramifications of this proposed legislation.

Now we come to general philosophy for a moment, if I may. I think it's almost unanimous in this House, in one form or another, that this type of tax is a regressive tax. What is this government's attitude to financing with relation to this type of legislation.

We see that the Premier (Mr. Davis) of the Province has found it necessary to adequately service his own office, to increase the costs to the taxpayer by close to $1 million in two years. Attendant on that we find it's incumbent upon the Speaker in the budget, to cut the stipends of attendants to try to overcome some of this spending.

We have seen the runaway costs of Medicare. This government's answer is not to try to work out something to give some sort of controls but "Let's cut off stipends to interning students as of last May"—granted, this has been corrected as a result of the opposition—and, of course, to attack the nursing students, although I'm sure none of these can fill the coffers of the party, and to make them pay tuition fees and give them, in some cases, two months to pay $250; and, of course, to pay for part of their residential accommodation.

The Provincial Secretariat for Justice and the whole galaxy of Justice has proliferated and the philosophy of this government is to advise legal aid to cut off services to children in the afternoon because the cost is so high. Why a child in the afternoon should not be as needful of that sort of care as a child in the morning perhaps this government will explain, because it's part of its philosophy.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): It's hard for anyone else to understand.

Mrs. Campbell: I would like not to deal in generalities but to take two specific cases to try to appeal to the Treasurer to understand something of the way in which this tax itself will function.

A young man—a handicapped young man but I trust he does belong to the same race—has an income of $136 per month. Because of his specific disability he has to pay out $200 for shoes in one year. These people are not permitted to work under the system that is operative here—and I'm glad the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) is here because I wanted to ask a question but my gymnastics are still not catching up with it. These handicapped people are advised that the fire marshal has informed employers that they should not be employed because they are a bad risk. I would love to have that checked. I wanted to ask that question.

These are people who are being asked to pay this tax out of these limited funds. How can the Treasurer say that they will get a credit next year? With this kind of increase I am perfectly certain that they will remain in the house and not get the shoes they need because they won't be able to pay it this year, and it doesn't matter next year.

There is one other point that I would like to make. The Treasurer has stated as his philosophy—and it is one with which I am in entire agreement—that we do not want to

pass off to future generations the debts of today.

Hon. Mr. White: I am sorry I didn't say that either.

Mrs. Campbell: All right. He did use another phrase. I just hadn't caught it.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes.

Mrs. Campbell: But it was stated that it was the real objective of this legislation to reduce the debt of this province and, therefore, of course, to have the present generation absorb it. I find the philosophy difficult to understand when one looks at the effect of this tax on future taxpayers who are not provincial taxpayers per se in this equation. Does the Treasurer understand that municipalities have been capitalizing the five per cent for their capital projects and will be of necessity capitalizing the seven per cent for capital projects, and this will be part of their debt financing for many generations to come!

I would note the time, Mr. Speaker, and would feel that it would be incumbent upon me at this point to move the adjournment of this debate.

Mrs. Campbell moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will continue with the debate presently before the House—order 16, Bill 98. We will also start sitting Monday evening.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, just before the adjournment, would the House leader give us assurance that so long as the debate on Bill 98 continues, the estimates committee will not be sitting?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I will not do that because I am of the opinion, although I am not certain, that the estimates of the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) have been called for Monday.

Mr. Renwick: That is precisely the reason for my question. They have been called for Monday afternoon following the question period. When a bill, such as this bill, is being debated in the assembly, it is not proper that the estimates committee, in my view, should be sitting. That is why I ask for the assurance.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As I have said on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to interfere with the sitting of committees. I think that this is consistent with the commitment that I gave the House. It is going to be difficult enough to keep them all planned and operating so we don't involve two different groups of people in two different places. I feel satisfied that we are doing the correct thing in accordance with my commitment.

Mr. Renwick: This bill is the core of the budget.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Just a point for the House leader: I understand and accept the relevance of his statement to the fact that estimates in committee will go simultaneously with the House. But on a bill of this kind—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, it's up to the committee. The member was complaining earlier—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, no, that isn't really fair.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The committee never met. So don't give us that nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: That isn't really fair, because the committee will follow what the House leader deems to be appropriate in the order of business and—well, the committee hasn't met yet, that's true; this particular committee hasn't even met. There are obviously people who are going to want to participate on second reading of this bill—since it is the centrepiece of the government's budget—who will also have to be in the committee on the Attorney General's estimates, and that just seems to be an unfair order in the business of the House. Surely the committee can begin to sit on conclusion of second reading.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Once again, Mr. Speaker, I am endeavouring to be as co-operative as I possibly can and I know that membership on committees can be substituted. I feel that I have bent over backwards—now far enough in the course of this session—in regard to the committee and the House and so on, in regard to the requests of the opposition. Although I really want to offer every co-operation that I can, I will leave that determination to the committee.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 27, 1973

Parks and recreation administration study, statement by Mr. Bernier 1341

Mercury task force, statement by Mr. Bernier 1342

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Singer 1345

Algonquin Park plan, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Reid, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer 1348

Soil sample processing, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon 1350

Parks and recreation administration study, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 1351

Interest payments on German loans, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 1351

Ontario position on pensions at 60, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Deans 1351

Women's conference on world conditions, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Sargent 1352

Ottawa families' housing problem, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Cassidy 1354

Service station operating hours, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Deacon 1354

Charges for use of Crown lands, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes, Mr. Foulds 1355

Mercury task force, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Reid 1355

Memo on electricians in property management branch, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Shulman 1356

Tabling letter from Ontario Hydro chairman, Mr. Davis 1356

Report, office of the Registrar General, Mr. Clement 1356

Report, liquor licence board, Mr. Clement 1356

Third reading, Income Tax Act amendment 1356

Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 1356

Retail Sales Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, on second reading 1357

Motion to adjourn debate, Mrs. Campbell 1377

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1377